



Final Evaluation

Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

Institutional Capacity Building (ICB)
Grant Number AFP-A-00-03-00015-00

Prepared by:
TANGO International

December 20, 2007

Table of Contents

Acronyms	ii
Executive Summary	iv
I. Background to the Final Evaluation	8
II. ICB Activities and Outputs	11
III. Program Quality Impacts: Field Perspectives	20
IV. Program Quality Impacts: Headquarters' Perspectives	41
V. Key Questions, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	54
Annex I: Scope of Work	58
Annex II: Results Summary Matrices.....	66
Annex III: Persons Interviewed	85
Annex IV: Documents Reviewed	86
Annex V: Questionnaires	87

Acronyms

ACDS	Atlas Copco Drilling Solutions
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ARC	American Red Cross
ART	Anti-Retroviral Therapy
CARO	Central Africa Regional Office
CIAT	International Center for Tropical Agriculture
CIES	International Education Society
CORE	Child Survival Collaborations and Resources Group
CP	Country Program
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
C-SAFE	Consortium for Southern Africa Food Security Emergency
DRD/PQ	Deputy Regional Director for Program Quality
EARO	East Africa Regional Office
EME	Europe/Middle Regional Office
EPPR	Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response
ERT	Emergency Response Team
FAM	Food Aid Management
FANTA	Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project
FFP	Food for Peace
FY	Fiscal Year
GDA	Global Development Alliance
HIP	Hygiene Improvement Project
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICB	Institutional Capacity Building
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IHD	Integral Human Development
INEE	Inter-agency Network on Education in Emergencies
INGO	International Non-governmental Organization
IPTT	Indicator Performance Tracking Table
IR	Intermediate Result
ISA	Institutional Support Assistance
JASS	Just Associates
JPS	Justice, Peace-building and Global Solidarity
LACRO	Latin America/Caribbean Regional Office
LQAS	Lot Quality Assurance Sampling
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MWA	Millennium Water Alliance
MYAP	Multi-Year Activity Program
NGO	Non-government Organization
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PITT	Performance Indicator Tracking Table
PLHIV	People Living with HIV
PQSD	Program Quality and Support Department
ProPack	Project Package: Project Design and Proposal Guidance for CRS Project and Program Managers
SARO	Southern Africa Regional Office
SAsia	South Asia
SEAPRO	Southeast Asia Regional Office
SILC	Savings and Internal Lending Communities

SO	Strategic Objective
SPP	Strategic Program Plan
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WARO	West Africa Regional Office
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive Summary

CRS was awarded an Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Grant on September 30, 2003 to strengthen core management of Title II programs, support technical innovation and best practices, and improve collaboration in order to better contribute to the reduction of food insecurity in vulnerable populations.¹ In 2006, a mid term review of ICB grant was carried out that noted several accomplishments during the first half of the ICB grant period. The organization has developed the Integrated Human Development (IHD) Framework and developed the capacity of Title II country programs to use the framework. It has also developed capacity of communities to influence factors that affect food security and maintained strong relationships with other INGOs, USAID and other agencies involved in promoting food security to create a shared learning environment for improved effectiveness in influencing food security strategies.

The overall goal of the ICB grant is to strengthen the capacity of CRS and partner staff to effectively conduct Title II programming aimed at reducing the vulnerability of food insecure populations. This goal is to be achieved through attainment of the following Strategic Objectives (SO) and Intermediate Results (IR):

SO1: Strategies for individuals, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted

IR1.1 Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors

IR1.2 Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized

SO2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security

IR2.1 The impact of HIV/AIDS is mitigated

IR2.2 Water insecurity is reduced

SO3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered

IR3.1 Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased

IR3.2 PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions

Cross-cutting IRs to strengthen design and implementation of Title II programs

IR-A Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased

IR-B Capacity of CRS' and local-partners staff to identify, measure, and document field impact is increased

¹ Grant agreement, 11.

The objective of the final evaluation is to appraise the outcomes, and impacts of CRS' capacity-building activities under the Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Grant.

TANGO International was contracted to conduct a final evaluation in order to determine the extent to which CRS has achieved the intended results of the ICB Program. This report documents the impact of the ICB grant on the stated goal and assesses the influence of activities carried out under the ICB on CRS' capacity to effectively implement Title II food security programs. The report documents progress made toward achievement of intended results with one year remaining in the ICB program, identifies some of the challenges faced over the course of the ICB, and offers recommendations for consideration by both headquarters and field staff as they continue to enhance their capacity to design and implement Title II food security programs.

Program-Quality Impacts

Responses to a qualitative questionnaire sent to twenty-four CRS Country Programs, regional offices and select headquarters personnel revealed varying levels of integration of the IHD framework into ongoing Title II programs. While several Country Programs acknowledged that the IHD and other methodologies introduced under the ICB had improved their efforts to strengthen coping mechanisms and improve emergency response, it is clear that program managers and field staff will require continued training in order to integrate the IHD into the full range of program activities. CRS has developed informational materials on the IHD as well as programming for Education and Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) that provide guidance on ways in which the the framework can inform specific sectoral responses. While these materials have been disseminated to CPs, some respondents to the survey felt they could use more training in this area. Adoption of the IHD may further be improved through the establishment of country level focal points capable of translating conceptual understanding of the IHD into alternatives for its practical use.

A majority of respondents claimed that efforts were being made to mainstream HIV/AIDS into all activities in order to mitigate the impact of the disease. CRS has also contributed to the technical understanding of staff working in this area by organizing training conferences on the linkages between HIV, food security, and nutrition. Still, more than half of CP respondents claimed they had yet to receive training on this specific aspect of improving food security among PLHIV. CRS is currently in the process of finalizing a Training of Trainers (TOT) Manual focusing on nutrition and will conduct a TOT workshop in FY08. Country Programs implementing water security activities were nearly unanimous in the claim that CRS interventions in this area had led to improvements in the conservation and productive use of water. Finally, respondents from individual Country Programs claimed to have had little difficulty in applying the IHD framework in conjunction with the food security framework established by FFP. Several also claimed that the IHD had helped them to effectively incorporate aspects of community self-reliance and resilience in the development of new MYAPS. The vast majority of respondents also reported that their Country Programs are actively involved in building the capacity of implementing partners and that they have been able to use

information gained through monitoring and evaluation to guide strategic decisions and strengthen linkages between Title II and non-Title II programs.

CRS continues to actively participate in a wide variety of collaborative, inter-agency learning initiatives primarily focusing on the development and standardization of indicators, activities focused on improved health, hygiene and enterprise development. Prominent examples of ongoing collaboration include alliances formed between CRS and CIAT, the American Red Cross, FANTA, Project Concern International, the CORE Network, and AED. Finally, CRS has made a concerted and largely successful effort to document lessons learned through previous and ongoing Title II programs as well as disseminate information on best practices to Country Programs and PVO partners.

Key Issues

CRS has made substantial progress towards achieving each of the objectives and intermediate results of its ICB program. However, while the IHD and other methodologies promoted by the ICB represent a significant step forward in CRS' ability to effectively implement Title II programs, continued effort must be made to ensure that field staff have sufficient capacity to make practical use of new tools. Considerable gains have been made in the capacity of field staff to incorporate risk reduction and emergency preparedness into multi-sectoral food security programs and the majority of country programs have taken steps to support the mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS. The ICB has also supported CRS' efforts to develop regional WatSan strategies designed to improve the domestic and productive use of water in targeted communities. Among the more common adaptations to program design resulting from the ICB include greater adoption of Sphere standards, increasing focus on the promotion of community and household resilience, and enhanced integration of relief and development interventions. While individual country programs are consistently involved in efforts to build the capacity of partner organizations, the final evaluation revealed that a number of planned capacity building activities have not yet been implemented. Despite CRS' overall effectiveness in increasing its capacity to design, implement and monitor Title II programs, a number of key challenges remain. CRS would benefit from the establishment of a focal point person to guide the practical application of concepts introduced in the IHD framework. At the same time, CRS should continue to work with its PVO partners to ensure that the great number of tools generated under the ICB adhere to specific standards and that field staff receiving new tools have sufficient technical capacity to apply them. Finally, each of these outstanding issues could be addressed in part by improvements in the consistency and quality of communication between headquarters and field offices.

Recommendations

- 1. Institutionalizing the IHD framework-**In the last year of the grant, more effort should be given to developing a strategy to systematically roll out the framework in the various country offices that are implementing Title II programs. Although this issue was highlighted in the mid-term evaluation, more work still needs to be done. This will involve developing standardized training tools and guidelines that can be used to train country office staff. The first step may involve training of

trainers to carry out the work. These trainers can then hold more structured learning events to facilitate Title II program adoption of new approaches. The second task will be to complete the guidelines that are currently under development. A third task should focus on establishing country level focal points capable of translating the conceptual understanding of the IHD into alternatives for its practical use.

- 2. Technical support to the field in the application of newly developed tools-** Under the ICB, a number of tools have been developed under each SO of the grant. Many country office staff indicated that they did not have the technical capacity to implement many of these tools. A strategy needs to be developed in the last year of the grant to provide technical support on the various tools created under each SO. This need was highlighted in the mid-term evaluation and still appears to be an issue for many staff in the field.
- 3. Measuring impact of multi-sector programming-** Although the IHD emphasizes the importance of multi-sector programming, there is still great deal of work that needs to be done on measuring impact of such programs. Efforts should be made to set up pilot activities to demonstrate how such multi-sector impacts could be measured.
- 4. More emphasis should be given to emergency assessments and linking relief and development-** Many country programs felt that more training was needed in emergency assessments and how to link emergency programming with development activities.
- 5. Capacity building follow up-** In countries where capacity building training on the IHD framework or tools has taken place, there is little follow up to determine whether capacity to use the framework and tools has been established. In addition, the documentation of tool application in some sectors has not been adequately shared to facilitate cross country learning. ICB resources should be used to ensure that follow up activities are built into technical support training activities and that documentation facilitates learning.
- 6. Continue to collaborate with other INGOs and USAID-** Although CRS has participated in a number of forums to share its IHD framework and tools with other NGOs, the opportunities to share these tools have been limited since the phasing out of FAM. As a result, many of the NGOs are creating similar tools that may not be following the same standards. CRS should seek more opportunities to share its tools with other organizations.
- 7. Continue to develop capacity of local partners-** Although efforts have taken place to strengthen local partners through training, sharing tools and guidelines, many of the follow on activities have not been implemented. More work needs to focus on partner strengthening in the last year of the grant.

I. Background to the Final Evaluation

Objective of the ICB Evaluation

CRS was awarded an Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Grant on September 30, 2003 to strengthen core management of Title II programs, support technical innovation and best practices, and improve collaboration in order to better contribute to the reduction of food insecurity in vulnerable populations.² In 2006, a mid term review of the ICB grant was carried out that noted several accomplishments during the first half of the ICB grant period. The organization has developed the Integrated Human Development (IHD) Framework and developed the capacity of Title II country programs to use the framework. It has also developed strong relationships with other INGOs, USAID and other agencies involved in promoting food security to create a shared learning environment for improved effectiveness in influencing food security strategies.

CRS is well positioned to further improve its programming approach and enhance the impact of food security programs with the tools, frameworks and country program capacity it has built up to the mid term.

The objective of the final evaluation is to appraise the outcomes, and impacts of CRS' capacity-building activities under the Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Grant.

Objectives of the ICB Grant

ICB Objectives and Target

The overall goal of the ICB grant is to strengthen the capacity of CRS and partner staff to effectively conduct Title II programming aimed at reducing the vulnerability of food insecure populations to be accomplished through three strategic objectives (SOs) and eight intermediate results (IRs) focusing on risk management and asset strengthening strategies for individuals, households, and communities³. The SOs and IRs are summarized below:

- SO1 Strategies for individuals, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted
 - IR1.1 Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors
 - IR1.2 Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized
- SO2 Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security
 - IR2.1 The impact of HIV/AIDS is mitigated
 - IR2.2 Water insecurity is reduced
- SO3 Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered

² Grant agreement, 11.

³ Please see Annex 2, the Indicator Performance Tracking Table.

IR3.1 Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased

IR3.2 PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions

- Cross-cutting IRs to strengthen design and implementation of Title II programs
 - IR-A Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased
 - IR-B Capacity of CRS' and local-partners staff to identify, measure, and document field impact is increased

The SOs and IRs address the Request for Application's (RFA) priority to strengthen Private Volunteer Organizations' (PVO) core technical competencies under the 2006-2010 Food For Peace (FFP) strategic framework, plus local partners' management abilities. CRS' project supports technical excellence, innovation and best practices for immediately applying lessons learned in combating food insecurity, for adding to the evidence base for improvements and innovations, and for influencing US Government and multilateral policy-makers.

ICB Final Evaluation Methodology

TANGO International has adopted a qualitative-based evaluation approach with the aim of gaining a fundamental understanding of how ICB is being implemented, how the grant was used in relation to its original intent, how its implementation has brought changes in Title II programming that the program intended to bring about on household and institutional participants, and whether the recommendations of the mid term review have been implemented to improve its performance during the last half of its implementation.

To understand the issues, progresses and challenges, TANGO International reviewed the ICB Proposal, DIPs, annual reports, IPTT, baselines, the ICB mid term evaluation report, and the responses from external agencies during mid term review. It has also reviewed PQSD descriptive documents, strategic planning documents, relevant country program documentation, and ICB publications including the IHD framework.

TANGO has used two survey instruments – the first instrument targets the Country Office Title II program staff while the second instrument targets the regional staff and relevant key headquarters staff.

All of the survey instruments were based on the ICB goals, objectives, intermediate results and corresponding indicators – all of which identify outcomes to be achieved over the course of the grant.

Country Programs Responding to the ICB Final Evaluation Survey	
Benin	Kenya
Burkina Faso	Madagascar
Ethiopia	Malawi
Gambia	Nicaragua
Ghana	Rwanda
Guatemala	Sierra Leone
Haiti	Northern Sudan

Although an open ended questionnaire was sent out to key staff working in 24 Title II country programs, staff from 18 country programs responded. The headquarters survey (Annex V) specifically addresses the use of conceptual models (IHD framework in particular) applied in Title II programs, specific tools used for monitoring and evaluation, capacity building of CRS staff and partners, knowledge sharing and learning practices, and means used for institutionalizing Title II programming efforts. Key headquarters staff were interviewed to understand the overall progress, institutional bottlenecks, and technical issues in implementing the ICB grant. The results of this evaluation are presented below.

II. ICB Activities and Outputs

SO1: Strategies for individuals, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted

IR.1.1. Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors.

Output 1.1 1: A holistic framework for integral human development and capacity building and its use

Approximately half of the activities planned for the period of 2004 to 2006 were completed in addition to most of the activities planned for 2007. Among the major accomplishments, CRS developed a concept paper on the IHD framework and three training modules; developed the IHD tools including a user guide, and revised the participatory livelihoods assessment guidelines and health framework and tool box based on the first year experiences. In addition, IHD perspectives were incorporated in many of the sectors' annual work plans (sectors include Agriculture/Environment, Education, Health, HIV/AIDS, Peace building, and Water/Sanitation). Tools focusing on integrating education, food security, literacy, HIV/AIDS and agriculture were also developed in this time period. In 2007, CRS developed a *User's Guide to the CRS Integral Human Development Conceptual Framework*. In addition, the Zambia Livelihood Assessment Report was produced as well as a paper entitled *Integral Human Development: A Framework for Livelihood Security Assessment*.

Given the scope of these activities, it is unlikely that they can all be completed by the end of the ICB. CRS is currently in the process of identifying one country program in each region to pilot "mainstreaming" IHD.

Output 1.1.2 Capacity building for IHD

Most of the activities planned for this output were completed, however, development of a comprehensive training plan for institutionalizing the IHD and organizing IHD specific workshops/learning events are among the currently ongoing activities.

In developing the capacity of field and headquarters staff, CRS organized training on the IHD framework in six of its eight operational regions. In 2005, CRS developed capacity building strategies for CRS staff as well as staff of partner organizations. In 2007, CRS finalized the IHD framework and developed an implementation plan for 2007-2010. This framework helps CRS in operationalizing the Justice Lens and links relief and development programs for greater impact.

IR.1.2. Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized

Output 1.2.1: Field tools for addressing risk reduction and emergency preparedness and related capacity building activities

For this output, most of the planned activities were completed. Accomplishments include: thorough literature review on risk reduction programming, development of a drought framework incorporating risk and vulnerability assessment tools using IHD framework, identification of regional emergency focal points on assessments and emergency field management, and provision of support to four MYAP countries with field tools that reduce risks and mitigate vulnerabilities. Moreover, the ICB grant allowed CRS to participate in a number of Food Security and HIV workshops including the EARO planning workshop on Food Aid & HIV/AIDS. In 2007, the South Asia Emergency Lessons Learned Workshop and the Yogyakarta Multi-Agency Evaluation were organized to strengthen the links between emergency and development programming.

The development of tools for assessments and responses in agricultural emergencies building on the “Seed Fair System Emergency Recovery Strategy” has yet to be completed. The targets for field tools are not currently fully realized.

Output 1.2.2 Capacity building for risk reduction and emergency preparedness in holistic manner

Activities to produce this output were completed; however, targets for some of the activities are currently underachieved. The capacity building plan for this output was updated annually. In addition, CRS has piloted *Learning Conservations*, presented the “Relief and Development” approach, and provided training on country-specific emergency response in Kenya. Workshops were organized to develop shelter strategies in West Darfur, Indonesia, and India/Sri Lanka. In 2007, CRS began the implementation of a newly-approved agency strategy for CRS’ emergency response, entitled “Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response Strategic Plan” (EPPR). This plan seeks to reinforce CRS’ emergency capacity worldwide. During this time period the organization coordinated a risk reduction workshop for CRS EARO and SARO staff as well as three emergency preparedness planning workshops.

Due to the impact of tsunami on ERT staff, CRS has only achieved 33 percent of its target to use the risk reduction framework and under achieved its training target (53 percent of the potential trainees received training) during the period from 2004 to 2006. In 2006, the EPPR Strategic Plan was revised and regional focal points for emergency response were established. Although CRS held a number of strategic lessons learned workshops, 60 percent of the targeted participants did not participate.

SO 2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security

IR 2.1. The impact of HIV and AIDS is mitigated

Output 2.1.1 Field tools for mitigating health/nutritional impact of HIV/AIDS and food security

Most of the activities planned for 2004-2006 under this output are ongoing while a number of activities planned for 2007 are yet to be completed.

The ongoing activities include mainstreaming HIV prevention intervention in Title II programs, promoting strategies that allow partners and communities to replicate and scale-up successful interventions, improving effectiveness of food aid for meeting the nutritional needs of HIV/AIDS-affected households using the IHD framework and providing technical assistance for community-level responses to continue until the end of the project.

CRS developed guidelines to assist country programs in using the IHD framework for HIV/AIDS programming, and produced a series of “Promising Practices” case studies documenting the success of CRS’ integrated HIV/AIDS programs. In 2006, six documents were produced documenting best practices in HIV/AIDS programming while integrating nutrition and food security to help orphans and vulnerable children. In 2007, the Executive Leadership Team of CRS approved the agency’s HIV Strategy. Moreover, it published a how-to guide on education for OVC and completed “A Review of the Experience of Catholic Relief Services Implementing the Positive Deviance/Hearth approach: What lessons for the future?”

The following is a list of planned activities that has yet to be completed under this output:

- Produce an HIV/AIDS & Nutrition Training of Trainers Manual;
- Support operations research on HIV, ART, Nutrition, Food Security and Livelihoods;
- Provide technical assistance on using the tools, best practices or IHD framework;
- Provide an action plan for scaling up;
- Develop coping strategy indicators in collaboration with CARE; and
- Assess new ways to use food-for-work to address disease related agricultural labor shortages.

Output 2.1.2 Capacity building for integrating food security into HIV/AIDS mitigation strategies

The planned activities under this output have been completed. A number of global meetings were organized to discuss technical assistance needs, identify assets and resources and to explore the relationships between HIV/AIDS and food security. As a result, 63 percent of Country Programs (CPs) reported systematically integrating HIV

prevention messages into other programming, 42 percent of CPs reported developing and implementing exit strategies and 10 percent of CPs reported using IHD framework to design food programming for HIV/AIDS affected groups.

The organization has been working to complete a training plan to promote the incorporation of HIV/AIDS mitigation in program planning. Another ongoing activity is working to improve program staff's knowledge of exit strategies for food distribution to PLHIV.

