



Annual Results Report

Multi-Year Assistance Programs/Development Activity Programs

Title II

Haiti/ACDI/VOCA

Fiscal Year 2008

Submission Date: November 21, 2008

ACDI/VOCA Headquarters

Avram E. Guroff
Senior Managing Director
Food Security & Specialty Crops
ACDI/VOCA
50 F Street N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20001
AGuroff@acdivoca.org
Tel: (202)879 0604
Fax: (202) 626 8726

ACDI/VOCA-Haiti

Emmet Murphy
Chief Of Party
92, Rue Grégoire
P.O. Box 15222, HT 6140
Pétion-Ville, Haiti
Emurphy@acdivoca-haiti.org
Tel: +1 (509) 3701 2234, 3701 3325,ext 301
Fax: +1 (509) 22561222

Table of Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS2

I. RESULTS REPORT3

A. ANNUAL RESULTS3

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES & INTERVENTIONS5

Strategic Objective 1: Increase resiliency against future food insecurity through the protection and enhancement of livelihoods and the development of community capacities..... 5

Strategic Objective 2: Protect vulnerable populations against immediate food insecurity and develop capacity to address long-term nutrition and health needs.....7

Strategic Objective 3: Improve the abilities of communities to identify and successfully respond to vulnerabilities and impending shocks.....8

B. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS9

C. SUCCESS STORIES11

D. LESSONS LEARNED11

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) (revised as of 10/08)
- Attachment 2: Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ)
- Attachment 3: Summary Request and Beneficiary Tracking Table
- Attachment 4: FY 2008 Expenditure Report
- Attachment 5: Monetization Tables

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BND	Bureau de Nutrition et Développement
CASEC	Communal Section Administrative Council
CBO	Community Based Organization
CNSA	Coordination Nationale de la Sécurité Alimentaire
Col-Vols	Community Volunteers
CRDA	Center for Research and Agricultural Development
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CS	Cooperating Sponsor
DIP	Detailed Implementation Plan
DMC	Disaster Meeting Committee
DPC	Département de Protection Civile
EWS	Early Warning System
FFP	Food for Peace
FFS	Farmer Field School
FY	Fiscal Year
IOM	International Organization of Migration
IPTT	Indicator Performance Tracking Table
IR	Intermediate Results
KPSL	Comité de Protection Civil Local
MARNDR	Ministry of Agriculture
MCHN	Mother Child Health and Nutrition
MSH	Management Sciences for Health
MSPP	Ministry of Public Health (French)
MT	Metric Ton
MYAP	Multi-Year Assistance Program
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PERSUAP	Pesticide Evaluation Report and Safer Use Action Plan
PMP	Performance Management Plan
TA	Transfer Authorization
SAPQ	Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire
SBA	Skilled Birth Attendant
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNOCHA	United Nations Office of Humanitarian Affairs
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WFP	World Food Programme

I. RESULTS REPORT

A. ANNUAL RESULTS

Introduction

ACDI/VOCA was awarded a five-year Multi-Year Assistance Program (MYAP) to be implemented in the Southeast Department of Haiti effective February 19, 2008. However, in anticipation of the program's official start, ACDI/VOCA began efforts in 2007 to register the organization as a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) in Haiti warranting duty-free status as well as began recruiting staff and laying the foundation for a successful program. ACDI/VOCA obtained designation as a registered NGO in December 2007 prior to project start-up.¹

The first several months of the project were devoted to establishing offices in both Port-au-Prince and Jacmel, as well as hiring key staff and establishing partner sub-recipient agreements. During this period, ACDI/VOCA's partners – Management Sciences for Health (MSH) and Bureau de Nutrition et Développement (BND), focused on the planning and preparation of the Mother-Child Health and Nutrition (MCHN) component. Additionally, ACDI/VOCA collaborated closely with existing Title II Cooperating Sponsors, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), and World Vision, for monetization sales, MCHN ration design, and a joint baseline study. Significant support was received from the Food for Peace (FFP) team at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Haiti Mission and in Washington, DC.

In June 2008, ACDI/VOCA conducted a quick participatory appraisal in La Vallée and Bainet in anticipation of the 2009 planting season due to take place between the months of February and March. In addition to establishing the baseline for ACDI/VOCA's 2009 interventions, the study was also instrumental in pointing out specific community constraints and opportunities that need to be addressed through the MYAP interventions. ACDI/VOCA identified 165 localities for eventual intervention as well as specific activities that could be developed under the life of the project. ACDI/VOCA started agricultural activities in three communes (La Vallée, Bainet and Cotes de Fer) and MCHN efforts in Cotes de Fer. Following the devastation of the hurricane season, ACDI/VOCA also worked with the United Nations Office Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) to provide humanitarian assistance to affected areas in these communes and the city of Jacmel. ACDI/VOCA plans to extend MYAP activities in the other targeted communes (Thiotte, Grand Gosier, Belle-Anse and Anse-à-Pitre) in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009.

Although the project activities started late in FY 2008, ACDI/VOCA was able to achieve some results, reported in the Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) and the Mission's Performance Management Plan (PMP). Based on the PMP submitted to USAID in May 2008, and its subsequent revisions, ACDI/VOCA had originally planned to reach 2,400 direct beneficiaries and 500 households by September 30, 2008. As illustrated in Table 1 below, the program exceeded its FY08 targets: it reached 3,650 beneficiaries in the last quarter of FY 2008, benefiting 924 rural households.

¹ After signing of the Transfer Authorization (TA), ACDI/VOCA modified its project cycle (for budget, work plan, and targets) from five 12-month periods (total 60 months) to periods based on the USG's fiscal year (still 60 months, but with activities taking place during the course of six fiscal years (2008 – 2013). As of submission of this report, everything has been converted to real time and is no longer on the 'proposal schedule' of five 12-month periods.

