

OFFICE OF FOOD FOR PEACE – STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE I
“CRITICAL FOOD NEEDS OF TARGETED GROUPS MET”

RESULTS REVIEW
FY 2000 PERFORMANCE

OFFICE OF FOOD FOR PEACE – EMERGENCY PROGRAMS
BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE
UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

June 11, 2001

RESOURCE REQUEST FOR FY 2003 FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1 (EMERGENCY PROGRAMS)
AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2 (DEVELOPMENT DIVISION) IS SUBMITTED AS A SEPARATE
DOCUMENT

Please Note:

The attached RESULTS INFORMATION ("R2") is from the FY 2002 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4"), and was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:
USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after July 1, 2001

PART 1: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2000, the Office of Food for Peace, Emergency Programs (SO1 team) provided 947,917 metric tons of Title II emergency food aid, valued at \$506.9 million to 32 countries. This provided for the critical food needs of at least 28,200,295 people, reaching 82.26 percent of the targeted level of beneficiaries. Of the total 947,917 metric tons emergency food aid, approximately 445,185 metric tons (47 percent) were programmed through U.S. private voluntary organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and 306,567 metric tons (32 percent) through the World Food Programme's (WFP) emergency relief programs. In addition, WFP programmed 196,165 metric tons (21 percent) through its Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRROs) that targeted an additional 7 million beneficiaries.

Although FY 2000 did not witness the level of "mega disasters" experienced the previous year, there were several crises that required considerable Title II emergency resources. The Africa region demanded 54.89 percent of overall FY2000 Title II emergency resources (520,270 metric tons valued at over \$293.3 million). Of the total provided to the Africa region, more than 47 percent (248,200 metric tons) assisted the drought in Ethiopia. Protracted complex emergencies in Angola, Sierra Leone, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda and Rwanda continued to require considerable food assistance that ranged from 68,000 metric tons to 14,000 metric tons.

The SO1 team provided 277,140 metric tons valued at over \$101.9 million (29.24 percent of overall FY 2000 resources) to Asia and Near East region. Of this total, more than 72 percent (200,000 metric tons) assisted the humanitarian crisis in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Assistance to Afghanistan (26,870 metric tons), and Indonesia (25,720 metric tons) also continued at significant levels.

The level of assistance provided to Europe and Eurasia was 108,567 metric tons valued at over \$73.6 million, while Latin America and the Caribbean received 10,000 metric tons valued at \$2.3 million. These represent 11.45 and 1.05 percent respectively of overall FY2000 Title II emergency resources. This is a significant decrease from the previous year when considerably more resources were required to respond to Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and the Balkan crisis.

Since the development of its Strategic Plan and results framework, the SO1 team and its implementing partners have sought to incrementally improve program performance and demonstrate results. To further ensure consistent, strategic planning in country programming, the SO1 team made several organizational changes during the reporting period. The Emergency Response Division was changed to Emergency Programs to reflect the division not only responds to emergencies, but integrates longer term issues in its programming. A new unit is in process of being established that will coordinate strategic planning across programs, incorporating SO1 principles, core values, and lessons learned into program planning and design. Monitoring and reporting on program performance will be further strengthened.

Constraints and Factors Influencing Progress

Staffing Shortage Experienced for Many Years: During the reporting period, staffing shortages continued to be a constraint. The SO1 team was understaffed and stretched to the limit throughout the reporting period. The complex and protracted process for recruiting both U.S. direct hires (USDH) and Personal Service Contractors (PSCs) contributed to the gap in staffing. A considerable length of time is required for Bureau of Management, Office of Procurement actions to get staff on board.

Contributing to this problem is the general perception that Backstop-15 and Food for Peace positions are not career enhancing for Foreign or General Service staff. In 1998, the SO1 team pointed this out (Review of FY 1997 Performance, April 27, 1998) and referred to an assessment conducted on the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative that indicated “USAID’s culture with respect to food (and other emergency) assistance remains an impediment to improved collaboration. A number of “development purists” ...are reluctant to devote attention and resources to relief assistance.” (John M. Miller, in collaboration with the USAID Greater Horn of Africa Initiative Transition Team, February 1998). The report indicated “while BHR/FFP and BHR/OFDA operating procedures are in many ways similar, with major programming decisions made in USAID/Washington, Missions perceive OFDA more favorably than FFP, because for the most part, it can respond in a timely fashion.” In addition, “some missions lack qualified FFP officers and/or senior managers who fully understand food aid. As a result, food aid is too often not fully integrated into mission strategies or given an adequate priority for time and attention.” Cross-training of Foreign and General Service staff in humanitarian assistance and Title II food aid, in particular, will help to change this perception.

The staffing shortage has had negative impact on its ability to program and monitor activities. However, as of the writing of this report, SO1 is encouraged by prospects of additional PSCs coming on board. Training will be needed for new SO1 team members on managing U.S. Government Title II food aid, and the particular legislative and regulatory requirements. Continued refresher training is also needed to maintain and update existing staff on regulations and procedures.

Increased Complex Emergencies, Increased Food Aid Channels: Increasingly, emergencies fall into the category of complex emergencies. As a result, time spent in coordinating across a multiplying number of partners and mechanisms has increased. Simultaneously, SO1 is dealing with an increasing plethora of food aid channels that make coordination and decision-making more problematic. These include Section 416(b), Titles I and II, Food for Progress, and the Global Food for Education Initiative (GFEI). While these increased the level of available food commodities, they demanded more management time – both in Washington D.C. and at USAID Missions. Programming, monitoring and reporting requirements greatly expanded. These requirements were for BHR management at the Assistant Administrative level and for interagency counterparts, such as the National Security Council. New mechanisms for coordination evolved, and are still evolving - for example, the bi-weekly USDA/FFP meetings on Section 416(b).