IR2.2: Water Insecurity is reduced

Output 2.2.1 Field tools and best practices for water security

Activities planned for the period 2004-2007 resulted in the preparation of Best Practices, technical product reviews, a technical reference CD, a technical publication on water storage tanks, regional water and sanitation strategies for East Africa and Central America, planning guidelines for Ethiopia and for all Title II countries in East Africa, and the establishment of an electronic library of CRS water sector reports. Work is continuing on the full electronic library of water sector reports and references which will give CRS country staff access to all major programs and donor-funded activities. In addition, work is continuing on the revision of the Project Tracking System to provide direct compilations of all past and present water sector activities. An action plan for using the above tools and reference materials has been prepared every year as part of the performance plan for PQSD.

The above tools and guidance materials have been widely distributed to CRS regional and country offices through direct mailings, workshops, field visits, workshops and intersectoral meetings. In addition, these materials have been circulated to other development organizations and the general public through presentations at universities, interagency meetings (numerous), professional conferences, and involvement in coalitions and partnerships with other organizations.

Before 2004, there was little technical guidance for CRS water sector projects. With the advent of the ICB, CRS now has technical guidance on both software and hardware aspects of water and sanitation planning, water quality monitoring and testing, water storage tank construction, groundwater development and borehole drilling. CRS/PQSD is now becoming known throughout the regional and country offices (as well as in the US domestic operations offices) as a source of useful information for the planning, design, promotion and advocacy of programs and projects to reduce water insecurity around the world.

Output 2.2.2 Capacity building for water security

The capacity building strategy is contained in the annual performance plans prepared for the water sector in PQSD and in the presentations (5) made to senior CRS executives, departmental retreats, and sectoral reviews. Formal regional strategies for water supply

and sanitation have been developed and adopted in East Africa and Central America, and new strategies are under formulation in West Africa and Southern Africa. An innovative agriculture and water resources strategy is currently being finalized for East Africa. Other current activities include the initial planning for a global groundwater development strategy and a global water and sanitation strategy. Title II countries are fully involved in the strategies focused on East Africa, West Africa and Central America.

The strategies for both the expansion and application of best practices and other guidance materials and for the incorporation of regional and country strategies are under continual improvement. The establishment of senior technical experts in the water sector at CRS headquarters, as well as at the regional levels, has allowed CRS to provide greater technical assistance to country programs and to enter into new partnerships and coalitions for supporting food security through reduced water insecurity. Of particular importance are CRS participation in the Millennium Water Alliance, the USAID Hygiene Improvement Project, Global Water Challenge, Faith-Based Water Working Group, Atlas Copco – CRS Partnership, Buffett Global Water Initiative and the UNICEF Watsan Emergency Cluster. These new coalitions give CRS access to water sector opportunities and provide CRS with outlets for tools and guidance materials that it has developed.

A major channel for CRS technical information and best practices are workshops (Madagascar, Malawi), an All Africa Water Conference, and less formal but important presentations at meetings of coalition partners and donors. Materials are currently in development for standard modules on a wide variety of water sector issues that directly relevant to CRS country programs and coalitions. The expansion of these presentations is still limited by the undeveloped nature of water sector programs in many CRS country offices. As field staff become increasingly aware of the availability of technical assistance, guidance materials, and related support for the water sector, they are requested greater assistance in the form of field visits, guidance documents and program planning.

SO 3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered.

IR 3.1: Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased

Output 3.1.1 Tools and case studies to help communities understand their rights and responsibilities and promote justice

The activities planned for this output are partially completed. Among the major accomplishments, CRS documented case studies on how peace-building and structural analysis helped reduced food insecurity and how Title II programs in India supported boarding school facilities. In addition, it developed an action plan to replicate structural analysis practices and strategies as well as document a micro-case study on reducing frequency of female genital mutilation.

CRS has been conducting case studies to augment peace-building training modules and integrate them with the IHD framework. There remain two planned activities to be completed. These activities are: joint planning of interventions with the communities to address structural injustices that impede food-security, and creating manuals and curricula to increase capacity of CRS and local partner staff to support community empowerment.

The following planned activities for 2007 under this output have yet to be completed.

- Strengthen organizational relationships in order to contribute to learning around risk reduction and the protection of assets in communities
- Provide technical assistance in development and emergency programs

Output 3.1.2 Capacity building for structural analysis and peace-building

CRS continues to train technical assistants to use structural analysis and peace-building tools and document case studies. CRS has yet to make a concerted effort to mainstream structural-analysis tools into program design and implementation. Some of the targets for technical assistance in structural analysis are also underachieved.

During 2004-2006 a number of activities were completed, including an assessment of knowledge/training needs of HQ and regional field staff on structural analysis, training on structural analysis and IHD as well as workshops on structural analysis and peace-building. Approximately 15 percent of country programs identified IHD framework as a helpful tool in analyzing root causes of food, water and livelihood insecurity. In 2007, the executive leadership team of CRS approved the agency's peace-building strategy and the Justice, Peace-building and Global Solidarity (JPS) Network annual meeting in SARO was organized during this period.

IR 3.2: PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions

Output 3.2.1 Institutional collaborations

Most of the activities planned under this output have been completed except the plan to continue collaboration with OICI on water security and Mercy Corps on food logistics. Major accomplishments during this period include collaboration with agencies (CARE, FANTA, ARC, etc) on M&E, joint field studies, indicator review and participating in meetings. Although CRS maintained its ongoing relationships with the Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), the American Red Cross (ARC), and International Education Society (CIES), it did not initiate collaboration with any new institutions/networks in 2007.

Output 3.2.2: Learning alliances with research institutions.

CRS and CIAT jointly developed a GDA proposal for three years, covering 25 countries and combining action research and implementation results for market chain strengthening, market-oriented production and marketing skills development for smallholder farmers and traders.

CRS also collaborated with Tufts University on a number of initiatives, including technical research and proposals in Agro-enterprise and Microfinance while it maintained collaboration with the International Water Management Institute in Africa.

CRS has also been working to strengthen current learning alliances with research institutions. A number of activities planned for this output have yet to be completed; including expansion of learning alliances with universities and research institutions, conducting studies related to development of a grassroots, scale-up model for agro-enterprise, promoting learning and innovation when choosing alliance funding for the field, and producing significant alliance initiatives that contribute to industry standards.

Output 3.2.3: Enhanced global leadership for FFP

From 2004 to 2006, CRS actively participated in FAM including participation in M&E meetings and review of all FAM/FANTA studies. CRS also supported FAM to assume a stronger leadership role and served on FAM's steering committee until it closed in late 2004. CRS staff participated in USAID, FANTA and other fora related to food security. Presentations were given by CRS on the coping strategies of PLHIV in Zimbabwe at the IFPRI Conference in Durban as well as articles published on Food Security, PLHIV and the Quality of Life in Emergency Nutrition Network Field Exchange.

CRS has been maintaining its cooperation with FANTA and USAID/FFP, and promoting PVO and FFP's leadership through FANTA as well as informal networks and workshops after the dissolution of FAM.

However, planned activities for 2007, including supporting publications and disseminating information via CRS' website, commercial publishers, and journals have yet to be completed.

Cross-cutting IR A: Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased

Output A.1.1.1: Field tools and information for local-partner capacity building

CRS planned to develop tools and case studies for strengthening partners' planning/implementation capacity in 2006, which was partially accomplished. CRS has field tested the “*Core Organizational Development Tools*” in Haiti and Zimbabwe and developed three case studies in Benin, Ghana and Niger. Developing needs assessment methodologies for capacity building, refining capacity building indices and developing guidelines for partners to conduct self-assessments are among the major achievements under this output.

CRS has yet to study positive deviance in field programs to advance understanding of successes. Moreover, the plan for dissemination of the tools and case studies for strengthening partners' planning/implementation capacity has yet to be realized. CRS has not yet developed a standard template and illustrative examples (by sector) for creating indices of local partner's capacities to manage and implement Title II programs. The capacity building plan for field offices to use tools and case studies using the IHD framework also needs to be updated.

Output A 1.1.2: Capacity building

During the period of 2004 to 2006, CRS developed a training plan to operationalize a template and illustrative indices as well as an annually updated capacity building strategy for using tools and case studies. Support to workshops/learning events for using tools and case studies has yet to be accomplished.

Cross-cutting IR B: Capacity of CRS' and local-partner staff to identify, measure and document field impact is increased.

Output B.1.1.1: Risk-sensitive indicators and approaches for monitoring and evaluating Title II program outcomes

CRS has been working on the development of a menu of indicators and generating field-friendly M&E and reporting modules. During this ICB phase, it has completed ProPack - I to develop Program Managers' capacity on project design and proposal guidance. ProPack - I was translated into French, Spanish and Portuguese and disseminated to country programs. To develop M&E capacity of the Title II program staff, CRS drafted and disseminated ProPack - II in 2007, though not with ICB funds. Field-friendly modules on “Guidance for the Preparation and Use of Indicator Performance Tracking Tables (IPTT)” and “Human Interest Stories: Guidelines and tools for developing human interest stories” were also developed.

In 2007, CRS planned to develop, but has not yet completed, early warning systems guidance, and provide assistance to developing, testing, revising and rolling out Title II project indicators in collaboration with other NGOs, following the guidance of the FANTA-led FFP PMP Working Group.

Output B 1.1.2: Capacity building for CRS and local partner staff

Most of the activities under this output have been completed including the development of field friendly M&E modules and Indicator Performance Tracking Tables. CRS developed a capacity-building Guide and facilitated evaluation workshop for CRS/SARO participants (including those from Title II countries).

III. Program Quality Impacts: Field Perspectives

SO1: Strategies for individuals, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted

IR 1.1: Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors

Awareness on the IHD framework

The vast majority of country programs are aware of CRS' IHD framework. Field staff indicated that during the last four years, the framework had been used in partner workshops and during livelihoods assessments and problem tree analyses. CPs have also utilized the IHD when drafting MYAPs and proposals, designing new livelihood and emergency programs, such as Kenya's KDER, and when implementing projects. While most programs are aware of the framework and a number of them acknowledged using elements of the IHD framework in situational analyses, many stated that they have not yet achieved systematic practical application of the tool. A number of programs mentioned that for thorough application, field staff need more training. Several respondents indicated IHD had never been used in their country program.

“In the past four years, I have been working in two country programs (Egypt and North Sudan). In both programs, we have been looking into issues affecting assets, systems and structure and shocks affecting particular vulnerable groups. For different reasons related to the nature of the program in each country, I was able to use the tool more in Egypt than Northern Sudan”.

Documenting the use of the IHD framework

With the exception of CRS/Ghana and CRS/Gambia, all responding country program staff were aware of documents that elaborated how to use the IHD framework, and how it had been used in country programs. Electronic forms, such as CD-ROMS received from CRS/HQ, or power points, and hard copies, such as manuals, hand outs, IHD training reports, project documents, or field trip reports, were some items mentioned. One country staff member commented that documentation is available on the shared drive and that those who have participated in the training have documents, but most people have not accessed them.

Development/revision of assessment and evaluation tools for linking the IHD more concretely to food security and the protection of assets

Only seven of 29 respondents indicated that they have developed or revised assessment tools which enable the IHD to be more concretely linked to food security and the protection of assets. CRS/ Kenya and CRS/Madagascar noted numerous PRA tools: well being rankings, time lines, and Venn diagrams, wealth rankings, historic patterns charts, seasonal activity charts, village household maps, and transect walks. One field staff member from Sierra Leone felt that the development or revision of baseline questions, progress reports, evaluation reports, and IPTT and CORAD monitoring forms had

augmented their country's ability to link IHD to food security and the protection of assets.

Ability to replicate IHD training and tailor sessions according to local needs and contexts

The majority of country programs felt that staff is able to tailor IHD training to individual country program contexts and needs. A recurring response however, was that even if regional staff were able to tailor the IHD framework to country contexts, that training is not replicated in country program training sessions. Many field offices commented that introduction and exposure to the framework takes place, but a shortfall exists in formal training sessions on application and processes. Sierra Leone desired much more IHD assistance for their country program, noting that that the MER system does not provide sufficient input information on the IHD framework.

“CRS/staff were briefed on the IHD tool in February 2005 and no other formal training occurred since then. There is consensus that a more in depth training is needed to understand the concepts and its application in project development, and implementation. It is in our plan to organize an in-house training session on the framework during the current year. This training is part of our strategic goal to strengthen staff capacity in project development and implementation.”
Benin

Changes in approach to strengthening the coping strategies of beneficiaries since the inception of the project

Country program staff enthusiastically contributed numerous methods to strengthen the coping abilities of target groups, since the inception of the ICB. Among the various approaches adopted by CPs are increased support for crop diversification, greater access to affordable financial services, provision of take home rations to encourage school attendance, preparation of disaster preparedness and mitigation action plans, and improved methods of community-based water and sanitation management.

“The vulnerability analysis was conducted during staff orientation session on the IHD framework. As a response to vulnerabilities, CRS/Benin is piloting Saving and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) activities for rural households to have access to financial services and reduce their vulnerability to food insecurity.”

Nearly 80 percent of respondents confirmed that changes had been made to program designs as a result of the ICB grant funding. Specific changes noted by participants included greater adoption of SPHERE standards, increasing focus on promoting resilience among program beneficiaries, and improved integration of emergency and development interventions.

IR 1.2: Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized

Participation in ICB-grant funded training for risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response

Over half of the responding country programs claimed that participants had attended ICB-grant funded training for risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response. A number of CPs acknowledged incorporating aspects of this training into activities focusing on gender, nutrition, HIV/AIDS and conflict mediation. Others stated that the skills and materials obtained through such trainings supported development of MYAPS, SYAPs and emergency plans.

Exposure to shock since the inception of the project

The vast majority of respondents stated that the target community of their program had experienced at least one shock since the inception of the project. One response from Burkina Faso reported the following – “.... *targeted communities are experiencing poor rainfall this year. Communities outside of our traditional area of intervention experienced flooding that we are responding to.*” During the Togo elections crisis, thousands of refugees crossed the border into Benin and CRS was among the first organizations to respond with local partner training, and providing assistance.

Tools used to link emergency and development programming

Responses were split regarding the extent to which tools are used to link emergency and development programming. Six programs do not link the two while three country programs offered conflicting responses. The IHD framework has been used in Kenya, Burkina Faso, and Ethiopia; specifically, Burkina Faso used the framework to evaluate flooding. PRA tools were mentioned by a couple of CRS field staff, and Nicaragua has utilized the SPHERE Manual and the Good Enough Guide. ProPack and Seed Vouchers and Fairs are used in Sudan.

A “few hours after the disaster, we used the standardized tool for rapid evaluation (EIMA or Multi Disaster Survey Tool). UNs, INGOs & National NGOs collaborate with BNGRC (Risk and Disaster Management National Office) to develop the specific tools for different sectors : Agricultural, Water Sanitation, Health.” CRS/ Madagascar.

Adaptation of emergency assessment tools and early warning systems to specific locales

Very few field staff reported that early warning systems had been adapted to specific locales. Three countries offered examples including formation of community action plans, the use of rain gauges to study rainfall trends, and weather forecasting in specific geographical areas. In Sierra Leone, CRS “*supports a program through WANEP-SL that provides training in early warning for conflict prevention and response*”.

Although half of the responding field offices felt that adequate tools for emergency assessment were available to their country program, a recurring theme suggested that even when tools existed, staff had not received adequate training on the use of the tools.

Use of the IHD framework to inform and improve the development relief approach

Country Program proponents of using the IHD framework to inform and improve the development relief approach were a small but enthusiastic group. Among the numerous positive impacts cited were: 1) increased use of Farmer-to-Farmer schools, Food-for-Assets projects and Hearth model to enable community-driven development, 2) the use of the IHD framework to formulate plans for reintegration and peace-building among refugee communities, and 3) increased ability to target beneficiaries with appropriate emergency or relief interventions according to their vulnerability status.

KEY ISSUES FOR SO1

Though the vast majority of respondents were aware of the IHD framework and had received documentation on its use, few acknowledged using the framework to adapt assessment methodologies and tools used by Country Programs. A number of CPs noted that the technical support received through the ICB has enabled them to incorporate new methods of strengthening coping mechanisms among vulnerable households and communities. Similarly, while the majority of respondents claimed to have participated in ICB-supported training on risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response, responses were mixed as to whether CPs had used this training to effectively link emergency and development interventions or develop new development relief activities. Very few respondents claimed that the ICB has led to changes in emergency assessment tools or early warning systems used at the country level. While responses suggest that the IHD framework and other technical assistance received through the ICB are both appropriate and adaptable to local operating environments, it is clear that in order to realize the full potential of new tools, CPs will need further training in order to incorporate them into ongoing assessment and emergency response activities.

SO2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security

IR 2.1 The impact of HIV/AIDS is mitigated

Development of HIV/AIDS impact mitigation components

All but two respondents acknowledged that their country programs contain a component to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS. Indonesia noted that this was not applicable to their CP; Rwanda is integrating training and support even without a formal component.

Field staff noted a plethora of tools and programming approaches that are being used to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS.

- Life skills education for primary school children
- Couple to couple counseling programs
- Mobilization of community-level support networks to provide care and support to PLHIV

- Educational support to orphans and vulnerable children
- Integration of HIV with other programming areas: Food Security, Basic Needs, Human Rights/Justice and Peace, Microfinance
- Training and the provision of medical facilities
- Community Sensitization (IEC/BCC approaches)
- Social rehabilitation
- Voluntary counseling and testing
- Prevention of Parent to Child Transmission
- Home- based and palliative care, counseling and support
- Provision of high caloric dense food commodities
- Financial support through the development of income generating activities.
- Organization of conferences during the “World AIDS day”.
- Antiretroviral therapy

Development of reports, papers, case studies or other records that document the use of tools to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS

Few programs have developed reports or papers that have documented the use of tools to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS.

- CRS/Benin conducted a case study which was published in CRS’ “*Promising Practices Manual*”.
- CRS/Ethiopia mentioned In charge!, We Stop AIDS, and the Youth Action Kit.
- The Targeted Nutritional Supplementation evaluation was cited by CRS/Zambia.

Mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS into Title II programs in within the last 4 years

Most CRS field staff feel confident that knowledge of HIV/AIDS prevention has been mainstreamed into country programs since the inception of the ICB. Examples included:

- Integration of HIV/AIDS prevention into the education program.
- HIV/AIDS awareness and capacity reinforcement of safety net centers
- HIV/AIDS awareness and sensitization sessions
- Title II food commodities distribution is being targeted toward PLHIV
 - Food support to five organizations working in PLHIV care domain
 - Food support to 500 PLHIV in Burkina Faso
- Junior life farmer field schools
- Community Awareness campaigns
- Opening of Voluntary Counseling and Testing Centers
- Prevention of Mother to Child Infection (IHAP) (community awareness creation, admission of prevention drugs before and after child birth)

“The AB Track 1.0 PEPFAR team has been visiting Safety Net Centers (part of the Title II program and raising awareness of HIV/AIDS where there is geographic overlap. CRS Rwanda contracted with CINEDUC (education by film) with private money to raise awareness in other centers that were not reached by AB Track 1.0 and raised awareness of HIV and promoted Voluntary, Counseling and Training.”
Rwanda

Obstacles hindering mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS into Country Programs

While most field staff feel that HIV/AIDS prevention is being mainstreamed into country programs, they expressed that it is a challenging process. The main constraints mentioned were funding and lack of staff with sufficient training. Several countries acknowledged that custom, stigma, fear of disclosure, and discrimination might prevent the program from reaching some of the PLHIV. Low prevalence also contributed to HIV/AIDS programs receiving lower priority.

Staff training on the special nutritional needs of PLHIV

In the past 4 years, CRS has facilitated a number of HIV and Food Security workshops which included a substantial nutrition components. While many ICB-participating CPs either received or were invited to these workshops, fewer than half of survey respondents acknowledged receiving this type of training. This may be due in part to staff turnover. CRS staff and partner NGO staff are typically the recipients of the training in these programs. Occasionally, staff from government departments attend.