Table 1: FY 2008 Program Goal Indicators Performance Results

Indicators	FY 2008 target	FY 2008 achievement	% of achievement	PMP FY 2009 Target	PMP FY10 Target
# of targeted direct beneficiaries reached (PMP IR 2.1)	2,400	3,650	152%	33,425	54,925
# rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance (4.5.2.8 (F))	500	924	185%	9,925	12,675

During the months of August and September 2008, Haiti was hit by three major hurricanes, affecting the entire country including ACDI/VOCA's operational areas in the Southeast. As formulated in its original proposal, ACDI/VOCA's response strategy in the case of a natural disaster would be to reorient its interventions to respond to changing food security conditions. In keeping with this strategy, in early September 2008 (following hurricane Gustav), ACDI/VOCA requested USAID approval to utilize 15 metric tons (MT) of commodity as a response to the hurricane affected areas. Working with partner BND, ACDI/VOCA distributed food to support households severely affected in the Southeast department, specifically those located in program-targeted areas. The distribution was organized in coordination with local authorities, the Mayor of La Vallée, the Communal Section Administrative Council (CASEC), and the Département de Protection Civile (DPC). Most households (80%) were reached through the emergency food distribution, while the remaining households (20%) reached under the program received support in agricultural activities. Table 2 gives a breakdown of the total number of households benefiting from United States Government (USG) assistance, broken down by commune and sector of activity.

Table 2: Number of vulnerable households benefiting from USG assistance

Sector of Activity	Commune				Total
	City of Jacmel	La Vallée de Jacmel	Bainet	Cotes de Fer	
Food distribution (SO2)	250	250	250	0	750
Agricultural/Livelihoods Activity (SO1)	0	86	88	0	174
Total	250	336	338	0	924

In FY 2009, ACDI/VOCA expects that 9,925 rural households will benefit directly from USG assistance in order to reach the cumulative target fixed in the PMP.

Emerging Trends

The past year was disastrous for Haiti on multiple levels: a) increasing global food commodity prices exacerbated by the country's significant reliance on imported food; b) the destruction caused by three major hurricanes in August and September 2008 wiping out harvests and damage to infrastructure and individual homes; and c) the decrease in remittances from Haitians in the diaspora affected by the widening global economic crisis.

Food insecurity has now touched a larger part of the population compared to when the MYAP was designed in early 2007. The Southeast sustained major infrastructural damage and some

areas lost as much as 80% of their harvest. In Belle Anse, malnutrition levels have increased dramatically, first caused by natural calamities (early 2008 drought, mid-2008 hurricanes), and then further exacerbated by the reduction in food supplies and the increase of prices. Areas such as Belle Anse need a more intensive agricultural intervention for greater sustainability and improved access to water. Focus group discussions following the death of several children from malnutrition in this area revealed that these populations believe that a concerted intervention to bolster agriculture, improved access to water and health clinics are most needed for the area. These are running themes continuously identified by communities when asked to identify their most pressing needs.

As such, ACDI/VOCA would like to reach more people through agricultural interventions and increase funding for improved water access for both drinking and irrigation systems. Given the disruption of normal production (following the hurricane season) and its impact upon livelihoods, the project needs to adapt its approach to reinstate the production cycle. Since the next planting season depends upon the prior season for seed supply and food for the family, it is imperative for the project to address the needs for shorter production cycle crop seeds that can provide farmers with quicker access to cash and food. In terms of adaptation of the project, additional funds are required to procure more seeds (beans, corn, vegetables, yam, etc.) and to support the diversification of livelihoods, such as improved fishing, which has a huge potential for income improvement and better nutrition for families in coastal areas.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES & INTERVENTIONS

Strategic Objective 1: Increase resiliency against future food insecurity through the protection and enhancement of livelihoods and the development of community capacities

Under this objective, in FY 2008, activities were mainly conducted under Intermediate Result (IR) 1.1. Though some preliminary activities were planned for FY 2008 – per the original Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) – under IR 1.2 (Improved managerial and financial capacity of community based organizations (CBOs) and local groups), and IR 1.4 (Increased diversification of livelihood strategies), the late start of the project did not allow sufficient time to get the necessary staff hired. Therefore, all indicators for IR 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 were set at zero in the last version of the PMP submitted to USAID/Haiti.

IR 1.1: Enhanced agricultural productivity, environmental management and market linkages

Beans

An early assessment conducted in June 2008 confirmed that beans, yam and corn are the main farm products in the area of intervention (La Vallée, Bainet and Cotes de Fer). However, one major issue facing farmers in those areas is related to the availability of quality seeds at reasonable prices for the planting seasons – this is especially true for beans.

In order to assist farmers to better prepare for the next agricultural season (that runs from February to June), the project worked with farmers to introduce a new black bean variety (arifi wurifi), which has high yields, is easily adaptable to different environments, and is resistant to “mustia” (a common fungus found in the area affecting beans and significantly reducing yield). ACDI/VOCA was able to obtain the new bean strain through collaboration with the Center for

Research and Agricultural Development (CRDA) of the Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDP) and Agritech, a local development firm based in Jacmel.

ACDI/VOCA planned to install 114 test/demonstration plots and train 240 farmers in seed and improved bean production as a means of boosting agricultural productivity. The approach was designed to replicate and validate results already obtained in other areas of the country. Eighty plots totaling 1.59 hectares were established and 174 farmers were initially trained (see IPTT, Indicator #11). An additional 231 farmers (165 individuals over the estimated target) participated in the managing and tracking of these plots. The difference between the actual and target figures (168%) resulted from a larger than anticipated number of farmers who participated in the test plots using the Farmer Field School (FFS) methodology. Many farmers expressed keen interest to participate in this seed validation process.

In an effort to impart knowledge and information on natural resource management and biodiversity, field extension agents trained farmers on soil conservation, which included a discussion of the soil-slope-water-bean plantation relationship. Although more training was planned for tree planting and reforestation, it could not take place due to the hurricane season.