Greater efficiencies are necessary to enable food aid managers to cope with administrative, legislative and regulatory requirements of U.S. Government food aid.

Monitoring of WFP's Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRROs): WFP has moved a number of the older protracted emergencies (EMOPs) to the PRRO category. The PRROs are supported by several donors, including the Office of Food for Peace. Although Food for Peace is one of the largest donors, the SO1 team does not have direct management oversight and has limited ability to influence broad and/or country level policy. It is difficult to monitor results achieved by these operations, as they do not have the same reporting requirements as the emergency relief operations (EMOPs). In addition, with the more dynamic PRROs, some of which are not fully funded, WFP issues EMOPs for the same populations.

Increased Demands for Information on Title II Emergency Food Aid: An excessive amount of time was consumed by information reporting, meetings, and damage control, particularly for high profile, "political" programs. With no information support available to the Office of Food for Peace, the SO1 team fills this gap. This has exacerbated the staffing problem and placed additional burden on limited staff who try to fulfill their regular duties of managing Title II programs. The constant demand for information has led to the disproportionate neglect of essential programmatic and strategic planning issues. There was inadequate time to plan strategies, or to review and reflect upon lessons learned, such as for countries in transition.

SO1 is re-organizing its management structure to establish a new unit that will help to coordinate information sharing on Title II emergency food aid programs with OFDA and other offices. However, to resolve this problem, a meaningful change is needed in how information dissemination is being managed within the Bureau for Humanitarian Response (BHR). The Agency's humanitarian response to crises will be better reflected with a common support mechanism that compiles and disseminates information on all BHR humanitarian response activities. The current mechanism supports OFDA, but not the Office of Food for Peace. This often results in an inadequate representation of Title II emergency food aid contributions to disasters in official USAID fact sheets and information shared with other agencies.

Strategic Plan

This is the fifth year of implementing and reporting on the Office of Food for Peace Strategic Plan, 1997 – 2001. A new Strategic Plan will be prepared for the next five-year cycle. The Office of Food for Peace is requesting the extension of its current Strategic Plan until next year's submission of its R2, and its final reporting against targets established in the 1997 – 2001 Strategic Plan. We need the extension so we can undertake an in-depth review of our progress and areas requiring further improvement. We plan to review all aspects of management, monitoring and reporting of Title II emergency food aid. Changes in the operating environment and lessons learned since 1997 will be reviewed and reflected in the new Strategic Plan. Performance indicators will be reviewed to ensure that these are still appropriate and useful for program management

and reporting. As we did for the 1997 – 2001 Strategic Plan, we would like to ensure that our implementing partners are fully engaged in this process. This requires time.

PART II: RESULTS REVIEW OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1

Header

Office of Food for Peace, Emergency Programs
Strategic Objective 1: Critical Food Needs of Targeted Groups Met
SO Number: 962-001-01

Operating Unit Self-Assessment:
SO1 exceeded expectations.

Summary

Strategic Objective 1 (SO1) of the Office of Food for Peace is “Critical food needs of targeted groups met”. SO1 seeks to ensure that food aid is provided to people in crisis situations who need assistance. Targeted groups are identified and beneficiary levels are recalibrated through a continuous process of monitoring and needs assessment that seeks to keep pace with changing situations. SO1 incorporates its core values and principles of the “**5 rights**” approach into its programs. These are: provide the right *food* to the right *people* in the right *place* (Intermediate Result 1), at the right *time* (Intermediate Result 2) and in the right *way* (Intermediate Results 3 and 4). The latter includes the “do no harm” principle and core values described in Annex III. These core values are incorporated into SO1’s results framework and performance indicators.

Achievements at the SO level are measured by: (a) percent of targeted population reached by food aid, and, (b) percent of programs reporting improved or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups. Over the life of the SO, the planned level of achievement is set at 85 percent (FY 2001) of targeted population provided food aid. This measures the planned (or revised) versus actual beneficiary levels aggregated for all programs for a given fiscal year. Starting from a base of 67 percent (FY 1996), the performance in this indicator has incrementally improved to 82.26 percent (FY 2000). To date, this has exceeded expectations.

The planned level for the second SO level performance indicator is set at 65 percent (FY 2001) of programs able to improve or maintain nutritional status of target groups. Starting from the FY 1996 base of 37 percent, this has incrementally improved to 85.37 percent (FY 2000). This has exceeded expectations.

SO1 is directly linked to the Agency Humanitarian Assistance Goal 6 and Performance Benchmarks “Crude mortality rate of vulnerable populations, in specific emergency situations, reduced over a period of time”, and “Levels of acute malnutrition stable at, or declining to, acceptable levels in specific emergency situations.” Through the provision of appropriate Title II food commodities and linkage with health and other interventions, SO1 seeks to improve and/or maintain the nutritional status of beneficiaries in emergency situations.

Although Crude Mortality Rate (CMR) was not originally included in SO1's results framework and as a specific performance indicator, the SO1 team pioneered the pilot testing of a methodology that integrates the collection of CMR with the existing nutrition survey protocol. World Vision volunteered to pilot-test the methodology in Sudan and found it to be feasible, with minimal additional expense or burden to their ongoing nutrition survey. Since then, other implementing partners have expressed interest in adopting this methodology. The inclusion of mortality of children from severe malnutrition will improve data interpretation. Without this, the nutritional situation may appear to be better than in reality, as children who are severely malnourished usually die without assistance and are not part of the survey population. Current efforts are focused on developing the guidelines (being undertaken by Action Against Hunger who originated and have used the methodology for many years) to be disseminated to implementing partners. Technical assistance will be planned through existing activities such as The Sphere Project training at local levels, and the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group of Food Aid Management for PVO HQ technical/managerial staff.