Of the countries that acknowledged training of this type, most felt that the information gained had been successfully applied within the country program. Applications included:

- A nutritional support project to a partner (the diocese of Ouahigouya) in Burkina Faso.
- Work with partners to develop guidelines in nutritional support for PLHIV.
- In Ethiopia, partner staff that had received training passed on the knowledge to beneficiaries (such as PLHIV, home based care providers) and other technical staff within the partner organizations. The trained partner staff also provided education about PLHIV nutritional needs to counseling services.
- Food security was integrated into two CRS/Kenya HIV/AIDS programs- TCB and APHIAII.
- CRS/Rwanda has a full time nutritionist that trains partner staff in nutritional needs of PLHIV and how to monitor the nutritional status of children and adults. Monthly reports are submitted and the nutritionist is responsible for tracking cases of malnutrition and follow-up with the partner.
- Provision of services to the HIV/AIDS patients enrolled in the care and treatment program occurred in Haiti.

While CRS Indonesia and southern African CPs involved in C-SAFE have been exposed to the development of exit strategies, nearly all CP respondents to the survey claimed this topic had not been directly addressed in formal training sessions. A few individuals were aware of training and commented that the information had been applied in phase out work plans and to support the nutrition interventions for PLHIV. CRS/Burkina Faso utilized the information during participation at the Oct, 2006 WARO workshop on “Food Security, Nutrition and HIV”. Eighty-eight percent of respondents were unable to confirm whether or not partner NGOs had incorporated any of the knowledge shared in training sessions to their work.

Types of qualitative and quantitative data used to measure improvements in the HIV/AIDS impact mitigation

Roughly half of the country programs that responded to the questionnaire were aware of qualitative and quantitative data used to measure improvements in the impact of HIV/AIDS as a result of ICB activities. Common sources of data cited were:

- Baseline studies
- Endline surveys on methods of transmission and prevention
- Quarterly and annual narrative and financial reports
- Mid-Term and Final Evaluations

Specific indicators noted by several country programs were:

- Height/weight data for children, health status
- Number and % increase in VCT uptake
- Number and % increase in HBC and Support
- Number and % increase in ART
- Number and % increase in PTCT
- Departmental/National infection rates
- Nutritional status of HIV and AIDS affected persons
- Number of active patients on ARV
- Number of people enrolled in Palliative Care
- Number of pediatric patients under ARV treatment
- Number of people/ pregnant women tested

IR 2.2 Water insecurity is reduced

Country Program components to reduce water insecurity among target communities

Water insecurity is a component that exists in close to three-fourths of the respondents' country programs. Exceptions were CRS/Gambia which was "*excluded from the list of countries qualified to apply because of the rather high water and sanitation coverage figures compared to other countries in the region*" and Benin, where for the most part water insecurity is being addressed by Medical Care Development International. Benin does however have a small school health component which addresses water security in schools. Additionally, CRS/Rwanda and CRS/Zambia do not provide assistance in this area.

Types of tools and strategies introduced to reduce water insecurity

Participating field staff offered numerous examples of tools and strategies introduced by CRS that have attempted to reduce water insecurity. Examples include the following:

- Installation of boreholes, water catchments, and piped water.
- Capacity building for water user committees in Indonesia.
- Management of water access by the local community (village water committees).
- Provision of potable water in schools

- Provision of water wells and pit latrines in communities where MCHPs and CHPs are constructed. This has been done on a very small scale but felt to be highly effective.
- Watershed management, water filtration and the dissemination of water conservation information and watering techniques in Nicaragua.
- Rehabilitation of irrigation systems

Most field staff were not aware of reports, papers, or case studies developed by their country program which document the use of water management tools. Ghana noted that “CRS supports community WATSAN committees to develop Facility Management Plans that detail responsibilities and roles of each committee member.” A list of borehole beneficiaries in CRS’ intervention area was recorded in Burkina Faso. CRS/Madagascar mentioned standardized tools by Diorano Wash. Several other respondents listed quarterly and annual reports.

Changes in the domestic or productive use of water resulting from CRS trainings and interventions

Ten of eleven country programs with water insecurity components expressed that CRS training and intervention has resulted in positive changes in the domestic or productive use of water. A short list of changes follows:

“Provision of safe water to user communities through three community managed defluoridation pilot projects in Alem Tean area have resulted in positive changes on the life of communities. Excess and undesirable fluoride content (about 9 mg/l) was a problem in the area, but this was reduced to about 2 mg/l, which corresponds to 75% of fluoride removal efficiency. This intervention has contributed to improved health condition of user communities in the area. In addition, the boreholes serve as water sources for livestock. “ CRS/Ethiopia

- Improved personal hygiene practices and hand washing practices
- Installation of school pumps
- Regular cleaning of water points
- Access to irrigated perimeters
- Reduction of diarrhea cases in the target villages
- Enhanced access
- Increased number of households with home gardens
- Optimized water use for multiple purposes
- Water and sanitation quality were improved

Six country programs with water insecurity components indicated that direct technical assistance through a field visit had been provided to their program. Of those that responded, the majority felt that the TA met the country program's needs.

“In Dedza under Integrated HIV/AIDS and Food Security Project, CRS provided farm inputs to the beneficiaries to be used for home gardening. These home gardens were made along the drainage system of the borehole with the aim of utilizing waste water from the boreholes” Malawi

Implementation of sanitary surveys and environmental examinations prior to water-related interventions

Six of the responding country programs with a water insecurity component were aware of sanitary surveys conducted prior to drinking water interventions. Surveys are generally conducted by CRS or partner staff. Methods ranged from baseline conditions of water supply and sanitary practices, to quick assessments of latrine location in order to determine the optimal site for boreholes. Respondents from Indonesia and Nicaragua indicated that surveys had not taken place prior to intervention.

Half of the responding country programs with a water insecurity component were aware of environmental examinations which had been executed prior to water-related interventions such as irrigation, fish-farming and other agricultural uses. The tests were commonly conducted by external consultants, government officials, and/or CRS staff. Field participants from Haiti, Nicaragua, Sudan and Ghana declared that environmental tests had not taken place prior to intervention by their country program.

“Environmental examinations on irrigation, water supply, rural access roads, seeds and other agricultural interventions occur at projects preparation stages. For USAID funded projects, Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) are requirements to be submitted along with proposals. The Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) conducted on small-scale irrigation in Ethiopia is instrumental while preparing mitigation measures for some water related activities. The CP is also using the checklist attached with the PEA document.”

Formation of village water committees

The majority of country programs with a water insecurity component asserted that the project had helped to form village water committees. Elected village water committee members, which in some cases are gender-balanced, members of the community, program officers, district representatives and local partner staff comprise the list of common attendees at meetings, which occur once a month in most areas. Field staff shared some major topics which are discussed in the village meetings and training sessions:

- Repair, maintenance, and hygiene of water pumps and wells
- Capacity building, group governance, and management of water

- Security of water facilities
- Fund raising activities for maintenance funds
- Community health and participation
- New project intervention

Those that believed the project had augmented the formation of village water committees were less sure that the information discussed at the meetings is being applied within the country program. A few individuals expressed that follow up had occurred.

- CRS/Madagascar has utilized the information to evaluate the managerial capacity of the community in order to ensure the system sustainability.
- CRS/Sierra Leone and CRS/Malawi incorporate the information when they are determining sites for construction or formulating other new projects.
- CP staff in Ethiopia review the minutes during field visits and discuss with partner’s staff and water committee leaders the implementation conditions of issues raised during meetings.

Integration of water and sanitation programming with other types of interventions

Country program staff affirm that steps have been taken to integrate water and sanitation programming with other types of intervention, and for the most part, assert that these efforts have been effective. The following undertakings were cited:

- Watsan programs in Madagascar have been linked with Health or Emergency response programs to “decrease morbidity and mortality caused by lack of drinking water and the sanitation infrastructure.”
- A WatSan component was included in the LEAD project in Sierra Leone.
- Additionally, Sierra Leone links Health Village Development committees to WatSan needs and existing resources. As part of the package for construction of health facilities under the OFDA project, wells were included.
- CRS Ghana supports integration of water, health and education programs by

- supporting behavior change communication to essential water supply and sanitation facilities.
- In Ethiopia, natural resources management implemented an intervention in which watersheds slowed run-off , allowing it to percolate into the ground. This had a positive impact on the rate of groundwater discharge. This integration has also contributed to an increase in the number of springs in watershed areas.

“CRS tries to support integration between water and health and education programs by supporting behavior change communication to essential water supply and sanitation facilities. They are moderately effective. Because it is privately funded, the scale of the water and sanitation project cannot come close to the health and education programs outreach. But where possible, the integration has been effective.” Ghana

- Water and sanitation programming was integrated into the Mother Child Health, Education, and Agriculture programs in Haiti. The agricultural program planted

- trees around the springs that were capped. Water is now available to children during the school day, and “children transfer messages received on proper use of water at home.”
- In Indonesia, the construction of water and sanitation facilities was implemented through Food for Work projects that also involved Title II commodity distribution. The watsan project was also accompanied by campaigns promoting hygiene and hand washing as well as home gardening.
 - CRS/Sudan integrates watsan programs with shelter and education through school construction.

Factors hindering progress in improving household water security

More than half of the responding country programs with a water insecurity component expressed that technical challenges exist which hinder progress in improving household water security. The numerous list of constraints included low staff capacity, cost, poor access to communities, hydro-geological complexities in some areas, limitations of equipment, lack of spare parts, very low success rates for locating water and water shortage in general.

Types of qualitative and quantitative data used to measure improvements in the water and sanitation resulting from country program activities

Seven of the 11 country programs with a water insecurity component offered insight into the type of data used to measure water and sanitation improvements resulting from project activities. Specific indicators included the following:

- Number and types of water and sanitation facilities constructed or distributed
- Number of people benefiting from the improved construction
- Percentage of reduction in diarrhea cases at village level
- Rate of morbidity and mortality
- Water yield from new water facilities
- Baseline surveys about water quality and hygiene practices
- Documenting proper use and maintenance of facilities
- KAP information

KEY ISSUES FOR SO2

The majority of respondents reported that HIV/AIDS has been effectively mainstreamed into all program activities and cited a range of tools and methodologies through which the impact of the disease is being mitigated. Still, a lack of funding, the need for more staff training and certain donor restrictions continue to present challenges to effective mainstreaming. Again, while CRS has organized a number of Food Security and HIV training events that covered the special nutritional considerations for providing food support to PLHIV, less than half of CP respondents to the final evaluation survey reported that they had participated in this type of training. Again, this may be a reflection of staff turnover or the limited response to final evaluation surveys. A number of CPs are taking steps to address water insecurity including installation of boreholes, formation of

water committees and dissemination of water conservation information in target communities. Nearly all of CPs implementing water security projects claimed that CRS interventions had led to positive changes in the domestic and/or productive use of water resources and many claimed to have made progress in integrating water, health and education activities. Given the level of success reported among CPs that have implemented HIV/AIDS and water/sanitation activities, concerted effort should be made to document promising practices and share them with CPs who have yet to implement such activities.

SO3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered

IR 3.1: Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased

Difficulties in balancing application of IHD with application of FFP food security framework

Few respondents experienced difficulty balancing the application of the IHD with the application of the FFP food security framework. One country program that did have trouble stated that they had been unable to use the IHD concept in a systematic manner and expressed the desire for more “*in depth training to understand the IHD concept and its application in project development, and management.*” Another noted that “*the existing DAP focuses on building long-term food security by promoting education and child health and development; however more could be done to build local capacities to ensure food security through community-based initiatives and support for local structures.*”

Use of the IHD framework and/or Contextual Analysis toolkit to identify and analyze systemic causes of food, water, and livelihood insecurity

Nine of the responding country programs noted that either the IHD framework or the Contextual Analysis toolkit had been utilized to help identify and analyze the systemic causes of food, water, and livelihood insecurity in their project. All but one program felt that these tools represented an improvement over previous methods of data analysis. Field staff appreciated the toolkits' ability to provide a more comprehensive and holistic approach by incorporating assets, shocks and seasonal trends. The IHD framework allowed country programs to analyze the problems systematically and closely identify livelihood options and coping mechanisms. Respondents valued that it allowed the country program to see the root causes of the problems, and to “*identify a broader range of specific actions to increase community resiliency to shocks*”). Field staff indicated that the food security framework (which is assumed to be a previously used method) did not offer insight into the vulnerability of target populations. One critic of the IHD, stated that “*its use has not changed the indicators tracked.*” 37 percent of the respondents had never heard of either tool, or stated they were not used in the country program.

A few country programs have documented the use of the IHD or Contextual Analysis tools to help identify and analyze the root causes of food, water, and livelihood insecurity

via training reports, DRP final evaluations, community action plans, and the 2008-2012 SYAPs and MYAPs. Most, however, have not.

Field staff predominantly agreed that sufficient training for these two resources had not been provided.

Implementation of CRS structural analysis workshops

CRS structural analysis workshops have been conducted in just a few of the responding countries. WARO provided training in Gambia and Sierra Leone for selected FTN staff, area managers and CRS programming staff. Madagascar simply stated that staff had facilitated the workshop. All three countries have experienced only one or two training sessions.

CRS/Sierra Leone was the only country program able to elaborate on the inclusion of a WatSan and governance components in the LEAD program, and the Agriculture strategy of 2003-2008, as action strategies which had developed based on information gained in structural analysis workshops.

Provision of advocacy tools and/or training to communities or community-based organizations

Over half of the responding country programs are providing communities, partners, or community-based organizations with human rights and advocacy tools or training. Specific examples include:

- CRS/Kenya noted: Do No Harm, Project Officer, CRS Advocacy Training Manual, Contextual Analysis Tool Kit, and Justice and Peace.
- Manuals for human rights education and translated copies of public law have been distributed by CRS/Benin.
- CRS/Ghana cited mechanisms for communities to advocate their rights to the district assemblies. This can occur in the form of written demands for support (water and sanitation, school feeding, infrastructure, etc), or by directly linking with district assemblies to advocate for support.
- APHIA II Lobbying and Advocacy Skills Training took place in the Rift Valley and Coast provinces of Kenya. “3 trainings were conducted for PLHAs where issues affecting OVCs and PLHAs were identified and prioritized, with the three most serious...” “issues used as a basis for lobbying and advocacy skills training.”
- The Diocese of Meru in Tanzania took part in lobbying and advocacy training to staff and community representatives to give participants the skills and knowledge needed to advocate against female circumcision.

IR 3.2: PVO practices and FFP’s global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions

Use of the IHD framework in developing MYAPs

Close to half of responding field staff stated that their nine country programs had used the IHD framework in developing a MYAP; most were able to describe how the process was different than the previous MYAPs/DAPs. Staff expressed that using the IHD in MYAP development enabled more

focus on community self reliance and increasing community resilience. CRS/Haiti believed that using the IHD offered a better systematization of approaches and more depth in understanding the issues. *“Livelihoods assessments were carried out at village levels, and these assessments were instrumental in closely analyzing gaps, opportunities, and coping/survival mechanisms”* (Ethiopia).

“The IHD framework was used to develop a MYAP/COSA (Comprehensive Close-Out Strategy Amendment...Rwanda is no longer on the priority list and CRS Rwanda was asked to submit a close out amendment to the DAP) and focus on what activities could be conducted in three years to close the program. Using the IHD framework more information came from the community on the needs that needed to be addressed in the close-out program.”

Cross-cutting IR-A: Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased

For the most part, country programs are not implemented directly by CRS. Local partners noted were:

- Caritas
- OCADES
- ALAVI
- AJPO
- Food Aid
- Catholic Dioceses
- Governmental structures
- CARE
- Save the Children US
- The Salvation Army
- World Vision Malawi

Assessing the needs and capacities of CRS partner organizations

Partners’ technical needs and capacities are commonly assessed by field visits, spending time with staff, workshops and meetings, and questionnaires. Methods used to determine managerial needs and capacities include institutional capacity assessments, field and monitoring visits, and reports/ meetings between CRS and partner organizations management. Financial needs and capacities are assessed by logistical resources,

liquidation reports, monitoring visits, proposal developments, questionnaires, and analyzing the capacity for fund raising or sources of organizational support.

Of the seven country programs that are using an organizational capacity-building tool, six expressed that the tools have been easy to understand, however, very few were able to cite any specific tools which their country program utilized.

CRS/ Indonesia makes use of Organizational Self – Assessment tools adapted from World Neighbor’s “*From the Root Up*”.

“CRS together with all partners engaged in a management capacity self-assessment exercise to determine relative technical and organizational development and capacity of each PVO in the following technical areas: agriculture & marketing; health; nutrition; HIV/AIDS; governance; and an established Monitoring & Evaluation system. The tool assessed each PVO’s human resource and organizational development and learning, and each PVO’s financial, accountability and compliance system.” Malawi

Field staff in CRS/Rwanda have created some of their own tools, using a variety of existing aids. The following were cited:

- *Questionnaire d’Evaluation Financiere Des Partenaires de Catholic Relief Services*
- *Evaluation du Systeme de Gestion des Vivres*
- *Guide d’ Evaluation du Système de Gestion des Ressources des Centres Safety Net*

CRS / Rwanda uses the information gained from the use of these tools to prepare training sessions for partners and their specific needs. During periodic visits to partner organizations, weaknesses are identified and potential solutions are proposed.

Development of action plans to address local partners’ needs

Most country programs confirmed that action plans had been designed and implemented to increase local partners’ organizational capacity, but few offered details on how. Noted examples include:

- Participatory organizational capacity assessments are conducted with partners and assistance provided to them to design and implement action plans to increase their organizational capacity. CRS/Benin
- *“From the consultant’s recommendation, a detailed action plan was later developed through a workshop session involving partner staff and facilitated by CRS. To some extent, the financial capacity needs were address through the development and adoption of financial procedures manual and an account software package. Very little was done on the technical weaknesses revealed by the study.” CRS/Gambia.*
- Capacity building of partners is increased *“through constant technical backstopping, annual surveys, cross learning, Technical Working Groups, and trainings. The partner was not only small but also was implementing such a big*

project for the first time and so had their capacity to implement the project and comply with regulations increased through various trainings, technical backstopping and improving their human and financial systems which, prior to the project was not there.” CRS/Malawi

- *“An action plan was developed based on the identified weakness, current capacity and potential. Organizational capacity building activities were developed and implemented with full participation and involvement of the partner, building as much as possible upon their current capacity and potential. Since the action plan was based on partner’s identified needs, most of the activities have helped the partner improve their capacity.” CRS/Indonesia*
- CRS/Rwanda has been helping all the partner organizations especially the Safety Net Centers develop strategic plans and organizational capacity is addressed in each plan.

Obstacles preventing local partners from increasing their organizational capacity

Field staff believed that many obstacles prevented local partners from increasing their organizational capacity. Funding was by far the greatest constraint. Lack of training, time, high staff turnover, and no system or long-term strategy for staff capacity building, were other typical difficulties cited by respondents. One individual mentioned that the constantly increasing number of vulnerable people in need of services and the focus on partners’ capacity to successfully implement their programs rather than build organizational capacities placed limitations on successful growth in this area.

“It is not clear that all CRS staff members understand what “capacity building” really requires – not just training, but open and honest collaboration that encourages partners to challenge themselves and gain new skills. There is a tendency for people to just do what needs to be done instead of investing in teaching other people.” Burkina Faso

Respondents concurred that the major obstacle preventing CRS from assisting partners to increase their organizational capacity was limited funding. Also mentioned frequently were the limitations of training, time, partner motivation, and the short duration of projects. One respondent noted that at times, there is lack of flexibility in projects due to donor driven activities and indicators.

Cross-cutting IR-B: Capacity of CRS’ and local-partner staff to identify, measure and document field impact is increased

Types of technical assistance and formal training provided for the monitoring and evaluation of Title II country programs

Technical assistance and formal M&E training took place in 10 of the 15 responding countries. In CRS/ Zambia the program is just beginning and a baseline has recently been completed. Topics covered included:

- IPTT Tools manipulation
- Designing of monitoring tools

- Training in PRA techniques
- Impact Assessment Training
- Fundamentals of M & E
- Situation and problem tree analysis
- Barrier Analysis training
- Use of Propack and IHD Framework
- USG Compliance and cash management training
- Baseline data collection training
- LQAS training
- Commodity management trainings

Commonly, CRS staff provided the training sessions. Other facilitators included CORAD, WARO, USAID, I-LIFE Project Management Unit and I-LIFE Commodity Management Unit. Attendees typically numbered near 20 and were a combination of CRS staff and partners' staff. Occasional trainings included community volunteers and local government employees. Most respondents felt that close to 20 participants is an optimal target.