The following table provides a breakdown of the total number of farmers who received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training, broken down first by commune and then by gender.

Table 4: Number of individuals who received USG supported short-term agricultural productivity training

Type of training	Commune				Total
	La Vallée de Jacmel		Bainet		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Formally trained	71	15	63	25	174
Informally trained	127	31	55	18	231
Total	198	46	118	43	405

The hurricane season had a negative impact on the success of this activity. The plots were in a developmental stage when hurricane Gustav hit Southern Haiti. The high soil humidity resulting from Gustav destroyed or damaged 90% of the plots thereby causing a substantial decrease in yields. For IPTT Indicator #9 (number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USC assistance), the target for FY 2008 was zero. Nonetheless, the surviving 10% improved beans seeds were successfully validated and will be counted as a new transferred technology in FY'09.

Fruit

The early assessment conducted in June 2008 also confirmed the importance of fruit production in the rural household economy. The program planned to support and to further expand three communal fruit tree nurseries established by local authorities in La Vallée through the provision of equipment and technical assistance. A total of 1,500 farmers were identified to receive 50,000 fruit tree seedlings from the nurseries. Unfortunately, the hurricanes also damaged these tree

nurseries so the project had to be postponed, despite already acquiring some of the necessary nursery equipment.

During FY 2009, ACDI/VOCA anticipates that 11,380 farmers will receive short-term agricultural productivity training. It is estimated that 9,925 producers will use at least two sustainable agricultural technologies out of the five technologies or management practices made available for transfer (see IPTT, Indicators #8 and #9). The project will train 7,000 people including local authorities, students, CBO members, and smallholder farmers in one or more of the following subjects: (1) soil formation and erosion processes, (2) soil utilization, (3) soil and water conservation practices and their limits, (4) weed burning and consequences, (5) sustainable agriculture, and (6) proper management of used water coming from washed coffee in coffee production areas.

In FY 2009, for IR 1.2 and 1.3, program activities will provide CBOs and associations tailored training sessions on specific subjects such as: governance, accounting and effective functioning of executive committees and strategic planning. Additionally, a Community Finance and Savings Specialist will be brought on board in FY 2009 to help farmers form rotating savings groups and increase their access to financial resources. For IR1.4, it is expected that at least one fishermen association will be equipped and trained on the use of improved fishing devices.

Strategic Objective 2: Protect vulnerable populations against immediate food insecurity and develop capacity to address long-term nutrition and health needs

Though MCHN activities (food ration distribution, children vaccination, antenatal care and postpartum /newborn visits) were slated to begin in Cotes de Fer in August 2008, the hurricane season made this region inaccessible. The MSH team was able to obtain a variety of vaccines from the Ministry of Public Health (MSPP) but it was only transported to Cotes de Fer at the beginning of October 2008. MSPP also provided propane tanks for the health centers' refrigerators.

Despite the delays caused by the hurricanes, at the end of July 2008, a team from BND and MSH was able to work with health centers in Gris-Gris and Cotes de Fer to evaluate conditions and further refine the design of capacity-building interventions. Qualified MCHN food recipients were also identified and issued ration cards for the distribution (originally planned in August), which was ultimately delayed due to the destruction of access roads to the communes.

Two workshops were organized by MSH in August 2008. In the first two-day workshop, MSH trained 76 Community Volunteers (Col-Vols) in Cotes de Fer and Gris-Gris. The objective of the workshop was to lay down the foundation for an effective vaccination program and improved delivery of newborn and infant health services (to be provided through the food distribution program). The second workshop, organized at the Cotes de Fer health center, presented the program's objectives and IPTT indicators (that need to be monitored) in relation to the center's health information system. The Col-Vols' area of intervention and the availability of human and material resources were also discussed.

Since the MCHN program relies primarily on existing health centers, the targets will be difficult to reach within the area of intervention at the beginning of the program, as the number of available health institutions and personnel are insufficient to cover all the targeted mother and children populations. The identification of local community resources and the carrying out of capacity building activities (such as the build up or reinforcement of community structures) are therefore FY 2009 priorities. Health center managers, health agents, community nurses, and doctors working with the program will be asked to participate to working sessions during the first quarter of FY 2009 in order to harmonize their understanding of indicators from the IPTT. A bulletin board will be prepared as a means of following-up with matrons or midwives as well as communicating revised distributions of feed rations. The program will plan its project implementation with the Southeast Health Department Director in order to avoid duplication the efforts with other NGOs working in the MYAP area of intervention. In order to meet FY 2009 PMP targets, the project will increase its efforts in pre and post-natal care, family planning and mother/infant feeding via the training of field health agents. It also plans on designing and establishing beneficiary registers and monitoring tools in order to better track the project's progress.

Strategic Objective 3: Improve the abilities of communities to identify and successfully respond to vulnerabilities and impending shocks

During FY 2008, the project undertook activities in La Vallée and Bainet for slow and rapid onset emergencies. The project developed an Early Warning System (EWS) to monitor slow onset disasters. Since August 2008, market prices have been collected on a regular basis in five local marketplaces – directly by ACDI/VOCA staff in La Vallée and Bainet, and indirectly by MARNDR staff in Cotes de Fer, Thiote and Jacmel. ACDI/VOCA has monitored the prices and flows of commodities including imported rice, corn (processed and un-processed), sorghum (pitimi), white and black beans, groundnuts, bananas, cooking oil, charcoal and/or wood and livestock. Primary agricultural crops such as beans, corn, and yams have also been monitored through field observation. Three rain gauges were installed by ACDI/VOCA in La Vallée and one in Bainet and three additional ones were installed by MARNDR staff in Cotes de Fer, Thiote and Jacmel. In order to ensure proper data collection, seven ACDI/VOCA project agricultural extension agents and eight agents from other institutions in Jacmel and Thiote were trained by ACDI/VOCA), on rainfall data collection, in collaboration with the Coordination Nationale de la Sécurité Alimentaire (CNSA). The data is submitted on a regular basis to the CNSA – it has also been communicated to a larger audience through two monthly newsletters produced by ACDI/VOCA staff. As an active member of the CNSA, ACDI/VOCA participated in a joint visit to the field with the CNSA staff to set up the EWS for the Southeast. In addition, the ACDI/VOCA program assisted CNSA to acquire 100 rain gauges to be installed throughout the country for rainfall data collection to complement the 40 additional rain gauges that ACDI/VOCA plans to install throughout the Southeast department.