Key Results

Similar to last year, the SO1 team is reporting on the results of four performance indicators. These are SO1 indicators 1 and 2, IR1 indicator 1, and IR3 indicator 1.

SO1 indicator 1: Percent of targeted population reached by food aid

SO1 exceeded its target of 80 percent in this performance indicator. The SO1 team reached at least 82.26 percent of the population targeted by programs. This represents 28,200,295 beneficiaries of the total targeted 34,283,584 beneficiaries. Due to dynamic changes in population movement in some situations, programs reported higher actual beneficiary levels compared to the planned levels. If these additional figures are included, the total number of people who received Title II emergency food aid totaled 28,915,655. This represents beneficiary levels reported by PVOs/NGOs and WFP's emergency EMOP operations (but does not include beneficiaries supported through WFP's PRROs).

See Annex 1 for detailed information on planned versus actual beneficiary levels by region, country, and implementing partner. Unless indicated, implementing partners provide information on beneficiary level through regular reporting and responses to the Results Review questionnaire.

This year's result is similar to last year's achievement of 82.29 percent. However, the number of beneficiaries this year increased significantly from last year. The 82.29 percent reached (actual) of targeted levels (planned) represents over 28.2 million people this year, compared to last year's 14 million people. Beneficiary levels more than doubled in Africa, Asia and Near East regions, primarily reflecting crises in the Greater Horn of Africa, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and East Timor/Indonesia.

SO1 indicator 2: Percent of programs reporting improved and/or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups

SO1 exceeded its target of 60 percent in this performance indicator. 85.37 percent of programs reported to have improved and/or maintained nutritional status of beneficiaries. This is a considerable improvement from last year's performance at 65.91 percent. Of those programs reporting to have contributed to improving or maintaining nutritional status of beneficiaries, 62.86 percent of programs indicated that they are able to provide supporting reports or data. This is a decrease from last year's 79.31 percent of programs able to provide such data. However, for the first time, SO1 is able to provide information on the source of data cited to support responses. Of those who reported having supporting data, the majority or 72.73 percent cited survey results as source of information, 54.55 percent cited ongoing monitoring data as source of information, followed by 36.36 percent using clinic/health data (note: some programs may use more than one data source).

IR1 indicator 1: Percent of programs that have instituted a continuous process of needs assessment and recalibration of targeting

SO1 exceeded its target of 65 percent in this performance indicator. 75.68 percent of programs instituted regular, periodic needs assessments to recalibrate beneficiary levels and assess changing situations. Although the target has been met, the level decreased from last year's 89.74 percent. Programs that did not incorporate this process were those primarily implemented in countries with security problems.

IR3 indicator 1: Percent of programs that have developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development

SO1 exceeded its target of 80 percent in this performance indicator. 81.81 percent of programs developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development. The level increased from last year's 77.36 percent. Without exception PVO programs address this issue in their program design and implementation. Some WFP programs do not address this issue in their emergency operations, but do so under the PRROs.

Gender Issue

SO1 intensified its efforts to gather information on gender breakdown of beneficiaries. Over 47 percent of programs provided this information, compared to last year's 32 percent. 50.52 percent of the total beneficiaries were females, and 49.48 percent were males. Results are similar to last year's breakdown with 51.96 percent females and 48.04 percent males.

Performance and Prospects

See Table 1 for longer-term performance trends and progress to date since FY 1996. SO1 continues to be on track in terms of meeting planned performance levels. In its main objective to provide for the critical food needs of targeted groups, there was an incremental improvement from FY 1996 up to last year.

Beneficiary Levels: Beneficiary levels, and how beneficiaries are counted (dependent on program interventions), are established at the outset of the program and reflected in the Transfer Authorization. Ration levels are set primarily based on projected or planned beneficiary levels, types of intervention, and other considerations such as coping mechanisms available to beneficiaries. In most cases, complementary, rather than full rations, are provided. Unlike PVO programs, Title II is not the only source of donated food commodities for WFP operations. For WFP programs, it should be noted that beneficiary levels are those provided assistance with Title II resources, combined with other donor resources. Although Title II usually provides the largest share of requested food contributions, when other donors fail to contribute, this may require the reduction of beneficiary or ration levels.

The 82 percent of planned versus actual beneficiaries may be approaching the highest possible level achievable as an aggregate of all Title II emergency food aid programs. There are situations such as in confined camps where it is feasible to reach all individuals and achieve 100 percent coverage. In other situations, this is not realistic due to security and access problems, and fluid population movements. For example, WFP in the Caucasus had difficulty in accessing beneficiaries due to security problems, and was able to reach just over 35 percent of planned beneficiaries.

What was noted a few years ago when SO1 initially embarked on its efforts to provide results (Review of FY 1997 performance, April 27, 1998) is validated by its several years of its pioneering experience in measuring program performance in crisis situations. Success is relative to the context of the situation, and qualitative or contextual information is essential to fully comprehend the complexities and challenges of providing emergency food aid. The “story” behind quantitative performance numbers needs to be understood. SO1 reviews performance ratings along with reasons for not meeting planned targets and objectives due to conflicts or other unforeseen circumstances. The cycle of hope and sudden violence continues to plague countries such as Sierra Leone and Angola. A lesson learned over and over again is that the political and military context changes rapidly in these countries, hence humanitarian intervention must be inherently flexible and cognizant of the security situation. The continuous assessment of conditions (Intermediate Result 1) has proven critical to recalibrate beneficiary numbers, and level of assistance required. Changes are usually reflected in the Transfer Authorization modifications.