Awareness of the field-friendly monitoring modules developed by ICB

The vast majority of respondents were not aware of field-friendly monitoring modules developed by the ICB; the few that were aware of their existence, overwhelmingly expressed that adequate training had not been provided. The single advantage of using these modules noted was that the 'Preparing for the Evaluation' module had helped CRS/Ethiopia manage evaluations smoothly and efficiently.

Number of M&E tools currently being used in the CP

Field staff response regarding the number of M&E tools varied from 2 to 30. Those cited were:

- Baseline survey
- IPTT/PITT
- IEE
- CORAD monitoring forms
- CRS monitoring forms
- Progress reports
- Mid-term and final evaluations
- Pro-frame
- Result framework
- Impact Assessment
- KPC
- Data Management planning tool
- M&E Capacity Assessment tool for partners
- M&E Calendars

- M&E Plans
- DIPs
- Collection of success stories

Opinions were split about whether or not reports or manuals documenting the use of M& E tools exist.

The vast majority of responding country offices declared that their program uses participatory monitoring methods for data collection and analysis. Focus Group Discussions and many Participatory Rural Assessment techniques were cited by virtually all respondents. Other methodologies noted were:

- Key informant interviews
- Joint planning and review meetings
- Lot Quality Assurance Sampling
- Community Forum Discussions
- Stakeholder’s self-assessment
- Appreciative Inquiry
- Questionnaires for population based surveys
- Workshops
- Community seedling committees monitor seedling survival in Sudan

One individual countered the positive responses with the following observation: *“It takes time and money, and a deeper understanding and appreciation of the value of participatory methods than what most people have here. PRA is used at the beginning to define the problem, but participatory methods are not used during project design, implementation or evaluation.”* CRS/Burkina Faso

Types of data monitoring systems and management information systems used in Country Programs

The following tools and information systems were cited by CPs as components of their Title II M&E systems:

- Baseline evaluations
- Mid-term evaluations
- Field forms and digital data bases
- Access databases
- GIS (Geographic Information System) Server
- Indicators Performance Project Tracking system (IPPT)
- Routine Data Collection
- Periodic Surveys

“Data obtained through M&E is mainly reported in project reports, through presentations to staff, key stakeholders and through participatory sessions with communities. Reports are submitted to Project Managers on a quarterly basis for review and feedback. The means by which the information is reported is determined based on the audience and type of action planning required.” Malawi

- The MIS currently used by CRS/Malawi was developed to monitor activities in the I-LIFE DAP. A system was developed in Access to track individuals and households' participation in I-LIFE activities.
- There is a plan this year to develop a database of key indicators, by sector, to compile and monitor for the country program. *Malawi*
- Quarterly narrative reports
- Annual indicator reports
- SPSS and Excel

*“CRS is promoting new participatory approaches such as the Most Significant Changes (MSC) methodology and the Participatory Impact Assessment (PIA). The three staff members who participated in the regional M&E training were briefed on these methodologies.”*CRS/Benin.

In several country programs data obtained through monitoring and evaluation is reported by partners' staff to CRS program officers. The POs then review and submit the data to M&E for entry and analysis. The analyzed data is presented back to the program manager, and is produced in reports per the requirements of the donor(s).

Use of M&E findings for strategic decision making

Respondents felt strongly that M&E findings had been used in strategic decision making. Examples of how the knowledge has been applied follow:

- To rectify and improve project implementation
- To provide TA on weak areas
- To use lessons learned for better planning
- To design new programs
- To develop the SPP
- To target operational areas
- To determine funding decisions for partners

“One example is on Positive Deviance implementation. The CRS/Indonesia program planned to establish 100 PD groups. However, based on the monitoring report from the field staff it showed that PD groups need a lot of technical assistance and guidance from the field staff and that the target communities did not really need that many groups. Based on the report, DAP manager decided to reduce the number of PD groups to 32 to be more manageable but with intensive assistance and guidance to improve and maintain the quality of services the groups provided to the target communities.”

Less than half of the responding country programs were able to describe new approaches for assessing impact which have been introduced by CRS. Respondents cited the IHD framework, PRA, Lots Quality Assurance Sampling, Annual DAP surveys, LQAS surveys, PIA and MSC.

Strategies for strengthening linkages between Title II and non-Title II programs

Nine responding field offices were aware of strategies which, in the past four years, had strengthened linkages between Title II and non-Title II programs where sectors or activities are similar or complementary. Some specific examples include:

- In emergency, Title II resources are often combined with emergency funds to better respond to the needs of communities
- In HIV/AIDS programming, Title II food is provided, while PEPFAR provides resources for treatment.

- Capacity building through Village Strategic Planning training is facilitated by the Peace Building program team for both CRS and PPSE DAP staff.
- In Indonesia, DAP Health has been integrated into collaborative programs in Agriculture and Peace Building.
- Title II grants have been used to scale up non-Title projects and lessons learned from Title II programs have been used to strengthen non-Title II grants. The reverse also applies.
- CRS supports quality education to complement school feeding, which is funded through Title II.
- Providing FFW support to non-Title II projects. e.g., the use of FFW for the implementation of the World Bank / NaCSA housing project, the UN Human Trust Fund for shelter construction, UNDP housing, and the construction of OFDA funded CHPs.
- Collaborating with partners not implementing non-Title II projects, e.g., providing FFW support to MSCL for provision of creation of community structures such as grain stores, drying floors, etc.
- In order to increase food security at a household level, CRS/Malawi rolled out a small-scale irrigation project which targeted the same beneficiaries as those in Title II programs. Rain-fed cultivation is complemented with winter/irrigated cultivation, increasing the number of months that beneficiaries have food.
- *“Where there is geographic overlap, it is easier to strengthen linkages between projects. CRS Rwanda holds quarterly integration meetings where we update where each project is working and how linkages can be strengthened. Mapping of all interventions is important and should be updated regularly so everyone has as much information as possible. During the quarterly meetings the programming department looks at ways to link different projects and then commits itself to two or three concrete activities for the next quarter. Previous quarter activities are reviewed and analyzed if they were not completed”.*

KEY ISSUES FOR SO3 AND CROSS-CUTTING IRS

In general, CPs had not had difficulty in applying the IHD framework in conjunction with the FFP food security framework. Several noted that the IHD framework and the Contextual Analysis Toolkit represented an improvement over previous methods used to analyze systemic causes of food, water, and livelihood insecurity. Nine CPs claimed to have used the IHD in developing new MYAPs and explained that it enabled them to achieve a greater focus on promoting community self reliance resilience. Many CPs are involved in building capacity of implementing partners and have developed action plans to do so, though few identified specific capacity building tools. The majority of respondents from CPs reported that they have undergone training on monitoring and evaluation and claimed that they were aware of the field-friendly monitoring modules developed by the ICB. The majority of respondents claimed that information gaining

through monitoring and evaluation had been used in strategic decision making and that over the life of the ICB, efforts had been made to strengthen linkages between Title II and non-Title II programs.

IV. Program Quality Impacts: Headquarters' Perspectives

SO1: Strategies for individual, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted

The effectiveness of the IHD framework in the field, and how the framework has been used in country programs (CPs)

Staff from CRS headquarters shared that the IHD framework was developed based on DFID's Sustainable Livelihoods framework, however spiritual and rights based dimensions of livelihoods were added to the framework by CRS. The IHD framework offers a spiritual lens to analyze ethical issues, and a justice lens to analyze issues related to rights. Although the IHD framework was developed before this ICB phase, the ICB grant allows CRS to complete the framework, developing tools and user guides and to develop the capacity of country programs to operationalize it.

In a group interview HQ personnel stated that in the beginning there was some resistance from the sectors to introducing IHD, however they eventually accepted the framework. Senior management understood the advantage of the IHD framework and adapted the framework into CRS' programming strategy in 2004. The mid-term strategic review has identified "IHD framework" and "partnership" as the two programming cornerstones for CRS. Although senior management understood the IHD framework, comprehending the framework remains an issue to the local level field staff.

Participants in the group interview additionally explained that internalizing the IHD framework by country programs seemed to be easier in CRS because of the approach that was taken by headquarters. Instead of forcing the country programs to adopt the framework, HQ allowed them to review the framework and identify pieces that are relevant to them. As a result the country programs took ownership over the framework. CRS has been developing a user friendly guide to help country programs to operationalize the IHD framework.

In the final evaluation survey, CRS headquarters and regional personnel reported varied levels of effectiveness and use of the framework in the field. One respondent noted that orientations and training had been offered at many levels. Country level workshops have occurred in Tanzania, Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia, Rwanda, Zambia, Haiti, India, Malawi and other ICB-participating CPs. Regional and multi-regional overviews have also been offered on the topics of "HIV/AIDS and nutrition, water, and disaster preparedness and response." ICB funding supported program development in HIV/AIDS, WatSan and agriculture allowing CRS to develop its capacity to address the issues. A number of tools were developed with ICB resources and these areas were integrated into the holistic IHD framework to improve CRS' title II programming in the field enabling a much bigger impact on households. The education sector has developed documentation on strategies for bringing education into the IHD framework. Although education is integrated into the framework, the challenge is to develop tools and standards that can easily be applied by field staff.

Close to half of the CRS headquarters staff that responded to the final evaluation survey reported that the framework had been effective and noted the following uses:

- Strategic planning processes and assessments
- Preparation of MYAPs (livelihood assessments) and the design of the accompanying assessments and analyses
- Establishing linkages between household livelihoods and levels of vulnerability which helps CRS identify gaps where project interventions could be of use
- After the Tsunami, IHD was used by the livelihood team in the initial assessment of Aceh. IHD components were visible in the resulting strategy.
- PQSD pointed out that with the help of the ICB grant, CRS was able to improve its capacity on M&E, partnership, knowledge management, publication, and cross cutting and multi-sectoral program development.

“The IHD was used to good effect in the EARO publication about SILC (savings-led microfinance) – outlining potential impacts on the assets of participants. This framework is going to be used in an upcoming evaluation.” HQ Staff

One respondent felt that although elaborate assessments had occurred in two of the country programs, neither resulted in significant capacity building. They remarked that by focusing initially on data collection rather than analysis, the effectiveness of the IHD framework is limited.

Half of the responding staff members reported that either they were unsure of the effectiveness and use of the IHD framework in the field, or they had not seen the framework in use by a country program. Several CRS HQ responses indicated that some sectors experience little or no use of IHD. Explanations inferred that staff need additional experience using IHD before it can become an integral part of CPs. Up to this point the training has been available to those who wish to take advantage of it, resulting in an inconsistency in the understanding and application of IHD between staff and partners. Time is needed to gain acceptance and understanding of the framework, before IHD can be completely incorporated into the guidance and TA provided to CPs.

Technical challenges which hinder implementation of the IHD framework in the country programs

The majority of respondents to the headquarters and regional ICB final evaluation questionnaire reported that the primary technical challenge which limited CRS’ ability to implement the IHD framework

“Staff have found it challenging to translate their conceptual understanding of the IHD framework into practical use. Initial orientation trainings have focused on the concepts and “presenting” the framework, without sufficient very concrete, practical discussion on how it can be used. When applied in practice, it is clear that there is still a lot of confusion of “what fits where” in the framework.” HQ Staff

in CPs was that the framework was complicated and difficult to understand. Country programs found the framework interesting and were interested in new approaches, but the

potential of how IHD might be applied to programming needs and response design is not apparent.

“In general I think the IHD is easier for sectors to utilize separately than for a CP to use as a whole or for multiple sectors to use together. Using the IHD to prioritize for MYAPs is still confusing for CPs as they struggle to develop objectives that are not sectoral specific and mesh IHD language with FFP language.” CRS HQ Staff

Comments from respondents suggested that discussion and debate is more effective for building ownership and that it is easier for sectors to use the IHD separately than for a CP to use it as a whole. The wealth of information available through IHD analysis presents another quandary. Staff are unsure how to incorporate relevant elements from this abundance of knowledge into project and strategy design without doing “integrated, all-encompassing projects.” Sectors that are familiar with the livelihood security framework have had a much easier time incorporating

IHD into program and strategy design. A recurring question from those familiar with the livelihood security framework is, “How is IHD different?”

An additional obstruction is the absence of a focal point; no one consistently holds responsibility to clarify IHD methodologies, making it challenging for staff to translate their conceptual understanding of IHD into practical use. To make the ICB grant more effective, HQ staff respondents believe that ICB should focus on a maximum of two to three themes. The current ICB is trying to achieve too many different things that are not realistically possible.

‘Measuring the impact of multi-sectoral programming’ presents another difficulty. CRS has yet to develop a sound methodology to quantitatively measure the impact (if any) of its current multi-sectoral programming. However, it has developed a methodology called “Most Significant Change” to document case studies and capture anecdotal evidences to measure the impact of multi-sectoral programming.

Two more constraints to implementing the IHD in country programs are high staff turnover of those that have received training, and the lack of available time. The process for defining the framework takes considerable time, which is limited for CPs struggling to meet deadlines.

Incorporating IHD perspectives in sectors’ annual PQSD work plans

When HQ and regional staff were asked how ICB supported sectors are incorporating IHD perspectives in their annual PQSD work plans, the responses varied drastically. A representative of PQSD indicated that all sectors he had worked with included IHD in their annual work plans. At the other end of the spectrum were staff members that were completely unaware of any IHD perspectives in the annual work plans. A query was raised about how, specifically, the IHD affects the design and application of M&E.

Three sectors stated that IHD perspectives were incorporated into annual work plans, but none explained how. Another response indicated that although the IHD had been

included into the sector’s work plan, little had been implemented in that sector’s country programs.

Monitoring and implementing the IHD framework in country programs.

Several noted that CRS does not monitor the use of the IHD framework, but rather, encourages and supports its use through trainings, SPP development, evaluation planning, and direct TA. Because CRS is a decentralized structure, monitoring and

“Monitoring and implementation is handled at the CP level, and to a lesser extent by regions due to the decentralized structure of CRS. This means that PQSD’s role is more limited to one of capacity building and training. Often country program staff in agriculture have played a more active role in leading the process of introducing IHD. Some Country Representative have played an important role in terms of their vision for IHD. DRDs PQ and RTAs have also actively advocated for an IHD perspective in country level programming.” HQ Staff

implementation take place at the CP level. When strategies and projects are reviewed at the regional level, CRS gains awareness on how and if, IHD is being used. One CRS staff member reported that monitoring of IHD does not take place in their region and several others did not know how either monitoring or implementation takes place.

SO2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security

Country Program Development or Revision of Tools for linking the IHD to food security and asset protection.

Respondents to the HQ ICB final evaluation survey listed many country programs that had developed or revised tools which enabled them to link the IHD to food security and asset protection: Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Ethiopia, Zambia, Chad, Haiti, Rwanda, Burundi, the Philippines, and the DRC.

CRS/India developed two training tools (“Stormy Weather” on asset protection and “All Things Considered” on the IHD framework) which bring together the main elements of the IHD framework. Additionally, it included “*an IHD-informed situational analysis in the facilitation guide for sector-specific strategy development workshops.*”

In a group interview, CRS HQ staff expressed that many of the tools and methodologies that were developed by CORE group members are relevant to Title II NGOs and FANTA could have been instrumental in sharing them. This could have optimized the use of resources. At the time when FAM was around, it acted as a platform for the title II NGOs to share the tools and methodologies and facilitate processes to standardize them. Since the phasing out of FAM this is an area that title II NGOs have been greatly missing. Now it seems to many of the stakeholders that there are too many tools but no standards to follow.

An interviewed stakeholder related the following -

CRS has developed a huge number of tools but there has been little documentation about the testing and standardization of them. It is critical to have a neutral platform to standardize tools. Currently, every NGO has been developing its own tool and there is no standardization. The usefulness of many of these tools is questionable. Across the organizations there is disconnect between headquarters and field regarding the development and use of tools; communication between HQ and the country programs appears to be a key shortfall. There is very little follow up after a training to provide technical backstopping to ensure that the country office gains the required capacity to use the tools.

Half of the survey respondents did not know if country programs had developed assessments and evaluation tools for linking IHD to food security and asset protection.

Qualitative changes which the IHD framework has brought into the country programs

Half of the responding regional and HQ staff believe that IHD has increased the understanding of the “way things work” and has provided a greater understanding of the variety of opportunities for intervention. IHD has offered a more holistic approach to programming, as well as strategies which have been instrumental in helping country programs develop SPPs.

“Because the IHD framework was introduced at the same time as several other tools (in particular ProPack I for project design), it is difficult to gauge its specific impact on project design quality. Clearly, the IHD framework has been particularly important in helping CPs develop SPPs or large programs in a more systematic manner. It has facilitated a more consistent focus on shocks / risk reduction and on structural constraints to people’s livelihoods options.” Regional Staff

A limitation mentioned was that although awareness is increased, CPs still have difficulty incorporating IHD into their programs.

The other half of the responding staff members did not know what qualitative changes the IHD framework has provided to country programs.

Documentation and sharing of best practices across country programs

CRS staff mentioned an assortment of best practice documentation and sharing methods.

- The Health sector uses a variety of activities, one of which was performing a study of HEARTH through the regions, and then following up by sharing the study with the regions.
- A series of three HIV & Food Security conferences took place in South, East and West Africa. Best practices and lessons learned within those regions were

documented and shared with other regions. Several publications were a result of the African conferences.

- South Asia has developed a regional share-point site to post reports, tools, and training facilitation guides. This region also organized “a process of country-level internal reflections on specific emergency response experiences”. Case study documentation resulted from this gathering and was used to inform senior managers on lessons learned. A follow up workshop is planned for 2007, which will assess progress and include partners.
- When technical committees exist in a region, they are commonly the main venue for sharing program strategies and best practices. Newsletters are also used.
- Experiences are shared at the annual Heads of Program and Program Quality meetings, which staff indicated are very valuable. One respondent noted that seldom does documentation on paper meet needs – other methods of dissemination are necessary.

“Best practices documentation is generally done in the form of short descriptions for reports, short pamphlets/papers, or guides with a compilation of practices. These materials are circulated via email and list serves, mailed to relevant CPs, and posted on a shared internet site. The process is not formal which CRS recognizes and some sectors are better at documentation than others. As CRS moves forward as a learning organization this process will hopefully become more streamlined and lead best practices into better programming.” Regional Staff

With regards to best practices of the IHD framework, two individuals felt there was considerable room for improvement. CRS has addressed the integration of the IHD in guidance for ProPack, SPP, education, SILC and Tsunami response. Still, some staff critiqued the fact that they had received no formal reference document on the purpose and use of IHD, and suggested that this type of information would be very helpful.

A capacity building strategy for the IHD framework

Responses were polarized regarding whether or not a capacity building strategy for the IHD framework exists. Of those that felt a strategy was in place or was developing, several related that it has either not yet been formalized or been implemented.

Specific initiatives to link development to relief activities

Several specific instances of linking development to relief activities were stated by respondents.

- The IHD Tsunami publication was CRS’ first effort at this type of association. Several PQSD staff followed up and visited the affected countries as they transitioned from the immediate relief assistance to more of a reconstruction focus.” A major constraint to CRS Tsunami aid in Aceh was staffing. It was decided that more emphasis be given to a rehabilitation phase.

- Soon after the Tsunami, a PQ workshop was held in Baltimore with a primary focus on risk reduction. The 2006 PQ workshop also addressed this issue. The annual ERT/Emergency Focal Points meetings have included risk reduction and linking relief and development as key topics. South Asia incorporates risk reduction/ mitigation and disaster preparedness in their regional strategy. Training workshops have been organized, and community based disaster preparedness is a key component of the CRS/India's disaster management.
- Joint DRR workshops were held in EARO & SARO, June 2007. *"In EARO, CRS/Kenya's response to the drought of 2004/5 successfully used vouchers to encourage use of the market (rather than a parallel relief delivery system) to move food into the food-shortage area both in the short term and the recovery phase."*
- The Haiti MYAP, which was recently approved, plans to link development to relief in FY 07-11.

One limitation noted was that the lack of a leader caused inconsistency in development and relief work. Progress in this area may be in sight; a staff member was recently hired to take on this responsibility.

Monitoring Evaluation and Reporting (MER)

Representatives for M & E related the following in an interview:

There were a number of M&E trainings provided to country programs around the world. To develop its M&E capacity, CRS also created Regional M&E Advisor positions. An M&E resource team has been developed who can go to a specific country and provide technical backstopping support.

There were a number of initiatives taken to strengthen the capacity of staff to design and implement monitoring system and now CRS wants to focus on developing staff capacity on evaluation.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation is another area where CRS has made good progress through providing training to staff and helping them to develop methodologies. The country programs have also identified organizations that have capacity on participatory impact assessments.