Unfortunately, ACDI/VOCA's EWS is currently unable to provide data on malnourished children since health activities have not yet fully started. Nonetheless, a total of 34 communities are currently monitored to track rainfall and market price patterns meant to mitigate the effects of drought and price shocks. The FY 2008 actual number of communities with a recently established EWS exceeded the FY 2008 target by 18% because the number of localities in the

areas chosen for rainfall and price observation was underestimated. For FY 2009, the system will be extended to other communes and capacity-building activities will be organized to reinforce the local authorities' ability to better monitor and interpret data.

ACDI/VOCA participated in three Disaster Meeting Committees (DMCs) with DPC representatives to prepare action plans and respond to the 2008 hurricanes.

ACDI/VOCA planned to train at least 10 local authorities on disaster preparedness and to support the DPC establish a Local Civil Protection Committee in La Vallée. Unfortunately, the emergency situation resulting from the hurricanes caused heavy flooding and inaccessibility to the area of intervention, which made it impossible to hold the training. Furthermore, staff was mobilized to assist in emergency activities such as the distribution of food, water and hygiene kits in coordination with other partners.

At present, the EWS does not provide data on some indicators (PMP indicators # 45, 47, 50, 51, and 52) as a result of the emergency situation. The late start-up also delayed the project's goal to prepare proposals, disaster preparation and response plans. In particular, for IPTT Indicator #48, (number of disaster response recovery proposals prepared with DMCs and submitted to donor), the hurricanes' timing (tail end of FY 2008) did not allow insufficient time for local committees to prepare proposals on how to respond to the disaster.

For FY 2009, ACDI/VOCA plans to train 40 people in disaster preparedness and to establish EWS in the remaining targeted communes. In coordination with the DPC, the Comité de Protection Civil Local (KPSL) will be established and trained in La Vallée. During the budgeting process, major activities to finance the EWS and relevant trainings were cut. As such, significant revisions are needed to make these activities feasible.

B. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

As described below, a number of changes were made to the program's Monitoring and Evaluation plan, specifically under Strategic Objective 1, one agricultural target was revised, and under Strategic Objective 2 where a number of MCHN indicators had to be revised to reflect the reductions made in the FY 2009 beneficiary levels caused by the increasing commodity prices and the roll-out plan in new communes. Additionally, the inspection of rural-based health centers uncovered a much more limited capacity compared to what had originally been anticipated (i.e. insufficient personnel within the health centers including a lack of local/community qualified human resources to conduct MCHN activities, and insufficient number of health centers to cover the targeted population). FY 2009 targets were therefore revised to reflect the reality on the ground as illustrated in the IPTT.

Revised FY 2009 Strategic Objective 1 Indicator Target, as illustrated in the IPTT (Attachment 1)

- # of producers using at least two sustainable agricultural technologies (FFP PMP IR 2.3) (Indicator #8). The targets for FY 2009-2012 were adjusted to reflect a more realistic adoption rate of new technologies by farmers. In general, farmers need to be convinced that "improved" practices actually work – this depends largely on profitability, availability of cash and labor, and the natural environment. The previous targets

submitted showed an adoption rate of 87% in the first year, which is not feasible in a new project and is inconsistent with the experience of other CSs' implementing food security interventions in Haiti. As such, more realistic targets were proposed and are reflected in both the IPTT (Attachment1) and the Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ).

Revised FY 2009 Objective 2 Indicator Targets, as illustrated in the IPTT (Attachment 1):

- # of pregnant and lactating mothers receiving food rations (Indicator #21). This indicator was reduced from 900 to 670 to reflect program cuts due to rising commodity prices. This was presented in the PREP in August 2008.
- # of children aged 6-23 months receiving food rations (Indicator #22). This indicator was reduced from 3,700 to 2,840 to reflect program cuts due to rising commodity prices. This was presented in the PREP in August 2008.
- # of malnourished children aged 6-59 months receiving food rations (Indicator #23). This indicator was reduced from 1,350 to 900 to reflect program cuts due to rising commodity prices. This was presented in the PREP in August 2008.
- # of postpartum /newborn visits in USG-assisted programs (3.1.6.3. (F)) (Indicator #29). This indicator was reduced from 3,773 to 1,574. Qualified Health Agents within the community are insufficient – the program must recruit and train them first to be able to conduct visits and collect appropriate information. This recruiting-training process is time consuming and will not allow the new agents to conduct enough visits and collect the appropriate information in order to achieve the previous target.
- # of antenatal care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities (3.1.6.4 (F)) (Indicator #30). This indicator was reduced from 3,920 to 2,000 taking into account the lack of health institutions and their relative distance to the beneficiary. The set up of Mobile Cliniques is first needed to achieve this target.
- # of people trained in maternal/newborn health through USG-supported programs (3.1.6.5 (F)) (Indicator #31). This indicator was reduced from 130 to 30 to reflect revised beneficiary levels for the year FY 2009 and the roll out of field health agents.
- # of deliveries with a Skilled Birth Attendant (SBA) in USG-assisted programs (3.1.6.6 (F)) (Indicator #32). This indicator was reduced from 2,205 to 1,547 to reflect the number of health centers available in the area of intervention and their institutional weaknesses. In support to the health community structure build-up strategy, special training needs to be organized for traditional birth attendants and village midwives to acquire appropriate skills.
- # of people trained in child health care and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (3.1.6.7 (F)) (Indicator #33). This indicator was reduced from 7,174 to 1,500 as a reflection of training programs planned in the first quarter of FY 2009 in Cotes de Fer, and roll out to Belle Anse, Grand Gosier and Anse-a-Pitre in the remaining quarters. The

previous target has been cut down dramatically to the lack of necessary requirements in the area of intervention such as the presence of qualified trainers and mother clubs. The roll out of this activity will first consist in recruiting and training trainers on child health care & nutrition, the development of a training curriculum and the organization of mothers into clubs that are to be regularly attended a regularly basis training session.