Food Aid Delivery and Distribution: Our performance assessment indicates that efforts are still needed to improve the delivery time of Title II commodities. Pipeline shortage is defined as “food commodities not delivered per schedule agreed to with cooperating sponsors and outlined in FFP call-forwards.” Although SO1 failed to meet its target in this performance indicator, there was improvement from FY 1999 performance. This

result is reviewed using FFP shipping logistics reports and cross-referenced with responses received from implementing partners.

It is important to SO1 that delays in processing food delivery (proposal approval, call-forward, and shipping of commodities) do not negatively impact on beneficiaries -- that is, on food distribution at the project site. When food does not arrive per schedule, implementing partners resolve the problem through various means to ensure that the distribution schedule is maintained. These include local purchase or borrowing food items, distributing incomplete food baskets or reduced rations, and reducing beneficiary levels. SO1 recognizes the additional burden to find these solutions. It will review the points of delays, such as the time between the call forward and the load date, and will make improvements where it can.

The single most frequent cause of food distribution delay was security problems, for example, in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Sudan. Other common reasons are poor road conditions, shortage of trucks, and poor government logistics system.

Although SO1 no longer monitors the time it takes to review and decide on proposals (deleted due to lack of staff to track this indicator), it hopes that the final resolution of its staffing shortage will help to expedite the process of food aid delivery. Additional staff will expedite the processing of proposals and approval of programs that involve intensive work. This includes: coordinating internally with other bureaus and offices, and externally with U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and other agencies, consultations with other donors, resolving outstanding issues with implementing partners, preparing appropriate documents to purchase, call-forward and transport Title II food commodities.

To expedite food delivery, SO1 pre-positioned Title II food commodities in U.S. ports. This was first pilot-tested in FY 1998 with an initial authorization of 9,600 metric tons to address the needs in Sudan and Somalia. The level increased to 65,000 metric tons in FY 1999. Pre-positioning proved highly successful to respond to Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and the Balkan crisis. FY 2000 approved pre-positioned level was not to exceed 31,940 metric tons. This was used to respond swiftly and effectively to complex emergencies in several Greater Horn of Africa countries, Angola, and to natural disasters in Madagascar and Mozambique.

Nutritional Status of Beneficiaries: There is significant improvement in programs able to improve and/or maintain nutritional status of beneficiaries, from the FY 1996 base of 37 percent to the current 85.37 percent. SO1 will seek to improve the analysis of nutritional status by integrating the collection and analysis of CMR with nutritional status surveys. It will provide guidelines to implementing partners and encourage the incorporation of this methodology with ongoing nutrition surveys. It plans to provide technical support through ongoing training activities, such as Food Aid Management and The Sphere Project. SO1 requires Development Assistance funds to continue this effort, and to ensure that technical assistance is available to implementing partners.

SO1 and its implementing partners aim to improve and/or maintain nutritional status of beneficiaries at each project level. In most of these situations, malnutrition rates depend on the level and appropriateness of humanitarian assistance, and SO1 tries to monitor and report on these changes as impact of its intervention. However, in some cases, it is realistically difficult to maintain gains made and/or make further progress. To effectively change this cycle requires a more coordinated strategy and longer-term efforts to address underlying factors that influence malnutrition. These include addressing food security issues of availability, access and utilization of food, and applying a comprehensive approach that encompasses, for example, feeding and childcare practices. Lack of clean water and sanitation, and poor health care contributes to increased malnutrition rates. These are all impacted negatively by sudden-onset natural disasters, conflict and security problems. This kind of analysis and strategic planning has not been consistently possible with the lack of staffing resources SO1 experienced for many years. This is only now being rectified. The new unit will apply analysis and strategic thinking into its programming, so that each activity relates to a more comprehensive approach.

Monitoring Results: Through the continued support and assistance from its implementing partners, SO1 has been able to incrementally improve monitoring and analysis of performance, in spite of operating in crisis situations. Although considerable progress has been made since FY 1996 in instituting an internal system to monitor and report on programs, SO1 needs to make continued modifications to improve and streamline this process further. It will seek to ensure the program tracking system is maintained and kept updated. Besides being useful for SO1 program monitoring, this will ensure that updated, essential information is available on Title II emergency programs to respond to urgent internal and/or external requests for information. The database for the Results Review monitoring needs to be modified, to facilitate data entry and analysis. Development Assistance funds are required to maintain and upgrade the system, and to ensure that information is being updated regularly.

This year, implementing partners made significant improvement in providing additional information on the beneficiary profile. Over 47 percent of programs provided information on gender breakdown of beneficiaries. Information on beneficiary grouping (i.e., refugees, internally displaced persons, returnees/resettled, or resident population) was available for all except two programs, or over 95 percent of programs. This information is used for the R2, as well as to anticipate enquiries for this type of information that has now become important for global monitoring.

SO1 will intensify its efforts to ensure that implementing partners meet reporting requirements. It did not meet its performance target in this indicator, and the result fell from last year's 50 percent to 45.45 percent this year. If the performance of PVO partners is tracked separately from WFP, the result is 83.33 percent. Of those programs meeting reporting requirements (all PVO programs), 60 percent did so on time (that is, within 30 days of reporting period and within 60 days for final end of project report). Timeliness was improved from last year for PVO reporting. Efforts are still needed to ensure that PVO programs utilize the questionnaire tool for regular reporting so that essential information can be easily compiled for the R2.