MER of Training/ Technical Assistance /the IHD Framework

Opinions are conflicted about whether or not the existing MER system provides sufficient knowledge on where, when, and in what form training and technical assistance are provided, and where the IHD framework is being used competently. Some staff felt that monitoring is lacking at a central level. Many responding staff had absolutely no opinion or knowledge of these topics; several felt this is not critical information.

*“What matters ultimately is the quality of capacity building / TA provided, not its quantity, while agency wide MER would by definition require rolling up numbers.
My experience is that even regional-level training is not that effective and that the best capacity building is country level training supported by lots of on-the-job, practical TA support. Depending on in-country capacity, country staff (e.g. HoPs) can provide training, mentoring and other TA support to their staff through “regular” staff meetings, one-on-one coaching and other means of learning that may not be captured in such MER systems” Regional Staff*

Benefits resulting from implementation of the IHD Framework

Regional staff feel that most, if not all, countries continue to need assistance, especially the newer programs. Two respondents cited benefits experienced by Title II country programs as a result of the implementation of the IHD framework.

- IHD has enhanced the ability of CRS/India staff to “develop a more comprehensive understanding of program contexts”. IHD has augmented this CP’s discussions about governance and the issue of rights and responsibilities. Utilizing information gained through the Structures and Processes box was deemed to be particularly helpful.
- One CP experienced “a significant shift in context”.

SO3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered

Title II Collaborations and Learning Alliances

CRS has been actively participating in a wide variety of Collaborations and Learning Alliances. Examples follow:

- Since FY2005 “*the CRS-CIAT agro-enterprise learning alliance has been successful at helping shift the focus from production to markets*”.
- A collaborative alliance with the American Red Cross exists, which produces “field friendly M&E modules on many health topics.
- CRS worked with FANTA in developing indicators for USAID/FFP’s Performance Management Plan and provided input to the development of FANTA’s Household Food Insecurity Assessment Scale. CRS helped FANTA piloting LQAS in Ethiopia and Haiti. It participates in PMP FFP working group where it plays an active contributory role. This working group developed user-friendly methodologies of measuring household food insecurity and produced a generic questionnaire/tool.

- CRS participated in different forums with Project Concern Intl. on HIV/AIDS programming and Alliance for Food Aid, and has helped in the preparation of the Skills-Building Sessions application form.
- CRS participated in the learning alliance forum to share methodologies and approaches in the field and exchange experiences.
- CRS hosted annual INGO Evaluators' Roundtable at their headquarters in 2004 in Baltimore. The enhanced collaboration on the part of CRS has included the active participation of its staff in Evaluation Interest Group.
- Being a member of CORE network CRS participated in nutrition working group and integrated management of childhood illness working group. The working group provided as opportunity for organizations to identify common interests, develop manuals and trainings integrating food security, and providing training to food security staff. CRS was involved in identifying common indicators across different projects and took the lead on piloting indicators with the whole group.
- CRS has been involved in the EIG and the joint 2005 panel at the AEA/CES.
- CRS worked with AED in developing a common understanding of how to achieve scale in AED's hygiene programs, how to use systems thinking to garner the partnerships and leverage points necessary for multiple stakeholders to work together for a common goal. Together with CRS and other organizations AED identified few locations where all of the stakeholders will practice some of the principles agreed to achieve scale.
- CIAT helped CRS to improve its capacity on market analysis through training that focuses on market analysis, concepts of enterprise development, and integrate business principles into CRS' ongoing development work. This helped CRS to shift its focus from a production and services driven approach to a market based approach that would facilitate local service provision. CIAT's interest was to test methodologies through CRS and adapt them into the African context.
- *“CRS has worked with CARE on issues related to the uses of food aid and local food purchase for which documents should be produced by CARE at the end of FY08. With ARC, CRS has produced a number of M&E documents and manuals.”* Furthermore, CRS' collaboration with the American Red Cross began with the start up of the ICB grant.

Staff declared that *“a number of other collaborations with local research organizations and specialized institutions have also been developed – but not under the formal Learning Alliance mechanism of the ICB grant”*

Documentation and Dissemination of Food Security Knowledge to Partners

HQ and regional staff have minimal awareness of how CRS is documenting and disseminating its knowledge of food security to its collaborating partners.

“Although, it was hoped that CRS would develop a model for use of food that others could use as well, CRS has not been able to put the info together in a way that they could share it with others. However it is a common problem with many PVOs. CRS could have done better in identifying indicators to measure the implementation of the IHD framework.” External Interview

One staff member felt that systematic methods of evaluation and the publication of livelihood assessment results has led to improved documentation of changes. Indonesia was mentioned as a good example. Indonesia’s partner is focused on food security and was able to bring health and nutrition components of Title II into their portfolio.

Additionally, few HQ and regional staff have knowledge of changes since the inception of the ICB to CRS’ strategies of ensuring that food aid interventions do no harm.

One staff member felt that livelihood assessments helped CRS establish baselines, which led to a better understanding of *“local production systems, marketing systems, periods of food insecurity, household strategies and the role of food aid in meeting these gaps.”*

Resolution of key shortcomings

Since the inception of the ICB, several changes were cited by HQ staff that have attempted to resolve shortcomings identified in recent evaluations of Title II programs.

- Lessons learned through Kenya’s USAID funded Child Survival Project led to the alteration of practices for a centrally managed Child Survival project. The phase out plan for the CS project was developed under the Kenya Title II project, and was praised by the evaluator as the best seen in 25 years.
- Following CRS/Rwanda’s Mid-term DAP evaluation, the entire program was re-planned. The final evaluation noted that the changes had improved the program’s implementation and had led to greater impact.
- Governance challenges have become a key issue in the Haiti education component.
- One sector reported that M&E had been a consistent problem, and that improvements are underway in this area – the FANTA M&E workshop was noted as an example.

Assessments of Graduated Program Areas

Very few HQ or regional staff are aware of any CRS assessments conducted in “graduated” Title II program areas which attempted to identify which methods or activities have had a lasting, positive impact or, conversely, have had negative effects.

CRS/Ethiopia was an exception and provided numerous examples of assessment findings. In June/July of 2004 an “ex-post” evaluation was conducted which surveyed communities that had graduated from their DAP. One example from the many findings provided follows:

“73% of the Households interviewed reported their capacity to resist shocks is improved. 33% of the total scheme beneficiaries who were practicing irrigation effectively in the Lege Oda Mirga Irrigation System reported that the 2003 drought did not have an effect on their livelihood. Households were generating Birr 70-110/week from sale of papaya only. They proudly reported that their annual food requirement was fulfilled, and even they had savings during the drought season.”

Documentation and Application of Lessons Learned

Respondents were emphatic and detailed when asked about CRS’ documentation and application of lessons learned from prior assessments or program evaluations to the current programs. Examples included:

- Kenya’s Mother to Mother support groups and its C-IMCI program are two examples of child health interventions which have scaled up, using lessons learned from prior CRS Title II activities. C-IMCI materials have been adopted by Kenya as national standards, and protocols of Mother to Mother support Groups are being studied by UNICEF and MOH to intensify this intervention throughout the country.
- Experiences related to the Tsunami and the Pakistan earthquake were acknowledged as primary resources for lessons learned in emergency response projects. *“The CRS/India and Pakistan OFDA Drought Mitigation Project includes an important best practice/lessons learned section.”*
- *“In the education sector, we drew on CP experience with food aid phase over and phase out strategies to create a ‘next phase planning tool’ to help country programs manage the transition away from USG-supported school feeding.”*
- Lessons learned from the Ethiopia evaluation encouraged CRS to place emphasis on developing community water management structures which promote community involvement from the inception of water planning activities. A Health RTA – one of the original authors of PHAST participatory methodology - has been hired in EARO to fortify this strategy.

- Information on seed security has been documented through Seed Briefs publications. *“In addition to this documentation, CRS has built on its success and experience with Seed Vouchers & Fairs to use vouchers in different environments -- as an intermediate approach to cash transfer. Many of these have been funded by other (non-Title II) donors, though in the upcoming Uganda MYAP we are considering incorporating voucher-based access to labor.”*
- Training offered in a behavioral change workshop in Sierra Leone was incorporated by communities *“struggling with Exclusive Breastfeeding”*. The communities created “baby friendly farms” where mothers can safely leave their baby with a caregiver while they work nearby, but are readily available for on demand breastfeeding.
- Many pilot projects which have taken place in CRS/Afghanistan have incorporated the lessons learned into subsequent projects. One respondent felt that lessons learned had been documented in both Uganda and Rwanda but did not know the details.
- ConceptNote, a regional template, contains a “Best Practice analysis” section, which is a key element during regional review.

External collaborators’ recommendations for increased CRS contribution to the wider NGO community’s ability to reduce food insecurity

- More support and interaction is needed between the senior management to improve the collaborative efforts which can go beyond M&E.
- CRS has a lot to offer, especially by establishing best practices. It should continue to look for ways to share the tools, guidelines, methodologies (for example IHD framework) to a wider community.
- Increased dissemination of methodologies and experiences to the field staff.
- Increased participation in the Millennium Water Alliance.

Benefits of CRS’ participation in collaborative efforts

Representatives from the American Red Cross, IRC, FANTA, Millennium Water Alliance, Project Concern International, CIAT, CARE, Atlas Copco Drilling Systems, Food for the Hungry, World Vision, Save the Children Fund, AED, FewsNet, Mercy Corps were questioned about the perceived benefits their organizations had derived as a result of CRS’ participation. Examples follow:

- Collaboration with CRS benefited ARC in developing its M&E modules.

- CRS collaboration with FANTA has benefited the broader community of Title II implementing agencies. Involvement of CRS as a partner PVO of FANTA in identifying indicators and tools made them usable and realistic for implementing partners. CRS HQ staff and field staff actively participated in developing and testing HHF insecurity scale that measures household access to food.
- CRS' partnership with CIAT has been a great benefit to its research staff. They have been able to test results on a much larger scale.
- CRS made significant contributions to mutual learning. This includes, among other things, the ProPack, the presentation of CRS' (and joint CRS-ARC) M&E strengthening strategies at a pre-Forum workshop at the American Evaluation Association conference in 2005.
- CRS collaborated with Atlas Copco Drilling Systems to provide training jointly in the field on managing water drilling equipments supplied by ACDS.
- ACDS has greatly benefited through working with CRS to get a better idea about the needs of the communities and the local context.
- CRS staff at different level provided technical support, feedback and provided valuable comment to improve the training materials that were developed by AED.
- The partnership between CIAT and CRS has led to new research based initiatives, between CIAT and CRS in evaluating key factors that drive market based collective activities and also finding better ways of integrating methods for group formation, with savings and loans schemes, market analysis and business development.

V. Key Questions, Conclusions and Recommendations

(1) How was the grant used in relation to its original intent under the RFA?

CRS has completed most of the work proposed under each of the three Strategic Objectives of the ICB grant. A few of the significant achievements of the grant are presented below.

- Development of IHD framework and use it as a programming cornerstone,
- Many country level training and workshops on the use of IHD framework
- Integrating HIV/AIDS prevention strategies into Food Security programming,
- Integrating water and sanitation interventions in title II programs,
- Implementation of “*Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response Strategic Plan*”,
- Completing project design guidelines (*ProPack-I*) and developing monitoring and evaluation guidelines (*ProPack-II*), and
- Development of tools to link emergency and development programs

It has been maintaining institutional collaborations with a number of organizations including CARE, FANTA and American Red Cross and played a leadership role to support FAM until it was dissolved in late 2004.

However, developing capacity of field staff to use the tools and frameworks remains an issue. Many field offices commented that the introduction and exposure to the framework took place, but a shortfall exists in formal training sessions on application and processes.

(2) How have ICB activities strengthened the capacity of the organization to implement effective Title II and/or food security programs?

In the last three years, CRS has undertaken a series of steps to strengthen its capacity to implement effective Title II programs. Capacity building plans have been developed which have been annually updated. Interviews with staff working for Title II programs suggest that ICB activities contributed to strengthen staff capacity to implement food security programs in the field. Training on risk reduction and emergency preparedness programming helped country programs in developing context specific early warning systems. More than half of the country programs reported systematically integrating HIV prevention messages into Title II programs because of the global meetings organized by CRS, approximately 40 percent of the programs reported developing and implementing “exit strategies”. CRS developed regional WatSan strategies and organized workshops (in two countries). According to a 2005 CRS report, approximately 29 percent of the countries that implement WatSan activities involving drinking water interventions (89 percent of all CRS title II programs) attributed support from ICB assistance. The ICB helped to develop tools for its peace-building component and has now been providing training to Technical Advisors to use structural analysis and peace-building tools. The ICB also allowed CRS to explore the linkage between nutrition and HIV/AIDS and better understand the linkages to build this into its programming. A majority of the staff interviewed also confirmed that changes have been made to program designs as a result

of the ICB grant funding. Specific changes noted by participants included greater adoption of Sphere standards, increasing focus on promoting resilience among program beneficiaries, and improved integration of emergency and development interventions.

However while the IHD framework has been developed to enhance staff capacity to critically analyze the root causes of food insecurity, a large number of field staff interviewed reported that they do not know how to use the IHD framework. Only 10 percent of country programs reported using the IHD framework to design food programming for HIV/AIDS affected people.

Developing capacity of partner organizations is another area where more attention is needed. Despite the fact that CRS developed assessment methodologies for capacity needs, guidelines to conduct self-assessments, user friendly M&E modules and indicator performance tracking tables, a large number of activities planned to strengthen capacity of local partner organizations are yet to be completed. Moreover, some of the tools that were developed to help partners are yet to be communicated to the organizations.

(3) What are the key challenges affecting progress in implementation and management of the ICB grant?

CRS faced a number of challenges in the life of the ICB Grant that are critical to the success of the project. A list of the key challenges is presented below.

- One of the challenges to institutionalize the IHD framework was the absence of a focal point until recently. No one in CRS consistently holds the responsibility to clarify the methodologies and tools outlined in the framework.
- Comprehension of the IHD framework by field staff remains a challenge. The framework has been found to be complicated and difficult to understand by the country program staff. Capacity building on the IHD framework has been hindered by high staff turnover and the lack of time to do the training.
- CRS has yet to develop a sound methodology to quantitatively measure the impact (if any) of its current multi-sectoral programming.
- Since the phasing out of FAM, there is no common platform to share the tools with other NGOs. As a result many Title II NGOs are developing tools with varying standards.
- A great number of tools and guidelines were developed by CRS but the country program staff do not have the technical capacity to use them. Providing adequate technical support to the field remains a challenge.
- Although education is integrated into the IHD framework, the challenge is to develop tools and standards that can easily be applied by field staff.

- Communication of the messages between the HQ and the country programs remains a challenge. There is very little follow up after a training to provide technical backstopping to ensure that the country office has gained the required capacity to use the tools.
- Although progress has been made in documenting CRS' success in integrating HIV/AIDS and WatSan interventions into Title II programs, the best practices are yet to be shared with all country programs.

(4) What are recommendations that can be made relative to incorporating lessons learned from successes and failures, identifying innovations and best practices, and facilitating inter-organizational learning, partnership and capacity-building in Title II programs?

The following recommendations highlight areas that will need focus over the remainder of the grant to achieve the Strategic Objectives and overall goal of the grant.

- 1. Institutionalizing the IHD framework-**In the last year of the grant, more effort should be given to developing a strategy to systematically role out the framework in the various country offices that are implementing Title II programs. Although this issue was highlighted in the mid-term evaluation, more work still needs to be done. This will involve developing standardized training tools and guidelines that can be used to train country office staff. The first step may involve training of trainers to carry out the work. These trainers can then hold more structured learning events to facilitate Title II program adoption of new approaches. The second task will be to complete the guidelines that are currently under development. The third task will be to establish country-level focal points capable of translating conceptual understanding of the IHD into alternatives for its practical use.
- 2. Technical support to the field in the application of newly developed tools-**Under the ICB, a number of tools have been developed under each SO of the grant. Many country office staff indicated that they did not have the technical capacity to implement many of these tools. A strategy needs to be developed in the last year of the grant to provide technical support on the various tools created under each SO. This need was highlighted in the mid-term evaluation and still appears to be an issue for many staff in the field.
- 3. Measuring impact of multi-sector programming-**Although the IHD emphasizes the importance of multi-sector programming, there is still a great deal of work that needs to be done on measuring impact of such programs. Efforts should be made to set up pilot activities to demonstrate how such multi-sector impacts could be measured.
- 4. More emphasis should be given to emergency assessments and linking relief and development-**Many country programs felt that more training was needed in

emergency assessments and how to link emergency programming with development activities.

- 5. Capacity building follow up-**In countries where capacity building training on the IHD framework or tools has taken place, there is little follow up to determine whether capacity to use the framework and tools has been established. In addition, the documentation of tool application in some sectors has not been adequately shared to facilitate cross country learning. ICB resources should be used to ensure that follow up activities are built into technical support training activities and that documentation facilitates learning.
- 6. Continue to collaborate with other INGOs and USAID-**Although CRS has participated in a number of forums to share its IHD framework and tools with other NGOs, the opportunities to share these tools have been limited since the phasing out of FAM. As a result, many of the NGOs are creating similar tools that may not be following the same standards. CRS should seek more opportunities to share its tools with other organizations.
- 7. Continue to develop capacity of local partners-**Although efforts have taken place to strengthen local partners through training , sharing tools and guidelines, many of the follow on activities have not been implemented. More work needs to focus on partner strengthening in the last year of the grant.

Annex I: Scope of Work



Scope of Work for ICB Grant Final Evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION⁴

Objective of the Final Evaluation

The final evaluation aims to appraise the outcomes and impacts of CRS' capacity-building activities under the Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Grant. In the context of CRS' ICB, impact refers in the first instance to the enhanced capacity of CRS staff – at HQ and especially in the field – to design and manage Title II FS programming and secondly at whether or not the Strategic Objectives (SOs) have been achieved. The evaluation will thus attempt to assess the positive impact resulting from ICB-funded inputs, outputs, and enhanced staff capacity.

The approach will emphasize external, more objective sources of information, in addition to CRS-internal ones. Conclusions drawn from evaluation findings will not focus on mid-course improvements or adjustments, but rather on results achieved, explanation of impacts, and lessons learned for future Title II programming and supporting institutional structures.

Description of the Institutional Capacity Building Grant

As of October 1 2003, a cooperative agreement was made between Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and the US Agency for International Development's (USAID) Food for Peace (FFP) Office for an Institutional Capacity Building award to CRS, to end on September 30, 2008. USAID awarded CRS \$2,800,000, which CRS matched with \$915,005 for a total of \$3,715,005 for five years.

CRS has a long and successful history of managing Title II programs with local partners. The ICB goal is to reduce food insecurity and consists of three strategic objectives (SOs) and eight intermediate results (IRs) focusing on risk management and asset strengthening strategies for individuals, households, and communities⁵.

ICB Objectives and Target

⁴ The *Title II Evaluation Scopes of Work* technical note was used as a reference document when drafting this Scope of Work. Bonnard, P. *Title II Evaluation Scope of Work*, Technical Note No. 2. FANTA. April 2002.

⁵ Please see Annex 1, the ICB Grant Results Framework.

The ICB goal to reduce food insecurity will be accomplished through three strategic objectives (SOs) and eight intermediate results (IRs) focusing on risk management and asset strengthening strategies for individuals, households, and communities⁶. The SOs and IRs are:

- SO1 Strategies for individuals, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted
 - IR1.1 Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors
 - IR1.2 Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized
- SO2 Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security
 - IR2.1 The impact of HIV/AIDS is mitigated
 - IR2.2 Water insecurity is reduced
- SO3 Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered
 - IR3.1 Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased
 - IR3.2 PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions
- Cross-cutting IRs to strengthen design and implementation of Title II programs
 - IR-A Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased
 - IR-B Capacity of CRS' and local-partners staff to identify, measure, and document field impact is increased

The SOs and IRs address the Request for Application's (RFA) priority to strengthen Private Volunteer Organizations' (PVO) core technical competencies under the 2006-2010 Food For Peace (FFP) strategic framework, plus local partners' management abilities. CRS' project supports technical excellence, innovation and best practices whether for immediately applying lessons learned in combating food insecurity, for adding to the evidence base for improvements and innovations, or for influencing US Government and multilateral policy-makers.