- # of children less than 12 months of age who received DTP3 in a given year from USG-supported programs (3.1.6.12 (F)) (Indicator #35). This indicator was reduced from 1,632 to 424 based on the reduction in target beneficiaries and to reflect the EMMUS IV study concerning DTP3 vaccination coverage.
- Couple-years of protection (CYP) in USG-supported programs (3.1.7.2 (F)) (Indicator #39). This figure was reduced from 5,800 to 3,000 in order to take into account contraceptive methods promoted by the health institution (depo provera, ovrette, lofemenal, and condoms) and their capacity to provide CYP. The long-term method is not offered by health care institutions. In some regions, family planning is not well known and it will require several social mobilization activities.

C. SUCCESS STORIES

In late September 2008, ACDI/VOCA and its partner BND distributed an eight-day emergency food ration of USG-donated food (provided through USAID) accompanied by hygiene kits, water purification tablets, and jerry cans (obtained through International Organization of Migration (IOM) and the United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF)) to 750 families affected by the 2008 hurricanes in Bainet, La Vallée, and Jacmel. The distribution was planned with the active engagement of the local authorities and was a success not only in getting food and in supplies to the people who needed it, but also in terms of security, safety and efficiency.

Beneficiary families were extremely grateful to the USG for these goods. During a distribution in La Vallée, Mrs. Jere, the grandmother in one of the impacted families, brought her 12-month-old granddaughter, Julienne, to receive assistance after they lost their home. The baby girl came to the distribution site with a piece of sugar cane that her grandmother had given her to ease the hunger. After receiving the food and other items, she said the following: “Thanks to the American people, I’ll be able to feed my granddaughter well today!”

ACDI/VOCA considers our intervention in the hurricane-affected areas a success because we were able to contribute to the hurricane response despite our limited capacity at this early stage in the program. While we did not reach a large number of beneficiaries, we believe this shows the potential of ACDI/VOCA to succeed on a number of fronts in Haiti under extremely difficult circumstances.

D. LESSONS LEARNED

ACDI/VOCA has learned many programmatic and logistical lessons during FY 2008 implementation of the Haiti MYAP in Southeast Haiti.

Livelihoods/Agriculture

- *Fungicide:* As mentioned above, 90% of the project beans that had been planted during FY 2008 were lost due to the heavy rains. A large portion of this loss could have been prevented with a Pesticide Evaluation Report and Safer Use Action Plan (PERSUAP) in place. This highlighted the necessity to prepare a PERSUAP and get pre-approval for certain fungicides in FY 2009 to prevent additional losses in the next rainy season.
- *Agricultural extension agents:* Given the increased food insecurity, and despite budget cuts, more extension agents and agronomists will be hired (instead of full-time staff as originally planned) in order to reach a larger number of beneficiaries. Furthermore, the program will also need to find funds for seeds, agricultural inputs, and market chain for some of its required activities (e.g. agricultural input supply shops). It is unclear at this time whether there are sufficient funds to ramp up these activities.
- *Watershed crisis:* Many watersheds in the Southeast of Haiti are in critical condition. They will need major interventions with government involvement. More specifically, the poor conditions at La Montagne have already had devastating effects on the town of Jacmel, and other areas remain in critical conditions such as Mapou, Belle Anse, and Marigot.

Health

- *Health Centers:* While it was assumed that the formal health service system in the Southeast was poor, the number of health centers in the area was overestimated as there is a great lack of such centers (especially in Belle Anse where there is only 1 for this large commune). This situation makes it much more difficult to achieve stated objectives whereby data would be collected at these centers for reporting indicators. As a result, Strategic Objectives 2 targets were revised accordingly. Furthermore, strategies need to be revised too to use train more health agents or matrons so that they can provide health services in the absence of health clinics.
- *Water:* Access to water is a much bigger problem than anticipated. Many areas need major water access interventions - not only for drinking water, but also for irrigation systems for agricultural production, especially in dry areas such as Belle Anse, Grand Gosier, and Anse-a-Pitres. Unfortunately, the funds for this area under the MYAP were under-budgeted in the proposal.

Early Warning System

- ACIDI/VOCA designed an ambitious program for the Southeast of Haiti to install an operational EWS by working closely with the DPC and develop local disaster management committees. One major challenge concerns the training of DPC representatives in each locality, namely that officials will not participate in trainings unless fees are paid to “certify” these trainings. Most NGOs are compelled to pay these fees and it is difficult to operate without the DPC’s blessing. As such, this presents a challenge to the program and a significant cost constraint to effect training in hurricane prone areas.

Emergency Response

- ACIDI/VOCA did its best to respond to the FY 2008 relentless hurricane season, despite its early phase of implementation. Beneficiaries in MYAP target areas were grateful for

ACDI/VOCA's interventions, especially following Hurricane Gustav, which flooded many parts of the Southeast. As the organization was only newly installed in La Vallée and Bainet communes, those interventions bolstered ACDI/VOCA's reputation - especially in those communities where the project had already started agricultural work as early as June.

- Despite this positive feedback from communities, it became evident to staff that normal project activities cannot carry on regularly after any similar major disaster. In addition, ACDI/VOCA has realized the impact that such calamities can have on project results. Furthermore, ACDI/VOCA has understood that it cannot and should not be compared to CRS or World Vision, who both have separate emergency response units. ACDI/VOCA requests different expectations from the donor given the project's small pipeline and therefore the need to tailor our emergency response activities to our comparative advantage, specifically, short-term emergency distribution if warranted and agricultural development in the post recovery and rehabilitation phase.