Although there is a need to improve regular reporting, implementing partners have consistently provided excellent collaboration with SO1's Results Review process. They continue to assist in refining and modifying the process, including the R2 data collection tool (questionnaire). For the fourth consecutive year, the SO1 team received 100 percent return on the R2 survey questionnaire from its PVO partners. The questionnaire (the same tool used for regular reporting) is sent out to all implementing partners a few months before the R2 is submitted to enable SO1 to compile data not available from regular reporting.

While reporting by PVO partners improved considerably, there is a need to improve the timely submission of reports by WFP. The Standardized Reporting that WFP prepares for all its donors has not met SO1's reporting needs. Because the Standardized Reports do not arrive in time to be used for the Results Review process, SO1 sends the reporting questionnaire as part of the R2 process. WFP's response to the R2 process has fluctuated in compliance over the four years, starting at 76.92 percent (for FY 1997 performance review), 45.45 percent (FY 1998), 87.50 percent (FY 1999), and 47.36 percent (current year). SO1 has already intensified its efforts with WFP by including SO1 reporting needs on the agenda of the recent April 24th U.S. Government/Bilateral Consultations. An official USAID memorandum was also issued that reiterated reporting requirements.

Possible Adjustment to Plans

Division Re-Organization: There were several adjustments during the reporting period. The Division was changed from Emergency Response Division to Emergency Programs to reflect the integration of longer-term issues in its response to crises. As part of this re-organization, SO1 is in the process of establishing a new unit that will coordinate strategic planning across Title II emergency food aid programs. Staffing constraints, experienced for so many years, are being resolved this year. Additional staff will help to systematically integrate strategic issues into programming decisions, and help to expedite food aid responses. The SO1 team is undergoing a phase of staff build-up and a transition period of training, establishing norms, and updating procedures.

Refinement of Results Review Data Collection Tool: SO1 modified its Results Review questionnaire to address areas that needed refinement. This included refining the indicator "percent of programs that have incorporated special needs of different targeted groups" so that it focused on the special *nutritional* needs of beneficiaries. Since "special needs" was not well defined, implementing partners used various definitions. The initial target for this performance indicator is therefore no longer applicable. See Annex V for SO1's updated Results Framework.

New Proposed Activities: If Development Assistance funds become available, SO1 is interested in undertaking several evaluations and assessments of its programs. These include SO1's response to the Balkan crisis, overarching issues such as U.S. food aid and conflict prevention, and the impact of shortfall of other donor contributions to WFP on

SO1's program results. It is seeking resources to undertake pending work on needs assessments and review methodologies being used. This will help to establish a common set of processes and/or minimum essential information across all programs to establish a standard to determine beneficiary level and needs. Development assistance funds are also sought to improve the quality of data and analysis on nutritional status, and to integrate CMR data collection and analysis in the nutrition survey protocol.

Program Coordination

Title II emergency programs are planned and implemented in close collaboration with USAID bureaus, Missions, and other offices within the Bureau for Humanitarian Response. Programs are often linked to OFDA's operations that provide seeds and tools and other non-food items that complement Title II food commodities. SO1 made concerted efforts to improve intra-agency communications that led to improved coordination with other bureaus and offices, in particular with OFDA, Africa Bureau, and State Department's Program for Population, Refugees and Migration (State/PRM).

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides commodities under Section 416(b) that complement Title II resources. In FY 2000, USDA provided over 3 million metric tons valued at over \$501 million used for development and emergency programs in all regions. The Food Aid Policy Council (FAPC) provides the consultation mechanism for Food for Peace and USDA on the major program and policy decisions for 416(b) resources. In addition, the Office of Food for Peace and USDA use bi-weekly consultations to detail the FAPC decisions at a detailed country and commodity level.

SO1 also relies on close coordination with other donors such as the European Union and CIDA, and international agencies such as UNHCR, UNICEF and UNHCR. Half of Title II emergency food commodities are programmed by WFP that has its own close collaboration with its implementing partners. PVOs/NGOs also utilize a wide network and their own private sources of funding.

The Office of Food for Peace invested significant time and energy at both the senior management and Emergency Program (SO1) Team levels. While such intra- and inter-agency coordination is essential, it is very labor intensive particularly during a period of serious staffing constraints.

Within the Office of Food for Peace, there is also close coordination with the Development Division (SO2) in Title II food aid resource management and programming. Title II food inventories maintained in countries for development projects (SO2) under implementation are used to respond rapidly during the first days and weeks of disasters. For example, Title II development food aid provided for the critical food needs in Ethiopia and India until Title II emergency commodities arrived. In the case of Ethiopia, SO2 de-committed 31,825 metric tons of Title II development food aid from another country that did not have an immediate need. This was re-committed as Title II

emergency food commodities and used in Ethiopia for programs implemented by WFP and PVOs (see Annex II for Ethiopia program description).

In India, the SO2 team redirected 10,380 metric tons valued at \$4.15 million as rapid response by CRS and CARE to the cyclone that devastated the coastal area of Orissa in October 1999. Later, an additional 4,500 metric tons of Title II emergency food commodities were provided through CARE. The cyclone left a million people without shelter, livestock or crops. CARE and CRS distributed relief rations and implemented food-for-work programs that helped rebuild roads, clear downed trees, clean wells and water tanks. A network of 19 indigenous NGOs managed the program, and distributed food through village level women's self help groups. The combined efforts of SO1 and SO2 met the critical food needs, and enabled communities to regain their main source of livelihood which was cultivation. Using Title II food as leverage, implementing partners, were able to mobilize complementary funding from the host government, European and U.S. based donors, including DFID, ECHO, OFDA, private donors and the Caritas Network.