Coverage of the ICB Grant

During the course of the ICB Grant CRS has implemented Title II Programs (including DAPs, MYAPs, and SYAPs) in the following countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia (West Timor), Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Malawi, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. While the portfolio of Title II country programs will be changing in the next few years, throughout the course of the ICB Grant only one program has phased out completely at this time, Kenya. Some of these programs have been implemented in collaboration with other PVOs and all of them have relied on substantial collaboration with local partners. Regional and HQ support is provided to country programs to support such large and complex programs.

⁶ Please see Annex 2, the Indicator Performance Tracking Table.

Description of Key Partners

Dynamic and wide-ranging collaborations are part of the plan: among Title II Cooperating Sponsors (CS), via Communities of Practice between CRS and its sister PVOs; with Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) and USAID through multiple information exchanges and through expert consultations (e.g., on standard indicators and evaluation methods); and between CRS and university or international research centers, based on well-structured, multi-year Learning Alliances that combine action research in relief and development programs with academic rigor in documenting and publicizing results.

Implementation History

The Midterm Review noted several accomplishments during the first half of the ICB grant period. CRS has developed the Integral Human Development (IHD) framework and built Title II country program capacity to use it. As a result of the IHD framework's utility, CRS leadership has established it as the agency's approach to development and relief and it is being integrated into many assessments and program and strategy design processes.

CRS has used the ICB grant strategically to integrate food security and HIV and AIDS programming. CRS' innovative approaches and related operations research have not only helped improve the effectiveness of CRS' approaches, but have also influenced the practices of others intervening in this area. Similarly, CRS has used the ICB grant to increase and improve the effectiveness of its water and sanitation programming. Since food security depends on water security, this investment has been critical.

Through the ICB grant, CRS has built community capacity to influence factors that affect food security. Given that increased citizen participation in public decision making contributes to better governance, which contributes to improved food security, this investment promises to have a long-term positive impact. CRS has also maintained strong relationships with other INGOs, USAID and others involved in promoting food security. Through these relationships, CRS has enhanced joint learning and contributed to as well as benefited from improved effectiveness in influencing food security strategies and implementing food security programming.

Finally, CRS is building staff, partner and community capacity to manage, implement and measure the impact of food security programs. During the first half of the ICB grant period, CRS has laid a foundation and developed helpful tools that are proving their utility in the field.

During the second half of the ICB grant period, CRS is well positioned to build on its successes to date. With new staff in place and tools and frameworks developed, CRS can focus on encouraging the adoption of the new approaches. Primarily, improved knowledge management will lead to greater impact from its ICB grant activities.

Develop and disseminate training materials and tools.

CRS field staff and other INGOs consistently requested that CRS/PQSD provide more training materials and field-friendly tools to help facilitate the adoption of the new approaches it is developing via the ICB grant.

Increase integration of grant-funded activities.

CRS is already using the ICB grant to promote a holistic approach to food security programming. Developmental relief and risk reduction are already well established in CRS. Water and sanitation activities are being integrated into health and agriculture programs, and HIV and AIDS interventions are incorporating nutrition. CRS will further enhance its effectiveness in integrating its programming approaches by focusing more attention on integrating the following areas:

Increase learning from innovative approaches.

With funding from the ICB grant, CRS is developing and testing a number of innovative approaches. During the second half of the grant period, CRS will invest more resources in learning from its early experiences with those approaches and sharing that learning systematically within the agency and with others promoting food security. Particularly, CRS will continue its learning and sharing to:

2. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

Key Team Members⁷

The team will consist of one senior-level consultant contracted as the External Evaluator and three CRS staff. The Evaluation Team will be lead by the External Evaluator – the Evaluation Team Leader – who will be responsible for the deliverables of the evaluation. The CRS Senior Technical Advisor (STA) for M&E will serve as the Evaluation Advisor and work closely with the External Evaluator on the methodology for the evaluation and content of the report. The ICB Grant Manager will serve as the Evaluation Logistician and provide logistic support for the consultant and make any necessary documentation available. The Deputy Director for the Program Quality Support Department (PQSD) will serve as Evaluation Manager overseeing a review of the agreed final version of the SOW, and approving the final product.

The Evaluation Team Leader should be a senior evaluator with an extensive background in Title II programming and the broader Title II community. The Consultant should possess technical knowledge of the activities in sectors where CRS has activities, knowledge of CRS, and appropriate data collection, analysis and report writing skills.

Key Working Relationships

Evaluation Manager: Judson Flanagan, Deputy Director for PQSD

Evaluation Advisor: Guy Sharrock, STA for M&E

⁷ Please see Annex 3, the Evaluation Team Scope of Work. This document will be elaborated and finalized when the Evaluation Team Leader is identified.

Evaluation Logistician: Kathryn Lockwood, ICB Grant Manager/TA for Food Security

3. EVALUATION CONTENT

The evaluation will focus on the use and impacts of the publications/documentation, training, and TA produced and/or delivered by HQ and regional staff to CPs. The midterm evaluation documented the quantity and high quality of such products and services already completed across the first 2.5 years of the ICB. However, it remains to be seen to what degree they have since been increased, differentially delivered, and resulted in detectable improvements in program quality -- and if effective in the latter regard, may also now have been more fully institutionalized.

The Evaluation Team Leader will determine the key questions to be addressed in the final evaluation based on the Results Framework Goal, SOs, and IRs. Topics to be addressed include the following:

- Determine the achievement of grant targets;
- Determine the appropriateness of the activities carried-out with respect to the problem analysis in the ICB and the current institutional and policy context of CRS and CRS' Title II programs;
- Assess CRS' administrative and financial management of the ICB grant, staff resources allocated to the grant, PQSD staff capacity built through the grant;
- Identify successes and challenges in meeting grant targets;
- Assess the impact of the grant on the institutional strength of the PQSD unit and sector teams supported through the grant;
- Evaluate the processes/effects that are in place now that link the ICB grant with MYAPs, TAPs and EOPs;
- Identify the institutional practices CRS has developed through the ICB grant (e.g., the IHD framework) and what their impact has been;
- Identify the better practices CRS has developed through the ICB grant with other agencies and what their impact has been (including those established through Learning Alliances);
- Identify how CRS has documented and shared practices and what their impact has been;
- Identify the specific changes in CRS' institutional strength that can be attributed to the ICB grant;
- Assess the results of CRS' collaboration with FANTA and other food security agencies or forums;
- Assess how CRS' work on the ICB grant has affected FFP's global leadership; and
- Recommend how in the future CRS might strengthen its ability to address causes of food security.

Proposed Evaluation Methodology

CRS recognizes good preparation as an essential first step to conducting an evaluation. As noted in the ICB Grant-funded document, *Preparing for the Evaluation: Guidelines and Tools for Pre-Evaluation Planning*⁸, CRS must identify the Evaluation Team Leader and finalize roles, responsibilities, and the timeline with him/her in order to minimize confusion.

Second is document review, including at a minimum: the ICB proposal, DIPs and annual reports, baselines, and the midterm evaluation; basic PQSD descriptive documents and all PQSD strategic-planning documents; any relevant country program (CP) documentation; and the final evaluations of the ISG I and II and ISA grants to CRS. The Evaluation Team Leader will work closely with CRS staff to identify the complete set of documentation that will be required for the initial literature review. CRS will establish appropriate mechanisms (e.g., Sharepoint) for sharing the data requested by the Team Leader.

Third, the evaluator will interview program-quality personnel funded out of HQ (STAs and TAs) and from as many regions as possible (Deputy Regional Directors for Program Quality or DRDs-PQ, and Regional Technical Advisors or RTAs). Interviews with selected HQ managers will also take place and, as available, Regional Directors and DRDs for Management Quality (DRDs-MQ).

Fourth, a survey will be employed with Title II Country Programs. This will be developed by the Team Leader with input from the Evaluation Advisor. The tool will evaluate major elements of program-quality improvements as seen by those actually managing and overseeing the implementation of Title II programs.

Fifth and finally, the evaluator will conduct group or individual interviews with key staff from collaborating agencies such as CARE, American Red Cross, and FANta, to name a few, in order to critically appraise CRS' active participation in and contributions to food security-related programming skills.

These initial proposals for the final evaluation methodology will be discussed and finalized once the Team Leader has been appointed, and as part of the preparatory work in FY07.

Proposed Evaluation Steps

Step 1: Identify Evaluation Team Leader (June or July)

Step 2: Document Review and Survey Development (August or September)

The evaluation will begin in HQ and consist of meetings, document review, HQ interviews, preliminary data collection, and development of the survey across approximately two weeks. The survey will be sent out to CPs for completion after it is complete.

⁸ McMillan D., A. Willard. *Preparing for the Evaluations: Guidelines and Tools for Pre-Evaluation Planning. Version 1.0.* Catholic Relief Services and American Red Cross.

Step 3: Data Collection and Interviews (October 1—30)

The Team Leader will interview the key respondents noted above.

Step 4: Data Analysis (November 1—15)

In this step, the Indicator Performance Tracking Table or IPTT will be examined in order to assess achievement of ICB targets as these were re-characterized according to midterm evaluation recommendations. The IPTT is the core of FFP-required M&E.

Also, all questionnaire and interview data will be analyzed at this time. Note that the questionnaire will be sent out about one month prior giving CPs time to respond. It is essential to receive responses from all CRS Title II countries whose activities have been influenced by ICB assistance.

Step 5: Report Writing (November 16—30)

The Team Leader will write the report in MSWord, assemble and attach the various supporting annexes, and then submit the document for CRS to circulate in Step 4.

Step 6: Stakeholder Review (December 1—15)

By the end of this step, all stakeholder groups will have had the chance to review the report and to submit comments and suggestions for validation or revision to the Team Leader.

Step 7: Report Finalization (December 16—20)

The Team Leader will respond to comments and finalize the evaluation report, submitting it in production-ready electronic form to CRS.

Step 8: Report Dissemination (December 21—January 31)

CRS will be responsible for all copying and distribution of the report to USAID and stakeholders. The Team Leader will present the major findings of the evaluation to CRS in a participatory meeting setting.

Deliverables

The Team Leader will produce an Inception Report at the end of the preparatory period in FY07. This will include a detailed statement of the specific questions the evaluation is seeking to address, a proposed initial “Table of Contents” for the final report, a clear statement of the methodology, and the agreed schedule and milestones that will be followed to ensure a successful completion of the evaluation. The evaluator will produce a draft of the final evaluation report by December 1, 2007, which will be reviewed by all relevant stakeholders within two weeks. The final report will incorporate or respond to all stakeholder commentary and shall be submitted electronically to CRS by December 31, 2007. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this evaluation will be those of the external evaluator.

A proposed outline for the report, to be finalized by the Evaluation Team Leader, is as follows:

Title Page
Acronyms
Executive Summary

- I. Background to the Final Evaluation
- II. ICB Activities and Outputs since the Midterm
(include discussion of management and finances)
- III. Program-Quality Impacts
(include CRS action on midterm recommendations here)
- IV. Impacts of Inter-organizational Collaboration
(with other organizations and FFP)
- V. New or Innovative Approaches
- VI. Lessons Learned

Annexes:

1. Evaluation Scope of Work
3. Persons Interviewed
4. Documents Reviewed
5. Updated IPTT
6. Questionnaire for CPs
7. Complete catalogue of all ICB products

Timeframe

The finalization of the methodology and background research will take place in the fourth quarter of FY07 and the rest of the evaluation will take place in the first quarter of FY08. The final evaluation report must be submitted by December 31, 2007.

Budget

A budget of \$30,000 has been allocated for the evaluation. The amount of \$10,000 has been set aside for preparatory work in FY07 and \$20,000 is FY08 to complete the evaluation.

4. ANNEXES

1. Results Framework
2. Indicator Performance Tracking Table
3. Evaluation Team Scope of Work

Annex II: Results Summary Matrices

CRS ICB Final Evaluation Results Matrix

FY 2004 – FY 2006	What was planned for FY2004 - FY 2006	What was done and not done in FYs 2004-2006
SO 1: Strategies for individual, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted.		
IR.1.1. Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors.		
Output 1.1 1: A holistic framework for integral human development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept paper on an IHD framework • Develop IHD framework tools and training modules • Continually refine the IHD and its applications • Support functional literacy programs for women • Develop strategies to reach out-of-school children and youth which enable them to grasp off-farm income opportunities. • Work with microfinance programs among the rural poor and marginalized • Health advisors will reorient current strategies to better incorporate nutrition 	<p>2004 – Concept paper IHD framework developed</p> <p>2004- 3 IHD Training modules developed</p> <p>2004- Propack manual finalized</p> <p>2005 – IHD framework tools developed: IHD User’s guide, Participatory Livelihoods Assessment, and Health Tool Box</p> <p>2005- Four ICB supported program sectors incorporate IHD perspectives in annual work plans: Agriculture, Education, Health, and HIV/AIDS.</p> <p>2005 – IHD framework paper revised based on field work</p> <p>2006- IHD framework tools developed focusing on education, food security, literacy, and Integrating HIV and Agriculture Programming.</p> <p>2006- Six ICB supported program sectors incorporate IHD perspectives in annual work plans: Agriculture/Environment, Education, Health, HIV/AIDS, Peacebuilding, and Water/Sanitation</p>
Output 1.1.2: Capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire a headquarters-based water security advisor. • Develop comprehensive training plan for institutionalizing the IHD • Train staff members in headquarters and field on the use of the IHD framework. • Annually updated capacity building strategy for the IHD framework • Continual IHD-specific workshops/learning events 	<p>2005- Capacity Building Strategy for CRS and Partner staff developed</p> <p>2004-05- Targets exceeded in # of instances of TA using IHD framework and for IHD specific workshops/learning events.</p> <p>2004-05 – Number of trainees in workshops exceeded by significant margin</p> <p>2004-06 - IHD Training in 6 of 8 CRS regions. Latin America/Caribbean and Europe/ Middle East have not received training.</p> <p>2006- Capacity building strategy for IHD framework reviewed and updated</p> <p>2006 –Targets for IHD TA met. Targets for IHD workshops surpassed.</p> <p>2006- Following recommendations, number of participants per workshop is reduced. Targets for # trainees are surpassed.</p>

IR.1.2. Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized		
<p>Output 1.2.1: Field tools for addressing risk reduction and emergency preparedness in a holistic manner</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop tools to help staff assess, prepare for, and respond to risks and shocks • Build on Seed Fair System emergency recovery strategy to design tools for assessments and responses in agricultural emergencies • Comprehensive study of lessons learned in emergency relief food- assisted activities 	<p>2004 -<i>Dry Spells</i> – risk management document on drought developed. 2004 - Lit. review of risk reduction programming presented at Emergency Corps meeting. 2005 - Tsunami Response paper, based on IHD framework, designed and disseminated 2005 – EARO planning workshop on Food Aid and HIV/AIDS 2005- Development of 7-step drought framework incorporating risk and vulnerability assessments from the IHD 2006 – Pakistan Earthquake Emergency Response Strategic plan developed. 2006 – CRS target for field tools not met. 2006 –Case studies of lessons learned in Pakistan, Niger, and Tsunami response compiled.</p>
<p>Output 1.2.2: Capacity building to increase and improve risk reduction strategies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually updated capacity-building plan • Workshops/learning events to promote incorporation of field risk-reduction into regular programming 	<p>2004- <i>Learning Conversations</i> piloted – collaboration of CRS and Freedom from Hunger. Used throughout S.Asia 2004 – Relief and development presentations in Kenya. Facilitated through use of IHD framework. 2004 Hands-on country specific emergency response training in Kenya 2005 – Workshop based on <i>Dry Spells</i> document takes place in S.Asia. 2005- South Asia Resilient Village planning strategy developed 2005-Sphere/DPR training for Caritas IMBISA region 2005-Shelter strategy development workshops in West Darfur, Indonesia, and India/Sri Lanka 2005- TA use of risk-reduction framework 33% of target due to Tsunami impact on ERT staff 2005- target # of trainees short by 47% due to staff support of Tsunami relief efforts. 2006 – <i>Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response Strategic Plan</i> (EPPR) revised. 2006- Emergency Focal Points (EFP) established in each world region. 2006- Pakistan PEER planning sessions and strategic lessons learned. 2006 – InterAgency Sphere training in Nairobi 2006 – Target for # of trainees in workshops short by 60%</p>

SO 2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security		
IR 2.1. The impact of HIV and AIDS is mitigated		
Output 2.1.1: Field tools for HIV/AIDS and food security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstream HIV prevention in Title II programs. • Promote strategies that allow partners and communities to replicate and scale-up successful intervention • Improve the effectiveness of food aid for meeting the nutritional needs of HIV/AIDS-affected households using IHD framework • Provide TA for community-level responses • Design and disseminate IEC strategies and materials on how to meet the nutritional needs of PLHIV • Assess new ways to use food-for-work to address disease related agricultural labor shortages 	<p>2005 – Document to help CPs use IHD framework for HIV/AIDS programming.</p> <p>2005- Promising Practices – case studies of CRS’ integrated HIV/AIDS programs</p> <p>2005 – PQSD HIV/AIDS Unit revisits strategy for scale-up</p> <p>2006 – Six documents of HIV/AIDS best practices developed addressing integrated programming, nutrition and food security, and orphans and vulnerable children.</p>
Output 2.1.2: Capacity building for integrating food security into HIV and AIDS mitigation strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training plan to promote incorporation of HIV/AIDS mitigation in program planning • Y 1 Focus on capacity building in SARO, Y 2 focus on EARO, Y 3 focus on WARO. • Improve program staff’s knowledge of exit strategies for food distribution to PLHIV 	<p>9/2004 – Best practices on nutrition for HIV/AIDS developed and presented to SARO.</p> <p>2004 –TA activities in SARO based on best practices in WARO</p> <p>12/2004 – First annual HIV/AIDS Global CRS TA Meeting</p> <p>4/2005 - HIV/AIDS Global CRS TA Meeting</p> <p>9/2005 – Food Security and HIV/AIDS conference EARO</p> <p>2005 - 63% of CPs report systematically integrating HIV prevention messages into other programming.</p> <p>2005 – 42% of CPs report developing and implementing exit strategies. Half of these feel that the strategies were unsuccessful.</p> <p>2005 – 10% of CPs report using IHD framework to design food programming for HIV/AIDS affected groups.</p> <p>2005 - Exceeded target of # of instances of TA in field, and # of HIV/AIDS- food security workshops/learning events</p> <p>2005 – Met target for # of trainees. Able to keep ratio of participants at or under recommended 1/35.</p>

		<p>2006- Capacity building plan updated with focus on defining exit strategies for food aid.</p> <p>10/2006 – Food Security and HIV/AIDS conference WARO.</p> <p>2006 – Targets are reached for TA using IHD framework. They included: study to evaluate success exit strategies for food aid in high HIV prevalence country (Malawi); TA to CRS/El Salvador to document integrated livelihood and PLHIV support group intervention; development of Junior Farmer Field School.</p> <p>2006 – Presented or participated in 3X target number of workshops or learning experiences. Some include PQSD meeting – Baltimore 2/06), Africa Forum on HIV/AIDS prevention, and 2 Ethiopia Partners Workshops on HIV/AIDS prevention.</p> <p>2006 – Targeted # of trainees exceeded by 360%. With the exception of Africa Forum, # of participants per event meets recommended ratio of 1/35.</p>
--	--	--