Commodity Management

- *Warehouses:* The construction of rural satellite warehouses is critical for the food security of extremely remote areas such as Cotes de Fer. This became apparent in the aftermath of Hurricane Gustav, when it became impossible to reach these areas by road to bring in emergency rations, as they were completely flooded. Requests were put in for three helicopters, but given the magnitude of the crisis in Gonaives, there was a waiting list for their use. Incredibly, some areas have remained inaccessible even three months after Hurricane Gustav. Furthermore, it would be ideal to build a warehouse in the Cotes de Fer area in conjunction with a local association, and would present important skill-building and livelihood opportunities for the people in the area as well as serve as a source of food for future emergencies. The warehouse could be used for bulking farmer products, food aid, and World Food Programme (WFP) items (such as pre-positioning water purification tablets and energy biscuits earlier in the season).

Logistical

- *Office start up:* The running and start-up of a major program office in a non-capital city (such as Jacmel) has taken longer than expected, first due to an energy problem in Jacmel, which was later worsened by the hurricanes in August and September 2008.

Attachment 1: Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT)

No	Indicator	Disaggregate by	Baseline	2008	2008	2008 %	2009	2009	2009 %	2010	2010	2010 %	2011	2011	2011 %	2012	2012	2012 %	LOA
				Target	Actual	Act. Vs. Target	Target												
PROGRAM GOAL: Food insecurity among the vulnerable people of Southeast Haiti reduced (Baseline to identify direct beneficiaries)																			
1	% of underweight children (0-59 months) (<-2 WAZ) (PMP SO1)	age/sex																13.7%	13.7%
2	% of stunted children (0-59 months) (<-2 HAZ) (PMP SO2a)	age/sex																22.7%	22.7%
3	% of beneficiary children (0-59 months) of age who gained weight in past 3 months (PMP SO2b)	age / sex																70%	70%
4	Average # of months of adequate household food provisioning (PMP SO3)																	7.2	7.2
5	Household dietary diversity score (#) (PMP SO4)																	9.6	9.6
6	# of targeted direct beneficiaries reached (PMP IR 2.1)	sex	0	2,400	3650	152	33,425			54,925			72,750			72,750			72,750
7	# rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance (4.5.2.8 (F))		0	500	924	185	9,925			12,675			16,450			16,450			16,450
Objective 1: Increase Resiliency against future food insecurity through the protection and enhancement of livelihoods and the development of community capacities.																			
<i>IR 1.1 Enhanced agricultural productivity, environmental management and market linkages</i>																			
8	# of producers using at least 2 sustainable agricultural technologies (FFP PMP IR 2.3)	sex/watershed/commune	0	0	0	N/A	4,666			9,741			16,560			16,560			16,560
9	# of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance. (4.5.2.4 (F))		0	0	1	N/A	5			TBD			TBD			TBD			
10	# of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance 4.5.2.7 (F)	sex of Head of HH	0	500	924	185	9,925			12,675			16,650			21,150			21,150
11	# of individuals who have received USG supported short term agricultural sector productivity training 4.5.2.12 (F)	sex	0	240	405	168	11,380			18,380			24,000			24,000			24,000
12	# of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance 4.8.1.1 (F)	watershed / commune	0	0			2,000			5,000			7000			7,800			18,200
13	# of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance 4.8.1.2 (F)		0	0			TBD												
14	# of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance. 4.8.1.4 (F)	sex categories of benefits received	0																96,000
15	# of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation 4.8.1.5 (F)	sex/watershed	0	240	174	72.5	11,380			18,380			24,000			24,000			24,000
<i>IR 1.2 Improved organizational and functional capacity of agricultural associations</i>																			
16	% of communities with improved capacity (identified as producer associations) (PMP IR 2.7)		0	0	0	N/A	5			10			15			20			20
17	# of producer organizations, water user associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations receiving USG assistance (4.5.2.9 (F))		0	0	0	N/A	60			75			90			120			120
18	# of women's organizations/ associations assisted as a result of USG supported interventions. (4.5.2.13 (F))		0	0	0	N/A	15			20			25			25			25
<i>IR 1.3 Increased access to financial resources</i>																			
19	% increase in group savings		0	0%	0	N/A	25%			30%			30%			35%			35%