Major Contractors and Grantees

The World Food Programme provided emergency food aid through their emergency relief programs (EMOPs) and their Protracted Relief and Recovery Programs (PRROs). The majority of Title II emergency food aid grantees are U.S. PVOs who partner with local non-governmental organizations. In FY 2000 there were 13 PVOs and local NGO grantees that implemented programs. These are: Adventist Development and Relief (ADRA), Aga Khan Foundation (USA), American Red Cross (ARC), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), Church World Service (CWS), Dutch Interchurch Aid (DIA), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Mercy Corps International (MCI), Lutheran World Relief (LWR), Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), Relief Society of Tigray (REST), and World Vision, Inc. (WVUS).

The major contractor assisting SO1 is Mendez England and Associates/Advanced Resources Technologies, Inc. It provides institutional support for Title II program and administrative backstopping. Through Global Bureau's cooperative agreement with the Academy for Educational Development, the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project (FANTA) provides technical assistance in performance measurement, health, nutrition and food security issues.

The summary table 1 below is for internal SO1 management use as it facilitates review of progress to date on performance indicators and targets. The performance indicators highlighted in bold are those selected for results reporting last year and this year.

**TABLE 1: SO1 INDICATORS AND RESULTS, FY 1996 - FY 2000
FY 2000 RESULT COMPARED WITH TARGETS**

Strategic Objective and Intermediate Results	Performance Indicators	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Rating
SO1: Critical Food Needs of Targeted Groups Met	% targeted population reached by food aid	67% (base)	74.4% Target = 67%	77.34% Target = 70%	82.29% Target = 75%	82.26% Target = 80%	Exceeded
	% programs reporting improved and/or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups	37%	62% Target = 37 %	52.78% Target = 50%	65.91% Target = 55%	85.37% Target = 60%	Exceeded
IR1: Improved Targeting of Food Aid to the Most Vulnerable Populations	% programs that have instituted a continuous process of needs assessment and recalibration of targeting	53%	85% Target = 55%	87.50% Target = 55%	89.74% Target = 60%	75.68% Target = 65%	Exceeded
	% programs that have incorporated special nutritional needs of different targeted groups. <i>Previously, “% of programs that have incorporated special needs of different targeted groups.”</i>	90%	67.5% Target = 90%	70.83% Target = 92%	71.79% Target = 94%	41.46% Target = 96%	N/A Revised
IR2: Food Aid Delivered to Target Groups on Schedule	% programs experiencing Title II pipeline shortages	30%	33% Target = 30%	47% Target = 25%	41% Target = 20%	34.09% Target = 20%	Failed to meet
	% proposals reviewed & cooperating sponsors notified of decisions within 21 business days of receipt. <i>Note: This indicator was not tracked due to lack of staff resources</i>	8%	37% Target = 15%	No info Target = 50%	No info Target = 60%	Deleted	N/A
IR3: Improved Planning to Transition Relief Activities to Development	% programs that have developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development	63%	73% Target = 63%	69.44% Target = 63%	77.36% Target = 75%	81.81% Target = 80%	Exceeded
	% programs that have paid specific attention to avoid the negative impacts of food aid in program design & implementation (“do no harm”)	60%	91% Target = 65%	88.89% Target = 70%	88.68% Target = 75%	93.18% Target = 80%	Exceeded
IR4: Strengthened Capabilities of Cooperating Sponsors & Host Country Entities to Manage Emergency Food Aid Programs	% ISG grants supporting emergency planning/evaluation	44%	Deleted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	% programs strengthening counterparts/local groups. <i>Note: Previously, “% programs collaborating with local institutions for activity results”. Revised June 1999</i>	93%	94% Target = 93%	86.11% Target = 93%	86.79% Target = 95%	88.64 Target = 95%	Failed to meet
	Percent of cooperating sponsors (programs able to meet reporting requirements (i.e., submitted all reports due). <i>Note: As in previous years, this does not include timeliness (i.e., within 30 days of reporting period & within 60 days of reporting period for final report). Of those programs meeting the requirements, 60%. Submitted reports on time (i.e., at least one report on time).</i>	17%	26% Target = 25	56.75% Target = 40	50% Target = 60%	45.45% Target = 80%	Failed to meet

Performance Data Tables

Performance data tables for four indicators (highlighted in Table 1) selected for FY 2000 are presented below.

**Table 2: Strategic Objective 1, Indicator 1
Result: Exceeded Expectations**

Percent of targeted population reached by food aid			
Unit of Measurement: Percent (%) of targeted population	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Reports, R2 questionnaire/survey	1996	Baseline	67%
	1997	67%	74.4%
Indicator Definition: "Targeted population" as defined at program start and stated in grant document.	1998	70%	77.34%
	1999	75%	82.29%
	2000	80%	82.26%
	2001	85%	

Comment:

WFP and PVOs/NGOs implemented 44 programs in FY 2000 (see Annex 1). Regional programs such as in the Balkans involve multiple country operations but are reported as one program, per the Transfer Authorization. The allocation of food resources between WFP and PVOs were at 53.02 percent and 46.97 percent respectively of the total 947,917 metric tons available for emergencies, including WFP's Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRROs)

As part of the efforts to improve the management and reporting on Title II emergency food aid, implementing partners monitored and reported on planned/revised versus actual beneficiary levels. Unless indicated, beneficiary levels are provided by implementing partners through their regular reports, or as response to the R2 process. SO1 team members review reported numbers for their particular countries. To the extent possible, the team seeks to verify beneficiary levels during monitoring visits. However, this data is essentially information "as reported" by implementing partners.

In FY 2000, programs were implemented in Africa (25 programs), Asia and Near East (12 programs), and Europe and Eurasia (7 programs). Programs reached a total of 28,200,295 beneficiaries of the planned level of 34,283,584 beneficiaries, representing 82.26 percent of the target. In addition, some programs assisted more beneficiaries than originally envisioned due to changing population movements, bringing the total beneficiary level reached to 28,915,655.