IR2.2: Water Insecurity is reduced

<p>Output 2.2.1: Field tools and best practices for water security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop “software” for local governance and conflict resolution • Develop strategies to mitigate water insecurity through reversing environmental degradation • Collaborate with new partners to study, test and refine state-of-the-art watershed management models. • Extend vulnerability-reduction and risk-management approach to integrate pre-and post-shock water and sanitation interventions • Develop tools that help partners scale up to meet water demands • Disseminate technical reference CD to all field offices, regional offices and HQ staff in PQSD in Jan. 2006. 	<p>6/2004 – Proposal for an Integrated Water Resource Management Program</p> <p>9/2004- Two WatSan strategies developed – EARO and South Asia.</p> <p>2005 - Prototype of best practice on irrigation of home gardens developed.</p> <p>2005 – Training manual for design and construction of low cost water storage tanks</p> <p>2005 – CD w/ over 200 technical reference documents on water supply and sanitation prepared.</p> <p>2005 - Partnership relations created with two private sector companies - ACDS and Proctor & Gamble</p> <p>4/2006 – Outline of action plan to scale up presented to PQSD, SARO, and All Africa Water Conference (5/06).</p> <p>2006 - Best practice documentations developed on home garden irrigation, water storage tanks, ecological sanitation and sand dams.</p> <p>2006 - Technical guide on solar and wind pumping systems prepared.</p> <p>2006 -Technical reviews on 15 commercial technologies prepared as field guide.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>2006 - distributed CD Technical Reference Library on water and sanitation technologies.</p>
Output 2.2.2: Capacity building for water security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce an annually updated capacity building strategy for using the best practices and scale-up framework • TAs will promote the most promising approaches that integrate multiple uses of water for health and agriculture 	<p>10-11/05 – TA emergency assistance to Niger drought and Pakistan earthquake.</p> <p>2005 - workshops on water supply and sanitation development in Madagascar and Malawi. Target # of trainees surpassed by 186%. Success in meeting recommended ratio of 1/35.</p> <p>2005 - TA on application of best practices in WatSan and development of regional water strategies to six Title II countries.</p> <p>2005 - 89% of Title II CPs report water and sanitation activities. Most involve drinking water interventions or environmental impact and social equity.</p> <p>29% of this group attribute ICB assistance to success of W&S activities.</p> <p>5/2006 – elements of capacity building strategy formulated. Included continuation of technical visits, CRS involvement in coalitions and alliances, recruitment of interns and junior professionals.</p> <p>2006- Presented or participated in 3.5x target # of workshops/learning events. Target # of trainees surpassed by 430%. 2 of 7 workshops/LE exceeded recommended ratio of 35/1. Topics of presentations included: CRS responses to the water and sanitation needs of the Asian Tsunami, peace engineering, moral dilemmas in disaster response, development of a CRS water sector, and development of CRS water and sanitation programs.</p>
<p>SO 3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered.</p>		
<p>IR 3.1: Communities’ ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased</p>		
Output 3.1.1: Tools to help communities understand their rights and responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan, jointly with communities, interventions to address structural injustices that impede food-security • Create manuals and curricula to increase staff’s and local partners’ ability to support community empowerment • Conduct case studies to augment peacebuilding 	<p>2004 – Case study of Title II supported boarding school facilities in tribal regions of India.</p> <p>2005 – 3 Case studies completed re: how peacebuilding & structural analysis contributes to increased food security (South Asia.)</p> <p>2005 - Pilot training on structural analysis tools.</p> <p>2005 – 3 case studies developed for West Africa.</p>

	<p>training modules and integrate them with the IHD</p>	<p>2/2006 - Development of action plan to replicate structural analysis practices and strategies.</p> <p>6/ 2006 - Educational micro-case study on reducing frequency of female genital mutilation; use of structural dynamics systems mapping.</p>
<p>Output 3.1.2. Capacity building for structural analysis and peace building.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train TAs in use of structural analysis and peacebuilding tools and case studies. • Mainstream structural-analysis tools in program design and implementation • annually update capacity building strategy for using the case studies and tools 	<p>2005 – Assessment of knowledge/training needs of HQ and regional field staff for structural analysis</p> <p>2005 - Achieved target # of TA using case studies or tools. Included - Structural Analysis and Emergency Response-Indonesia 5/05; Structural Analysis and IHD analysis – Ghana & India; Structural Analysis and peacebuilding change goals for peacebuilding M&E - Kenya.</p> <p>5/2005 - Structural Analysis and IHD training for West Africa region – Ghana.</p> <p>2005 - 15 % of CPs credit IHD framework as instrumental in analyzing root causes of food, water and livelihood insecurity.</p> <p>2006 – Capacity building strategy was not updated.</p> <p>9/2006 - Systems mapping relating to peacebuilding modelled at CARO/EARO technical commission meeting. Systems Mapping orientation for incoming CRS Country Representatives.</p> <p>2006 - Four structural analysis and peacebuilding workshops. Target # of trainees surpassed by 175%. Ratio no more than 1/28.</p>
<p>IR 3.2 PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions.</p>		
<p>Output3.2.1: Institutional collaborations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with PVOs to develop products for designing and implementing better food-assisted programming • Share resources with food-aid community through numerous presentations, workshops, conferences, and documents on websites • Expand collaborative study with CARE on best practices in food-assisted programming, initiated during ISA. • Continue collaboration with OICI on water insecurity. 	<p>2004 – Continued collaborative study with CARE initiated during the ISA.</p> <p>2004 -2006 M&E Units of CRS and ARC collaborate. 2004-Long-term, intensive TA supplied to Malawi for understanding and designing appropriate M&E systems.</p> <p>2005-2006 - continued collaboration with CARE</p> <p>2005 – Collaboration with FANta on review of two new food access indicators</p> <p>2005 - participation in the annual PVO Roundtable meetings, and 2005 American Evaluation Conference -Toronto, Canada</p> <p>2005 – Produce 3 M&E learning modules w/ ARC.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue collaboration with INEE on education and emergencies. • Continue collaboration with ARC on M&E. • Continue collaboration with Mercy Corps and others on food logistics. 	<p>10/2005 – Joint led session with World Food Program (WFP) on food-assisted education. ‘Ending Child Hunger in Partnership’.</p> <p>2006 – Participation in Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies.</p> <p>3/2006 – Participate in Cooperative and International Education Society (CIES) Meeting - Honolulu, Hawaii.</p> <p>2006 - CRS and CARE jointly hired an M&E expert to evaluate and revise a partnership capacity building tool.</p> <p>2006 – Produce additional 3 M&E learning modules w/ARC.</p>
<p>Output 3.2.2: Learning alliances with research institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen current learning alliances with research institutions • Expand # of learning alliances with research institutions • Products and studies related to development of a grassroots, scaling-up model for agro-enterprise will be completed in Years 2-3. 	<p>2004 - CRS and CIAT complete a joint GDA proposal for a 3-year, 25-country, multi-regional Agro-enterprise Learning Alliance that combines action research and implementation results for market chain strengthening, basic market-oriented production and marketing skills for smallholder farmers and traders.</p> <p>2005 - Education presentations at CIES Annual Meeting and two INEE events. CRS-CARE food aid meetings in Egypt and Baltimore.</p> <p>2006 - Maintained learning alliance with CIAT. With CIAT support undertook workshop for eight States in India to introduce agro-enterprise lessons learned into the work of Self-Help Groups.</p> <p>2006- collaborated with Tufts University on a number of initiatives, including technical research and proposals in Agro-enterprise and Microfinance.</p> <p>2006- maintained collaboration with the International Water Management Institute in Africa.</p> <p>2006 - joint research project of the microfinance role in financing agricultural value chains w/ OSU grad. student.</p>
<p>Output 3.2.3: Enhanced global leadership for FFP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue engagement with USAID/FFP, FANta, and FAM • Y1 - Support FAM to assume a stronger leadership role as a primary link between FAM’s PVO membership and FANta and USAID 	<p>2004- Active participation by CRS M&E Advisor in FAM M&E meetings.</p> <p>2004 - principal reviewer on all versions of the FAM+FANta study on food-access indicators.</p> <p>9/2004 - M&E Advisor hosts annual PVO Evaluators Roundtable at CRS, which results in massive sharing of M&E materials amongst</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Y1 -Serve on FAM’s steering committee for Y2 of ICB. • Y1- Support and participate in FAM’s M&E during grant period. • Y2-EOP – with the dissolution of FAM, direct focus on promoting PVOs and FFP’s leadership through FANTA and informal networks and workshops. 	<p>all participating PVOs, spin-off exchange visits between PVOs on M&E issues of mutual interest, consolidation of a new, post-FAM M&E WG as a formal entity under Inter Action.</p> <p>2004 – 6 instances of CRS staff participation in USAID, FANta, and other fora related to food insecurity</p> <p>4/2005 - Presentation on coping strategies of PLHIV in Zimbabwe presented at IFPRI Conference in Durban.</p> <p>5/2005 - Article on Food Security, PLHIV and the Quality of Life published in Emergency Nutrition Network Field Exchange.</p> <p>2005 - Completion of an 18-page review of two new food access indicators proposed by FFP/FANTA.</p> <p>3/2006 - participated in Partnership to Cut Hunger’s seminar on Reconsidering Food Aid.</p> <p>9/2006 - contributed to the organization of a PVO Food Security Assessment Workshop.</p> <p>2006 – surpassed target # of instances of staff participation in USAID, FANTA, and other fora related to food insecurity</p>
Cross-cutting IR A: Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased		
<p>Output A.1.1.1: Field tools and information for local-partner capacity building</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study “positive deviants” in field programs to advance understanding of success. • Develop guidelines for using capacity indexes and tools. • Implement Resource and Needs Assessment for Capacity Building in FY05 via focus group discussions, telephone interviews and email questionnaires administered over 3 months. 	<p>2004- Research was completed on the impact of sustainable livelihoods on programming.</p> <p>2004 - Capacity Building STA was involved in learning how to use the IHD for program planning and implementation.</p> <p>2004 – Bibliography compiled of most current literature on the use and impact of sustainable livelihoods. Distributed in an initial draft that will form the basis of a complete IHD training.</p> <p>2004 - Developed a Resource and Needs Assessment for Capacity Building.</p> <p>2005 - Refined capacity building indices and developed guidelines for partners to conduct self-assessments; Capacity Checklist, Institutional Development Framework, T2-PCI (Title II Program Capacity Index), LCCI (Local Community Capacity Index).</p> <p>2005 - Development of cross-partner assessment tool - “Natural Morningstar: A Simple Guide for Cross-Partner Review to</p>

		<p>Improve Natural Environments and Buffer Natural Disaster”</p> <p>2005 - No standard templates or illustrative examples (by sector) for creating indices of local partner capabilities to manage and implement Title II programs were developed.</p> <p>2006 – No tools or case studies for strengthening partners' planning/implementation capacity were created.</p> <p>2006 - The “<i>Core Organizational Development Tools</i>” were field tested in Haiti and Zimbabwe.</p>
Output A.1.1.2: Capacity Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop training plan to operationalize template and illustrative indices • An annually updated capacity building strategy for using tools and case studies 	<p>2005 – Capacity building plan was updated.</p> <p>2005 - No learning events/ workshops took place.</p> <p>2006 - Grants Specialist position redesigned around food security as well as the IHD Framework. Position re-titled - Technical Advisor for Food Security</p> <p>2006 - capacity building work plan developed with input from country programs, RTAs, and relevant HQ offices.</p> <p>2006 - Completed 33% of target # of instances of Technical Assistance: CRS Haiti completed a Livelihoods Assessment for planning the next stage of food security programs; E-consultations and materials were provided to Malawi to assist the I-LIFE project to work more effectively to support partners in the consortia.</p> <p>2006 - Completed 2 x the target # of workshops and learning events: three staff trainings in how to work effectively with partners using the IHD framework and the organizational capacity assessment tools; IHD/PRA Training for SPP & MYAP development (Haiti), May-June 2006.</p> <p>2006 - IHD/PRA Training for SPP & MYAP development (Haiti), May-June</p> <p>2006 - Surpassed target # of trainees by 154% w/ ratios = or < 1/26.</p>
Cross-cutting IR B: Capacity of CRS’ and local-partner staff to identify, measure and document field impact is increased.		
Output B.1.1.1: Risk-sensitive indicators and approaches for monitoring and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop menu of indicators • Design M&E evaluation standards 	<p>2004 - Content completion of <i>Project Package -- Project Design and Proposal Guidance for CRS Project and Program Managers</i> or "ProPack" initiated under CRS'</p>

<p>evaluating Title II program outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate with USAID in the standardization of basic food-security indicators • Expand and update PPG • Generate 10 field-friendly modules targeted to common Title II M&E and reporting needs 	<p>ISA award.</p> <p>2004 - Completion of field-friendly M&E module: <i>Success and Learning Story-Writing Package</i>.</p> <p>2004 - Two M&E modules brought to near final drafts. Content includes quality control in the planning and delivery of any type of capacity-building services to Title II PVO staff and how to go about hiring qualified M&E field staff.</p> <p>2005 - Three "field-friendly" DMER modules developed w/ ARC.</p> <p>2005 - Delivery of three additional versions of ProPack I in languages other than English: French, Portuguese and Spanish.</p> <p>2005 - "Emergency Operations Basket of Indicators" developed and posted to the PQSD/M&E intranet site, and distributed agency wide to program quality and other staff via the M&E Community of Practice list-serve.</p> <p>2006 - Final drafts completed for review of : 1)ProPack II Orientation Package, 2)Field-friendly module "Guidance for the Preparation and Use of Performance Indicator Tracking Tables (PITT)." 3)Field-friendly module "Human Interest Stories: Guidelines and tools for developing human interest stories. Version 1.0"</p> <p>2006 - development of draft working paper - "Guidance for Developing Early Warning Indicators and Trigger Levels for USAID/FFP MYAP Proposals"</p> <p>2006 - design and early implementation of major initiative - "Developing CRS-wide Commonly Accepted and Core Project Indicators"</p>
<p>Output B.1.1.2: Capacity Building</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop annual training and technical assistance plan for field use of M&E materials 	<p>2004 - Target # of instances of TA using the manual, modules, or indicator baskets surpassed by 375% (75 instances).</p> <p>2004 – 13 training/learning events focusing on ProPack or M&E element , Proframe.</p> <p>2004 - 6 field staff mentored, 4 of them from Title II regions/CPs: Latin America, Eastern Africa, and Southern Africa.</p> <p>2004 - Target # of trainees surpassed by 244%. Ratios < or = 1/31 in all but one</p>

		<p>workshop.</p> <p>2004 - Regular participation in FAM M&E Working Group.</p> <p>2005 - <i>ProPack</i> training conducted for CRS staff in headquarters and every region.</p> <p>2005 - indicator basket posted to the PQSD/M&E intranet.</p> <p>2005 – Target # of instances of TA achieved.</p> <p>2005 – 3 learning events/workshops focusing on ProPack or M&E element , Proframe.</p> <p>7/2005 - Co-facilitated M&E session for CRS’ International Development Fellows.</p> <p>2005 - Achieved 62% of target # of trainees. Goals were perhaps set too high, implying ratios > than 1/45.</p> <p>2006 - Capacity building strategy updated with emphasis place on the provision of TA to (strategically) key clientele and, where necessary, country program staff and to colleagues working on Title II programs at headquarters.</p> <p>2006 - Target # of instances of TA surpassed by 120%. All mentioned using <i>Propack</i> manual(s), indicators, or modules.</p> <p>2006 – Target # of workshops/learning events per year surpassed by 767% (23 events). 8 Workshops directly funded by ICB grant.</p> <p>2006 –Target # of trainees surpassed by 265%. Ratios < or = 1/27 with the exception of one workshop in Indonesia.</p>
--	--	--

FY 2007	ICB planned activities for the FY07	What was done and not done in the FY07
SO 1: Strategies for individual, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted.		
IR.1.1. Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors.		
Output1.1 1: A holistic framework for integral human development and capacity building in its use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update IHD concept paper to build on experience with the framework during 2005 and 2006 • Support roll-out of the IHD • Host RTA meetings timed to the CORE spring conference • Develop tools for field use in analyzing food security • Demonstrate IHD effectiveness in enhancing program quality in 	

	<p>two regions who have had sufficient practice and experience with the IHD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop assessment and evaluation tools for linking the IHD more concretely to food security and the protection of assets. • Best Practice Research on “How do our Title II programs contribute to human assets under IHD” • Support to two title II programs for improving health • Develop strategies to reach children and youth who are out of school; to promote adult literacy; and global CRS consultation on education and dissemination of relevant technical materials • Develop capacity plan to promote HIV/AIDS mitigation in program planning • Up-to-date capacity building plan • Liaise with major international groups and associations 	
--	---	--

IR.1.2. Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized		
---	--	--

<p>Output: Field tools for addressing risk reduction and emergency preparedness and capacity building in their use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify regional Emergency Focal Points on Assessments and Emergency Field Management • Develop and support tools and risk reduction frameworks, based on IHD • Support four MYAP countries with field tools that reduce risks and mitigate vulnerabilities • Compile lessons learned for better links between emergency and development programming, • Develop and disseminate an annually updated capacity building strategy for using the risk-reduction frameworks and food-aid lessons • Provide technical assistance, using the risk-reduction framework or lessons learned • Apply consistent adherence of TA criteria and adherence to reporting 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • systems. • Conduct risk reduction/ preparedness workshops/learning events using IHD or shock-specific frameworks with trainees 	
SO 2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security		
IR 2.1. The impact of HIV and AIDS is mitigated		
Output 2.1.1: Field tools for HIV/AIDS and food security in their use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support improved education practices in programming for Orphans and Vulnerable children • Produce and disseminate a HIV/AIDS & Nutrition Training of Trainers Manual • Organize a Global HIV/AIDS Technical Team Meeting • Complete, translate and disseminate CRS HIV/AIDS Programming Guidelines • Support operations research on HIV, ART, Nutrition, Food Security and Livelihoods • Hold one regional conference on HIV/AIDS, nutrition and food security • Provide Technical assistance, using the tools, best practices or IHD framework • Publish and disseminate tools for and critical compilations of proven “best practices” and strategies worldwide in responding to nutrition and food insecurity in populations living with HIV/AIDS • Provide an action plan for scaling up • Create an annually updated capacity building strategy for using the tools, best practices and scale-up framework • Develop coping strategy indicators in collaboration with CARE 	10/2006 - HIV/AIDS Global CRS TA Meeting held in WARO
IR2.2: Water Insecurity is reduced		
Output 2.2: Field tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disseminate resource inventory 	

<p>and best practices for water security in their use</p>	<p>of tools for Sustainable Livelihoods approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop best practice tools and guides in linkage of water/sanitation to HIV/AIDS home based care and water quality monitoring • Disseminate best practice tools during country visits • Provide direct TA through field visits in at least four Title II countries • Conduct an All-Asia Water Conference for CRS countries in SEAPRO, South Asia and MENA 	
---	---	--

SO 3: institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered.

IR 3.1: Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased

<p>Output 3.1.1: Tools and capacity building to help communities claim their rights, understand their responsibilities, and promote justice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish standards and document peacebuilding best practices in countries where food insecurity could be mitigated • Strengthen organizational relationships in order to contribute to learning around risk reduction and the protection of assets in communities • Update annual capacity building plan for structural analysis and peacebuilding • Provide technical assistance in development and emergency programs • Conduct at least one structural analysis workshop in Title II country/region 	
---	---	--

--	--	--

IR 3.2 PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions.