No	Indicator	Disaggregate by	Baseline	2008	2008	2008 % Act. Vs. Target	2009	2009	2009 % Act. Vs. Target	2010	2010	2010 % Act. Vs. Target	2011	2011	2011 % Act. Vs. Target	2012	2012	2012 % Act. Vs. Target	LOA
				Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target
<i>IR 1.4 Diversification of livelihood strategies</i>																			
20	# of MSME's receiving business development services as a result of USG assistance (4.5.2.14 (F))		0	0	0	N/A	5			12			17			22			22
Objective 2: Protect vulnerable populations against immediate food insecurity and develop capacity to address long-term nutrition and health needs																			
<i>IR 2.1 Increased access to nutritious foods at the household level</i>																			
21	# of pregnant and lactating mothers receiving food rations		0	0	0	N/A	670			1,870			2,100			2,100			2,100
22	# of children aged 6-23 months receiving food rations		0	0	0	N/A	2,840			8,170			9,300			9,300			9,300
23	# of malnourished children aged 6-59 months receiving food rations		0	0	0	N/A	900			2,700			3,150			3,150			3,150
24	# of fuel saving stoves distributed		0	25	0	0	40			TBD									
25	Amount of fuel saved via introduction of fuel efficient stoves[1]		0	N/A	N/A	N/A	52,560 KG			TBD									
<i>IR 2.2 Improved maternal and child health</i>																			
26	% of children 0-6 months of age exclusively breastfed (PMP IR 2.2)	sex	40.60%	45.60%	0	0	55.60%			60.60%			65.60%			75.60%			75.6%
27	% of births attended by skilled health personnel (3.1.6.1)	age														50%			50%
28	% of children < 12 months fully vaccinated. (3.1.6.2)	sex														70%			70%
29	# of postpartum/newborn visits in USG-assisted programs (3.1.6.3 (F))	≤3 days		230	0	0	1,574			3,773			4,018			4,165			4,615
30	# of antenatal care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities (3.1.6.4 (F))		0	480	0	0	2,000			3,920			4,165			4,410			4,410
31	# of people trained in maternal/newborn health through USG-supported programs (3.1.6.5 (F))	sex	0	5	0	0	30			130			130			130			130
32	# of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA) in USG-assisted programs (3.1.6.6 (F))	age, location	1,960	0	0	N/A	1,547			2,205			2,401			2,450			2,450
33	# of people trained in child health care and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (3.1.6.7 (F))	sex	0	150	0	0	1,500			7,174			14,348			16,739			16,739
34	# of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (3.1.6.1 (F))		0	0	0	N/A	3,740			10,840			12,450			12,450			12,450
35	# of children less than 12 months of age who received DPT3 in a given year from USG-supported programs (3.1.6.12 (F))	sex	1,260	160	0	0	424			1,632			1,958			2,447			2,447
36	# of children < 5 years of age who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (3.1.6.13 (F))	sex	699	100	0	0	914			1,142			1,370			1,599			1,599
37	# of cases of child diarrhea treated in USAID-assisted programs (3.1.6.14 (F))	sex, age	3,185	0	0	N/A	3,342			TBD									
38	% of people in reproductive age using a modern family planning method in USAID geographic target areas. (3.1.7.1)	sex, age														40%			40%
39	Couple-years of protection (CYP) in USG-supported programs (3.1.7.2 (F))	Zone U/R	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,000			5,800			10,200			14,000			14,000
<i>IR 2.3 Improved household sanitation and access to water</i>																			

No	Indicator	Disaggregate by	Baseline	2008	2008	2008 % Act. Vs. Target	2009	2009	2009 % Act. Vs. Target	2010	2010	2010 % Act. Vs. Target	2011	2011	2011 % Act. Vs. Target	2012	2012	2012 % Act. Vs. Target	LOA
				Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target
40	% of caregivers demonstrating proper personal hygiene (hand washing) behaviors (PMP IR 2.2)															80%			80%
41	# of people in target areas with access to improved drinking water supply as a result of USG assistance (3.1.8.2 (F))	sex/urban/rural	0	0	0	N/A	0			TBD									
42	# of people in target areas with access to improved sanitation facilities as a result of USG assistance (3.1.8.3 (F))	sex/urban/rural	0	100	0	N/A	150			TBD									
Objective 3: Improved ability to identify and successfully respond to vulnerabilities and impending shocks																			
<i>IR 3.1 Improved capacity of local organizations and groups to identify and respond to vulnerabilities and shocks</i>																			
43	% of assisted communities with disaster early warning and response system in place (PMP IR 2.4)		0	3%	21%	18%	25%			45%			80%			90%			90%
44	% of assisted community with improved physical infrastructure to mitigate impact of shocks (PMP IR 2.5)		0	5%	0	0	25%			30%			35%			40%			40%
45	% of assisted communities with safety nets to address the needs of their most vulnerable members (PMP IR 2.6)		0	0	0	0	5%			10%			15%			20%			20%
46	Number of people trained in disaster preparedness as a result of USG assistance (F indicator #?)	sex/commune	0	10	0	0	40			90			110			125			125
47	# of disaster preparation/ response plans with trigger indicators completed by DMCs in target area (MISSION)		0	0	0	N/A	5			15			20			25			25
48	# of disaster response recovery proposals prepared with DMCs and submitted to donor (MISSION)		0	2	0	0	6			17			TBD			TBD			TBD
49	# of DMC meetings attended in target area (MISSION)		0	5	3	60%	15			35			45			50			50
50	# of risk reduction/ mitigation proposals completed (MISSION)		0	2	0	0	7			17			22			25			25
51	# of true safety nets established and run by community (MISSION)		0	0	0	N/A	5			10			15			20			20
52	# of safety net proposal completed by community in target areas (MISSION)		0	0	0	N/A	TBD			TBD			TBD			TBD			TBD

FFP Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ) - FY 2008

YOUR COMMENTS

You may make comments, if desired in this column. I.e., if you are uncertain whether a particular indicator is what FFP is looking for, mention it here.

CS PROGRAM INFORMATION

CS Name(s)	ACDI/VOCA
Country <small>(or Countries, for Regional Programs)</small>	Haiti
Project location(s) in country	Southeast Department (Communes: Thiotte, Grand-Gosier, Anse a Pitre, Belle-Anse, La Vallee, Bainet and Cotes de Fer)
Program Start Date (mm/dd/yy)	2/19/2008
Program End Date (mm/dd/yy)	2/18/2013
Program Name	Multi Year Assistance Program
TA or Project Number	FFP-A-00-08-00029

CS CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name (person filling out the SAPQ)	Nael Jean Baptiste, M&E Manager
Contact Email	njean-baptiste@acdivoca-haiti.org
Contact Address	92 rue Gregoire, Petion-Ville, Haiti
Contact Phone	509 36 53 32 94

SECTION 1: Data from a Representative Population-based Survey

This section asks for impact data coming from a quantitative survey such as a baseline or final evaluation

1	<p>Did your program conduct a quantitative, population-based, statistically representative survey such as a baseline or final evaluation in FY 08?</p> <p>Answer "Yes, '08" if you conducted a survey in FY08. Answer "Yes, '07" if you conducted a survey in FY07 but you did not report on it in last year's FY07 SAPQ because the final data were not yet available. If you conducted a survey in FY07 and already reported the results in the FY07 SAPQ, choose "No".</p>	Yes/No	If No, go directly to Question 15
		Yes, '08	