The regional breakdown in performance, based on the planned level, is as follows:

- (a) Africa region: 16,272,827 beneficiaries, representing 84.12 percent reached of the total regional target of 19,345,180 beneficiaries.
- (b) Asia and Near East region: 10,432,525 beneficiaries, representing 78.95 percent reached of the total regional target of 13,214,208 beneficiaries.

(c) Europe and Eurasia region: 1,494,943 beneficiaries, representing 86.70 percent reached of the total regional target of 1,724,196 beneficiaries.

Beneficiaries included 24,971,884 vulnerable residents (or 84.62 percent of total 28,915,655 actual beneficiaries), 3,217,826 internally displaced persons (7.86 percent), 279,750 refugees (3.95 percent), and 446,194 returnees/resettled (3.58 percent). This is based on over 95 percent of programs providing data on beneficiary groups.

In addition to the programs detailed in Annex 1, the Office of Food for Peace contributes to WFP's Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRROs). Funding for these are earmarked as biennial pledges. SO1 will seek better reporting on these operations, and similar to the WFP's emergency operations/EMOPs that report on planned/revised versus actual beneficiary levels as well as the impact of food aid. In FY 2000, the Office of Food for Peace contributed 196,165 metric tons valued at more than \$116 million for these operations that targeted over 7 million beneficiaries. PRROs were implemented in Africa (Angola, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Great Lakes region, West Africa region), Europe and Eurasia (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Tajikistan), Asia and Near East (Afghanistan, Cambodia), and Latin America and the Caribbean (Colombia).

Table 3: Strategic Objective 1, Indicator 2
Result: Exceeded Expectations

Percent of programs reporting change and/or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups			
Unit of Measurement: Percent (%) of programs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Reports, R2 questionnaire/survey	1996	Baseline	37%
	1997	37%	62%
Indicator Definition: % of programs* reporting change and/or maintenance of nutritional status of target groups	1998	50%	52.78%
	1999	55%	65.91%
	2000	60%	85.37%
*Excluded programs that had impact indicators other than nutritional status.	2001	65%	

Comment:

Data for this performance indicator is “as reported” by implementing partners. Both primary (collected and analyzed by implementing partner) and secondary data are provided. Due to the limited availability of Development Assistance funds, technical support to PVOs to strengthen their capacity in assessing, analyzing and monitoring nutritional status proposed in last year's R2 was not undertaken. SO1 is again seeking Development Assistance resources so minimal support could be provided, and to encourage implementing partners to improve analysis by integrating Crude Mortality Rate (CMR) data collection with nutrition surveys. SO1 is also seeking Development Assistance funds to strengthen nutritional programs, such as therapeutic and supplementary feeding programs.

This year, SO1 received information on therapeutic and supplementary feeding programs implemented with Title II emergency food aid resources. 41.46 percent of programs with a nutrition component undertook supplementary and/or therapeutic activities, either directly or through collaborative efforts with other PVOs/NGOs and international agencies. Programs sought to improve the nutritional status of the malnourished, and/or those at risk of becoming malnourished such as pregnant and lactating women, young children, and the elderly.

To better understand the effectiveness of therapeutic and supplementary programs supported with Title II food resources, SO1 commissioned a review of the program in Burundi where standardized protocols and reporting tools were established by UNICEF. SO1's implementing partners, WFP and PVOs/NGOs, as well as the Ministry of Health use these protocols. For the first time in a complex emergency, there is national standardization of treatment, of survey methodology and reporting. This makes it possible to obtain an accurate overview of the nutritional status of the country and monitor changes over time. Initial data for 1999 shows 78 percent recovery rate for the therapeutic feeding program that addressed severely malnourished children and adults. This is above the standard recommended recovery rate of 75 percent for therapeutic feeding programs. The study assessed to what extent the standard approved protocols/tools were being utilized, and how data is being used for program management. The management of the program could be improved with availability of appropriate personnel and better coordination among the agencies.

A similar model is being implemented successfully in Angola due primarily to UNICEF's efforts. Although there is need to improve overall technical capacity, a national nutrition survey protocol has been established with 98 percent of surveys using a common methodology. 45 good quality surveys have been undertaken in the past two years. The recently established National Nutrition Survey Archive has completed partial compilation of more than 120 surveys since 1996. Data from 48 therapeutic feeding centers and 11 NGOs are being coordinated. Data for September 1999 – December 2000 shows 86 percent cure rate. In addition, the general acute malnutrition situation in the accessible parts of Angola improved in 2000 compared to 1999. This is due to humanitarian aid provided in security zones, relatively improved access to land and markets, and the main harvest.

During FY 2000, SO1 provided Title II emergency food aid to Angola through the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and WFP that targeted IDPs and other vulnerable groups. WFP undertook supplementary and therapeutic feeding programs, and community kitchens that benefited over 167,000 recipients. Child Survival and OFDA funds also supported these programs. WFP reported that food assistance contributed to the saving of lives and in maintaining the nutritional status of beneficiaries in operational areas, and that this can be supported by the various surveys carried out.

Table 4: Immediate Result 1, Indicator 1
Result: Exceeded expectations

Percent of programs that have instituted a continuous process of needs assessment and recalibration of targeting			
Unit of Measurement: Percent (%) of programs Data Source: Reports, R2 questionnaire/survey Indicator Definition: % of programs that undertake needs assessment semi-annually (only for programs of duration more than 6 months)	Year	Planned	Actual
	1996	Baseline	53%
	1997	55%	85%
	1998	55%	87.50%
	1999	60%	89.74%
	2000	65%	75.68%
	2001	65%	

Comment:

Data provided for this performance indicator is “as reported” by implementing partners. Although performance in this indicator was good, SO1 needs to examine more closely how needs assessments are being undertaken. Partners utilize a variety of tools and methodologies to identify beneficiaries and their needs that influence estimated food aid levels and funding.