<p>Output 3.1.2: PVO communities of practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote and pilot minimum standards for education in emergencies • Participate in annual INEE working group meeting on standards for education in emergencies • Collaborate with ARC on M&E: 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversee production of 2 field-friendly M&E Modules Work with PVOs on Strategic Assessment program to mitigate food insecurity 	
Output 3.2.2: Learning alliances with research institutions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to pursue alliances with research institutions and universities Promote learning and innovation when choosing alliance funding for the field Produce significant alliance initiatives that contribute to industry standards 	
Output 3.2.3: Enhanced global leadership for FFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve on FAM's steering committee Y4 Participate and contribute to USAID-sponsored events, FANta, and other fora related to food insecurity Support publications and disseminate broadly via CRS' website, commercial publishers, journals, etc. Participate in FANta and FFP technical meetings on Household Food Insecurity Scale (HFIS) food access indicator guide for Title II programming. 	
Cross-cutting IR A: Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased		
Output A.1.1.1: Field tools and information for local-partner capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disseminate tools and case studies for strengthening partners' planning/implementation capacity Standardize template and illustrative examples (by sector) for creating indices of local partner capacities to manage and implement Title II programs Update capacity building plan for field offices to use tools and case studies using the IHD framework 	
Output A.1.1.2: Capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support workshops/learning events using tools and case studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .
Cross-cutting IR B: Capacity of CRS' and local-partner staff to identify, measure and document field impact is increased.		
Output B.1.1.1: Assessment, design, monitoring, evaluation,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop early warning systems guidance Provide assistance to developing, 	

learning and reporting guidance for Title II programs	testing, revising and rolling out Title II project indicators in collaboration with other NGOs, following the guidance of the FANTA-led FFP PMP Working Group	
Output B 1.1.2: Capacity building for CRS and local partner staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a capacity building plan for using ProPack manuals and DMER modules • Develop a Title II-specific M&E training package • Oversee production of field-friendly modules on aspects of DMER that field staff most often ask about • Deliver Title II DMER-related trainings, technical assistance and/or orientation Provide 2 evaluation tools to Title II countries • Develop M&E approach for food assisted education programs 	

FY 2008	Planned ICB Activities for the FY08	What is in progress
SO 1: Strategies for individual, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted.		
IR.1.1. Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors.		
Output1.1 1: A holistic framework for integral human development and capacity building in its use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a livelihoods assessment training in West Africa • Conduct a training-of-trainers IHD workshop in Southeast Asia • Translate IHD Education document, which looks at the experience and improved understanding of how to use IHD in on-going education programming, into French and pilot in Haiti • Document experience and provide guidance for on-going Title II countries in planning for/developing sustainability and phase-out strategies for Food Assisted Education • Conduct a risk reduction workshop in West Africa • Up-to-date capacity building plan • Provide technical assistance to CPs in implementing IHD 	
IR.1.2. Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized		
Output 1.2.1: Field tools for addressing risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise EPR Handbook with up-to-date IHD information 	

<p>reduction and emergency preparedness and capacity building in their use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ERT contributes to continual refinement of IHD framework/definitions • Contribute to development and rollout of Risk Reduction training package • ERT staff to attend PQSD meetings on ICB and IHD • IHD is incorporated into applicable ERT guidelines and manuals where applicable • Key risk reduction documents and tools posted on CRS intranet and ERT resource CD-Rom • Lessons learned exercise for better links between emergency and development programming done in two countries • Compilation of lessons Learned linking emergency and development • Develop “Systems and Structures” IHD Assessment module • Conduct training with EFPs on Emergency Assessments • Annual EFP Meeting – ICB/IHD component 	
--	--	--

SO 2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security

IR 2.1. The impact of HIV and AIDS is mitigated

<p>Output 2.1.1: Field tools for HIV/AIDS and food security in their use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish Promising Practices II • Invent HIV ration algorithm • HIV-Agriculture Collaboration • Develop mechanisms to conduct field-based operations research to identify evidence-based strategies that mitigate HIV • Disseminate findings from field-based operations research to identify evidence-based strategies that mitigate HIV • Case studies of successful Title II health programs that contribute to human assets • Ration guidance for Food Assisted Education programs 	
<p>Output 2.1.2: Capacity building</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct workshop for HIV/AIDS & Nutrition Training of Trainers Manual 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry-out HIV/AIDS, Food Security, and Nutrition learning event in India • Continued collaboration with HIV/AIDS on issues related to OVC-Education 	
IR 2.2: Water Insecurity is reduced		
Output 2.2.1: Field tools and best practices for water security and capacity building in their use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare well drilling manual for CRS CPs • Identify “best practices” in CRS projects and prepare CRS guidelines • Prepare EARO water sector strategy • Technical assistance support to Title II countries • LACRO water sector strategy workshop • Annual membership in Millennium Water Alliance 	
SO 3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered.		
IR 3.1: Communities’ ability to influence factors that affect food security is increased		
Output 3.1: Tools and capacity building to help communities claim their rights, understand their responsibilities, and promote justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update JASS toolkit on structural analysis • Update capacity building plan for using case studies/tools • Technical assistance support to Title II countries • Carry-out two structural analysis /peacebuilding workshops 	
IR 3.2 PVO practices and FFP’s global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions.		
Output 3.2.1: PVO communities of practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued participation and support INEE • Collaborate with ARC on M&E: Oversee production of field-friendly M&E Modules • Collaborate with CARE on outstanding food security initiatives 	
Output 3.2.2: Learning Alliances with research institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to pursue alliances with research institutions and universities • Promote learning and innovation when choosing alliance funding for the field • Produce significant alliance initiatives that contribute to industry standards 	
Output 3.2.3: Enhanced global leadership for FFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate and contribute to USAID-sponsored events, FANta, 	

	<p>and other fora related to food insecurity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support publications and disseminate broadly via CRS' website, commercial publishers, journals, etc. 	
Cross-cutting IR A: Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased		
Output A.1.1 Field tools, information, and capacity building for local partner capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize and disseminate "Working in Consortia" manual • Work on exit strategies manual with models for sustainability • Carry-out indices training in LACRO • Carry-out case studies research • Work on multi-sectoral MYAP lessons learned workshop • Provide technical assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Cross-cutting IR B: Capacity of CRS' and local-partner staff to identify, measure and document field impact is increased.		
Output B.1.1.1: Assessment, design, monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting guidance for Title II programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food security-related indicators development and testing • Early warning indicators and trigger levels roll-out • Conduct project final evaluation 	
Output B 1.1.2: Capacity building for CRS and local partner staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visits to HQ by M&E Advisor off-site • Elaborate ICB field-friendly modules/briefing notes • Work on Participatory Impact Assessment Approach • Provide M&E training to CARO and visit WARO M&E support 	

Annex III: Persons Interviewed

Countries	Name
Eritrea	James McLaughlin
Ethiopia	David Orth-Moore
Uganda	Jack Norman
Sudan	Mark Snyder
Rwanda	Sean Gallagher
Kenya	Ken MacLean
Benin	Carla Brown-Ndiaye
Niger	Lisa Washington-Sow
Gambia	David Donovan
Senegal	Rebecca Bassey
Burkina Faso	Debbie Shomberg
Sierra Leone	Alexander Mathew
Madagascar	Chris Bessey
Zambia	Paul Macek
Angola	Juan Sheenan
Zimbabwe	Darren Hercyk
Malawi	Nick Ford
Haiti	William Canny
Nicaragua	Conor Walsh
Guatemala	Lane Bunkers
India	Jennifer George Poidatz
Indonesia	Richard Balmadier
Ghana	Vewonyi Adjavon
Liberia	Anthony DiFilippo
Peru	Julio Gamero
Regions	
DRD PQ SARO	Driss Moumane
DRD PQ WARO	Hippolyt Pul
DRD PQ EARO	Lori Kunze
DRD PQ LACRO	Gaye Burpee
DRD PQ SEAPRO	Susan Hahn
DRD PQ SAsia	Dominique Morel
HQ – PQSD	
TA Food Security	Kathryn Lockwood
Deputy Director PQSD, ICB Key Personnel (through 10/1/07)	Judson Flanagan
Deputy Director PQSD (IR3.1)	David Leege
STA Agriculture (IR1.1)	Geoff Heinrich
Deputy Director Emergency Operations (IR1.2)	Dane Fredenburg
TA HIV and AIDS (IR2.1)	Carrie Miller
STA Water and Sanitation (IR2.2)	Dennis Warner
STA Capacity Building (IRA)	Sarah Ford
STA M&E (IRB)	Carlisle Levine
STA M&E (IRB)	Guy Sharrock
STA Health	Mary Hennigan
STA Education	Anne Sellers or Eric Eversmann

Annex IV: Documents Reviewed

Catholic Relief Services (2003) Revised Technical Application for RFA # M/OP-03-1127
Submitted: Aug 1, 2003

Catholic Relief Services (2003) Detailed Implementation Plan for FY2004; *Submitted: December, 2003*

Catholic Relief Services (2003) Institutional Capacity Building Grant M&E Plan;
Submitted: December, 2003.

Catholic Relief Services (2003) ICB Year One Implementation Plan Matrix; *Submitted December 19, 2003.*

Catholic Catholic Relief Services (2003) Implementation Plan Narrative; *Submitted: December 22, 2003.*

Catholic Relief Services (2003) Five year plan; *Submitted: December 23, 2003.*

Catholic Relief Services (2004) ICB IPTT; *Submitted: June 29, 2004.*

Catholic Relief Services (2004) Annual Report for FY2004; *Submitted: January 15, 2005*

Catholic Relief Services (2005) Annual Report for FY2005; *Submitted: December, 2005*

Catholic Relief Services (2006) Annual Report for FY2006; *Submitted: February, 2007*

Catholic Relief Services (2007) Mid-Term Review; *Submitted: January, 2007*

Catholic Relief Services (2007) ICB PITT Revisions; *Submitted: March 21, 2007*

Catholic Relief Services (2007) Detailed Implementation Plan for FY2008; *Submission pending*

Annex V: Questionnaires

CRS ICB Questionnaire October 2007

SO1: Strategies for individual, households, and communities to manage risks to food security are promoted.

IR 1.1: Coping abilities of targeted groups are reinforced in all program sectors.

1.1.1) Are you aware of the IHD framework? Yes No;

1.1.2) In last 4 years, how has the framework been used in your country program?

1.1.3) Are there documents available in the Country Office documenting the use of IHD framework? Yes No

If yes, in what form?

1.1.4) Did your project/program develop/revise assessment and evaluation tools for linking the IHD more concretely to food security and the protection of assets?
 Yes No

1.1.5) Please name the tools:

1.1.6) Which tools are most useful in facilitating field implementation?

1.1.7) Which (if any) are ineffectual?

1.1.8) With the help of the IHD framework are staff able to tailor IHD training to individual country program contexts and needs? Yes No

1.1.9) Have country-level staff been able to replicate these IHD training sessions within the Title II country programs? Yes No

If not, why not?

1.1.10) Who participated in these training?

- CRS staff;
- Staff from partner NGOs;
- Staff from government departments;
- Staff from other INGOs.

1.1.11) What did the program do differently in strengthening the coping abilities of target groups since the inception of the project?

IR 1.2: Program initiatives linking emergency and development are prioritized.

1.2.1) How many participants attended ICB-grant funded training for risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response?

_____ CRS staff;
_____ Staff from partner NGOs;
_____ Staff from government departments;
_____ Staff from other INGOs.

1.2.2) What topics and techniques are covered during training for emergency preparedness and response?

1.2.3) How has the information provided in training been used in program design and evaluation?

1.2.4) What changes has CRS made in program design as a result of ICB grant funding?

1.2.5) Did the target community of your program experience any shock since the inception of the project? _____ Yes _____ No

1.2.6) Has your CP used any tool to link emergency and development programming?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, please name the tools.

1.2.7) Have early warning systems been adapted to specific locales? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, how?

1.2.8) Are adequate tools for emergency assessment available to your CP?
_____ Yes _____ No

1.2.9) Has the country program received adequate training on the use of these emergency assessment tools? _____ Yes _____ No

If so, please explain which tools have been relevant and helpful. If not, please explain what is lacking.

1.2.10) If applicable, how is the IHD framework used to inform and improve the development relief approach?

1.2.11) What type of data (qualitative and quantitative) are used to measure emergency response improvements resulting from country program activities.

SO2: Human capacities and community resilience are protected and enhanced by holistic responses to two major challenges to food security.

IR 2.1 The impact of HIV/AIDS is mitigated.

2.1.1) Does your country program have a component to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS? Yes No (If no, please move to the next section).

2.1.2) What types of tools and programming approaches have been used to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS?

2.1.3) Did the country program develop reports/ papers/ case studies or any other record that documents the use of tools to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS?
 Yes No

If yes, which tools have documented use?

2.1.4) Has knowledge of HIV/AIDS prevention been mainstreamed into Title II programs in your CP in last 4 years? Yes No

If so, how? If not why not?

2.1.5) What (if any) obstacles hinder the ability to mainstream HIV/AIDS prevention into the country program?

2.1.6) Have program staff received training on the special nutritional needs of PLHIV in the last 4 years?
 Yes No

2.1.7) Who has received the training?
 CRS staff;
 Staff from partner NGOs;
 Staff from government departments;
 Staff from other INGOs.

2.1.8) How was the information been applied within the country program?

2.1.9) Did partner NGOs incorporate any of the learning from the training to their work?
 Yes No I don't know

2.1.10) Have program staff received training on exit strategies for food distribution to PLHIV within the Title II program? Yes No

2.1.11) Who has received the training?
 CRS staff;
 Staff from partner NGOs;
 Staff from government departments;
 Staff from other INGOs.

2.1.12) How was the information applied within the country program?

2.1.13) Did partner NGOs incorporate any of the learning from the training to their work?

_____ Yes _____No _____ I don't know

2.1.14) What types of data (qualitative and quantitative) are used to measure improvements in the impact of HIV/AIDS resulting from country program activities?

IR 2.2 Water insecurity is reduced.

2.2.1) Does your country program have a component to reduce water insecurity of the target communities? _____ Yes _____No (If no, please move to the next section).

2.2.2) What type of tools and strategies has CRS introduced to reduce water insecurity?

2.2.3) Did the country program develop reports/ papers/ case studies or any other record that document the use of water management tools to reduce water insecurity of target communities?

_____ Yes _____No

If yes, which tools have documented use?

2.2.4) Describe any changes in the domestic or productive use of water that you believe are a result of CRS training/intervention in your country program.

2.2.5) Was direct technical assistance through a field visit provided to your country program? _____ Yes _____No

2.2.6) Who provided the TA?

2.2.7) Did the TA meet the country program's needs? _____ Yes _____No

2.2.8) Have sanitary surveys been conducted prior to drinking water interventions?
_____ Yes _____No

2.2.9) Who conducted the surveys?

2.2.10) When did they occur?

2.2.11) Have environmental examinations occurred prior to other water-related interventions such as irrigation, fish-farming, and other agricultural uses?
_____ Yes _____No

2.2.12) Who conducted the examinations?

2.2.13) When did they occur?

2.2.14) Did the project/ program help to form village water committees? ___ Yes ___No

2.2.15) If so, who attends and how often do the committees meet?

2.2.16) What are the major topics discussed in village water committee meetings/
training?

2.2.17) How did the information discussed in village water committee meetings get
applied within the country program?

2.2.18) What steps have been taken to integrate water and sanitation programming with
other types of interventions?

If so, how is it integrated? How effective have these efforts been?

2.2.19) What (if any) technical challenges hinder progress in improving household water
security.

2.2.20) What types of data (qualitative and quantitative) are used to measure water and
sanitation improvements resulting from country program activities?

SO3: Institutional capacities for influencing food practices and policy are bolstered.

**IR 3.1: Communities' ability to influence factors that affect food security is
increased.**

3.1.1) Has your CP had any difficulty balancing application of IHD with application of
FFP food security framework? ___ Yes ___No

3.1.2) Have either of CRS' tools – the IHD framework or the Contextual Analysis toolkit
– been utilized to help identify and analyze the systemic causes of food, water, and
livelihood insecurity as part of your Country Program? ___ Yes ___No

3.1.3) If used, was this seen as an improvement over previous methods of data analysis?
___ Yes ___No

If yes, why was that? If no, why not?

3.1.4) Did the country program develop reports/ papers/ case studies or any other record
that documents the use of IHD or Contextual Analysis tools with partners/ community
groups to help identify and analyze the systemic causes of food, water, and livelihood
insecurity?

___ Yes ___No

If yes, which tools have documented use?

3.1.5) Was sufficient training provided for these resources? Yes No

3.1.6) Have CRS structural analysis workshops been conducted in your country/ region?
 Yes No

If so, how often and who provided the TA?

3.1.7) Who attended the workshop?

3.1.8) Were action strategies developed based on information gained in structural analysis workshops? Yes No

If so, what type of strategies?

3.1.9) Did your country program provide communities or community-based organizations with advocacy tools or training? Yes No

3.1.10) What type of tools or activities?

3.1.11) How often did training sessions occur?

3.1.12) Who provided the training? Who attended?

3.1.13) For maximum effectiveness, what do you think should be the maximum number of participants in the workshop _____

3.1.14) What (if any) obstacles hindered civil society interventions?

3.1.15) What types of data (qualitative and quantitative) are used to measure improvements in community empowerment, resulting from country program activities?

IR 3.2: PVO practices and FFP's global leadership role are enhanced by CRS contributions.

3.2.1) Has your country program used the IHD framework in developing a MYAP?
 Yes No

If yes, please describe how it is different than the previous MYAPs/ DAPs?

Cross-cutting IR-A: Capacity of local partner staff to plan and implement programs is increased.

4.1.1) Is the Title II program being implemented directly by CRS? Yes No

4.1.2) If the program is implemented by local partners? Please list

4.1.3) How did CRS assess the needs and capacities of partner organizations on the following areas?

Technical:

Managerial:

Financial:

4.1.4) If an organizational capacity-building tool has been used, was it easy to understand and adjust to the local context? ____ Yes ____No

4.1.5) If capacity-building tools have been used, please identify the tools.

4.1.6) How was information gained from the tools used to identify strengths and weaknesses within the program?

4.1.7) Were action plans designed and implemented to increase local partner's organizational capacity? ____ Yes ____No

If so, how?

4.1.8) How did these action plans address local partner's needs?

4.1.9) What (if any) obstacles prevented local partners from increasing their organizational capacity?

4.1.10) What (if any) obstacles prevented CRS from assisting partners to increase their organizational capacity?

Cross-cutting IR-B: Capacity of CRS' and local-partner staff to identify, measure and document field impact is increased.

4.2.1) What type of technical assistance and formal training has been provided with regards to the monitoring and evaluation of Title II country programs?

4.2.2) Who provided the training?

4.2.3) Who attended the training?

4.2.4) Approximately how many participants were present in a single training session?

4.2.5) For maximum effectiveness, how many participants do you recommend?

4.2.6) Are you aware about the field-friendly monitoring modules developed by ICB?
___ Yes ___ No.

4.2.7) Was adequate training provided to use these modules? ___ Yes ___ No.

4.2.8) Please tell us the advantages/ or disadvantages of using these modules

4.2.9) How many M&E tools are currently being used in the CP? _____

4.2.10) Are there any reports/ papers/ handbooks/ manuals for use of M&E tools
___ Yes ___ No.

4.2.11) Are participatory monitoring methods used in your CP? ___ Yes ___ No.

If not, why not

4.2.12) If yes what types of participatory methodologies are used for data collection and analysis?

4.2.13) What types of data monitoring systems and management information systems are used in your Country Program?

4.2.14) How is the data obtained through monitoring and evaluation reported? To whom is it reported?

4.2.15) Have findings from M&E been used in strategic decision making?
___ Yes ___ No.

If so, how?

4.2.16) Please describe any new approaches for assessing impact which have been introduced by CRS.

4.2.17) Please describe strategies (if any) to strengthen linkages (in last 4 years) between Title II and non-Title II programs where sectors or activities are similar or complementary.

Thank you for your time and honest input

CRS ICB Questionnaire October 2007
For CRS HQ & Regional Staff

- 1) Describe the effectiveness of the IHD framework in the field. In which ways has the framework been used in CPs.

- 2) Describe the technical challenges that hinder progress of implementing the IHD framework in the country programs. How has the framework been received by different sectors and different CPs.

- 3) How many sectors supported by the ICB incorporated IHD perspectives in their annual PQSD workplans?

- 4) How does CRS monitor and implement the IHD framework in CPs?

- 5) How many CPs have developed/ revised assessments and evaluation tools for linking the IHD to food security and asset protection?

- 6) What qualitative changes has the IHD framework brought into the country programs.

- 7) How does CRS document the better/ best practices and share them across the CPs.

- 8) Does CRS have a capacity building strategy for the IHD framework? How has the strategy been implemented? How does CRS monitor the implementation of the strategy?

- 9) Since 2004, did CRC take any specific initiative to link development to relief activities?
_____Yes _____No.

- If yes, please describe the initiatives, and its usefulness.

- 10) Does the existing monitoring, evaluation, and reporting (MER) system provide sufficient knowledge on where, when, and in what form trainings and technical assistance are provided? _____ Yes _____No

If not, why not?

11) Does the existing MER system provides sufficient information on where the IHD framework is being used competently? _____ Yes _____No

12) Which countries require more assistance, and what are the benefits Title II country programs are experiencing as a result of the implementation of the IHD framework?

13) Describe Title II collaborations and learning alliances that have developed since FY2005.

14) Describe any changes to Title II collaborations and learning alliances which existed prior to FY2005?

15) Since FY2005, have there been changes in the way that CRS' experience and knowledge in food security is documented and disseminated to its collaborating partners?

16) Describe any changes since 2003 in CRS strategies to ensure that food aid interventions do no harm.

17) Describe any changes since 2003 to resolve key shortcomings of Title II programs identified in recent evaluations.

18) Since 2004, did CRS conduct any assessment in prior program areas that have "graduated" from Title II assistance to identify which methods or activities have had a lasting, positive impact or, conversely, have had negative effects. _____Yes
_____No.

If yes, please describe the major findings of the assessment (s).

19) Since 2004, did CRS document and apply lessons learned from prior assessments or program evaluations to the current programs as appropriate? _____Yes _____No

If yes, please give two examples of such application.