This review was planned for last year, but was not undertaken due to other priorities for limited funds. Should Development Assistance funds become available, SO1 plans to review current practices and determine if minimum common data, or a common set of processes would improve planning and management of emergency food aid. The newly established unit for strategic planning and results reporting will take the lead on this.

Table 5: Immediate Result 3, Indicator 1
Result: Exceeded expectations

Percent of programs that developed resettlement or rehabilitation plans to link relief to development or relief exit strategies			
Unit of Measurement: Percent (%) of programs Data Source: Reports, R2 questionnaire/survey Indicator Definition: % of programs that plan <u>and</u> implement plans	Year	Planned	Actual
	1996	Baseline	63%
	1997	63%	73%
	1998	63%	69.44%
	1999	75%	77.36%
	2000	80%	81.81%
	2001	85%	

Comment:

Data for this performance indicator is “as reported” by implementing partners. All PVO programs incorporate relief-to-development strategies in their design and implementation. The monitoring and reporting on this performance indicator is reliable

and can be verified by other sources. SO1 recognizes the shift from relief-to-development may not always be a continuum or linear progression, due to natural disasters or conflict situations that often set back gains in rehabilitation. However, when applied, this strategy has had positive impact on beneficiaries, for example in Ethiopia.

Ethiopia received more than 47 percent of the total Title II emergency food aid to the Africa Region during FY 2000. Programs were implemented by WFP, a joint U.S. PVO operation group (Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Save the Children/USA, and World Vision), and the Relief Society of Tigray (REST), a local NGO. Implementing partners ensured the monitoring and reporting on the impact of this high level assistance on nutritional status, and on recovery and longer-term food security issues (see also Annex II). The Food for Recovery Program/Employment Generation Scheme was part of the emergency relief response. The drought related food crisis in the Tigray region was severe to the extent that many families were forced to sell their basic household assets and means of food production. Farmers resorted to cash loans to purchase food and this led to failure on repayment of loans and increased farmer indebtedness. Therefore, the strategy employed under the Title II emergency food aid program was to assist drought affected households to maintain and reestablish their livelihood system through the provision of relief food packages, and at the same time linking it with short and long term food security development activities.

Implementing partners in Ethiopia ensured there was a link between relief and recovery by undertaking drought mitigation measures, building up public assets, and creating income and employment opportunities. Title II emergency food was provided to beneficiaries in exchange for their participation in community development activities, such as environmental rehabilitation and road construction. Approximately 80 percent of the relief beneficiaries received food through the food-for-work program. Soil and water conservation activities resulted in the maintenance of eroded roads, degraded farmlands, and damaged intra-rural roads, and the planting of thousands of seedlings. Farm areas were ploughed on time without major reduction of the labor force.

The relief response exerted a stabilizing effect in the program areas. Title II emergency food aid helped to stabilize communities and achieved the following results:

1. Vulnerable families, having migrated in the first half of the year, returned to their homes and to productive livelihoods. Title II programs stabilized and resettled over 90 percent of the targeted population.
2. The employment and income made available through food aid prevented distress migration and the erosion of household assets. After June 2000, there was no forced migration in search of food.
3. Title II food stabilized local markets, as prices of major crops did not significantly increase in the latter part of the year.

4. As a result of continued food distribution, the forced sale of livestock was reduced. The price of livestock was relatively maintained at an average price level compared to the previous year. Agro-pastoral families were able to retain core livestock assets.

ANNEX V: UPDATED RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Strategic Objective 1: Critical Food Needs of Targeted Groups Reached

(No change)

Intermediate Result 1: Improved Targeting of Food Aid to the Most Vulnerable Populations

Refined definition in IR1, Indicator 2: Percent of programs that have incorporated special needs of different target groups

This is now focused on “special *nutritional* needs” of target groups.

Explanation: Without this redefinition, implementing partners had varying definitions of “special needs”, and including those not addressing nutritional status.

Intermediate Result 2: Food Aid Delivered to Target Groups on Schedule

Deleted IR2, Indicator 2: Percent of proposals reviewed and cooperating sponsors notified of decision within 21 business days of receipt

Explanation: Insufficient staffing resources to track this performance indicator.

Intermediate Result 3: Improved Planning to Transition Relief Activities to Development

(No change)

Intermediate Result 4: Strengthened Capabilities of Cooperating Sponsors and Host Country Entities to Manage Emergency Food Aid Programs

(1) Refined definition in IR4, Indicator 2: Percent of programs collaborating with local institutions for activity results.

This is now re-worded as “Percent of programs *strengthening* counterparts/local groups for activity results.”

Explanation: Since the majority of Title II emergency programs collaborated with local institutions, the focus is now directed to those that actually strengthened counterparts/local groups through collaborative activities.

(2) Deleted IR4, Indicator 1: Percent of Institutional Support Grant (ISG) supporting emergency planning/evaluation.

Explanation: This was deleted in FY 1997. At the time of developing the strategic Plan and performance indicators, the ISG grants focused on strengthening development food aid (SO2). SO1 wanted to ensure that an increased proportion of these grants supported

emergency food aid programming – measured by this indicator. However, for progress to be made in this SO1 indicator, it meant that SO2 programs would receive less support. This was deleted to avoid conflict between SO1 and S02.