2	<p>Which type of quantitative survey did your program conduct in FY 08?</p> <p>Choose your answer from the drop down menu.</p>	Baseline Survey

3	<p>Are the final data from your program's survey available at this time?</p> <p>Do not answer "Yes" if you have preliminary data only. If final data are not yet available, answer "No" and report on them in next year's SAPQ. Only final data should be entered into the SAPQ.</p>	Yes/No	If No, go directly to Question 15
		No ----->	

1A: Months of Adequate Food Provisioning

4	<p>What is the estimated total number of households in your target geographic area?</p> <p>Your program's survey interviewed a <i>sample</i> of the households in your target geographic areas; what is the <i>population</i> of households represented by your survey?</p>	FY 08
		# households in target areas

5	<p>In the survey, did your program measure number of months of (in)adequate food provisioning, following the standard FANTA methodology for this indicator?</p> <p>See the "Definitions" tab for a description of the standard methodology for this indicator.</p>	Yes/No	If No, go directly to Question 7

6	<p>What was the average number of months of adequate food provisioning?</p> <p>Fill out the table below with the data from your survey conducted in FY 08. If you measured INADEQUATE instead of ADEQUATE months, convert your data to ADEQUATE months (12 - number of inadequate months). Only provide data if you used the standard FANTA methodology.</p> <p>If this is a baseline survey, please also provide your future year target(s) for this indicator.</p> <p>If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the average number of months of adequate food provisioning data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY 08 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.</p>	Future Targets						
		FY 08	Most recent FY prior to FY 08 <small>(enter n/a if FY 08 was the baseline)</small>		FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
		# months	From which FY?	# months	# of months	# of months	# of months	# of months
		Indicator						
	Average number of months of ADEQUATE food provisioning							

1B: Household Dietary Diversity

7	<p>In the survey, did your program measure household dietary diversity, following the standard FANTA methodology for this indicator?</p> <p>See the "Definitions" tab for a description of the standard methodology for this indicator.</p>	Yes/No	If No, go directly to Question 9

8	<p>What was the average household dietary diversity?</p> <p>Fill out the table below with the data from your survey conducted in FY 08. Only provide data if you used the standard FANTA methodology.</p> <p>If this is a baseline survey, please also provide your future year target(s) for this indicator.</p> <p>If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the average dietary diversity data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY 08 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.</p>	Future Targets						
		FY 08	Most recent FY prior to FY 08 <small>(enter n/a if FY 08 was the baseline)</small>		FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
		# of food groups	From which FY?	# of food groups				
		Indicator						
	Average household dietary diversity score							

1C: Underweight

9	<p>In the survey, did your program measure the prevalence of underweight (WAZ <-2) in children 0 - 59 mo of age?</p>	Yes/No	If No, go directly to

If you measured underweight for a different age group, or you used a different measure or cutoff, answer NO.

Question 12

10 **What was the prevalence of underweight (WAZ <-2) in children 0 - 59 months of age?**
 If this survey is a baseline survey, please also provide your future year target(s) for this indicator.
 If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the underweight data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY 08 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

Indicator	FY 08		Future Targets			
	% underweight	Most recent FY prior to FY 08 (enter n/a if FY 08 was the baseline)	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
% of underweight (WAZ<-2) children 0-59 months of age						

11 **What is the estimated total number of children 0-59 mo of age, living in your target geographic area?**

FY 08
0-59 mo

Your program's survey interviewed a *sample* of the children 0-59 mo of age living in your target geographic area; what is the *population* of children 0-59 mo of age?

1D: Stunting

12 **In the survey, did your program measure the prevalence of stunting (HAZ <-2) in children 6 - 59 mo of age?**

If you measured stunting for a different age group, or you used a different measure or cutoff, answer NO.

Yes/No

If No, go directly to Question 15

13 **What was the prevalence of stunting (HAZ <-2) in children 6 - 59 mo of age?**
 If this survey is a baseline survey, please also provide your future year target(s) for this indicator.
 If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the stunting data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY 08 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

Indicator	FY 08		Future Targets			
	% underweight	Most recent FY prior to FY 08 (enter n/a if FY 08 was the baseline)	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
% of stunted (HAZ<-2) children 6-59 months of age						

14 **What is the estimated total number of children 6-59 mo of age, living in your target geographic area?**

FY 08
0-59 mo

Your program's survey interviewed a *sample* of the children 6-59 mo of age living in your target geographic areas; what is the *population* of children 6-59 mo of age represented by your survey?

SECTION 2: Annual Monitoring Data

This section asks for data about direct beneficiaries, coming from your routine monitoring system

15 **Did your program implement (deliver goods and services to beneficiaries) in FY 08?**

Yes/No

Yes

If No, you are FINISHED. Submit the SAPQ.

2A: Anthropometry

16 **Did your program implement activities to maintain or improve the nutritional status of beneficiaries in FY 08?**

Yes/No

No ----->

If No, go directly to Question 18

17 **What anthropometric indicators does your program use for regular monitoring of the nutritional status of beneficiaries?**

For each indicator, fill in the desired direction of change (increase or decrease) and the data for FY 08 and the previous year, FY 07. It is OK to leave prior year data blank if you do not have beneficiary data from the prior year.

Fill out the table below with the ANTHROPOMETRIC indicators used by your program for annual monitoring of the nutritional status of your program's beneficiaries. Please write the precise definition for each indicator, including the measure used and the age group (e.g. % of children 0 - 23 mo old with WAZ < -2). In other words, do not write simply "Malnutrition rate" or "Recovery rate" or "% graduating from feeding program" without explaining what anthropometric measure and cutoff is used.

Please provide only ANTHROPOMETRIC indicators. Acceptable anthropometric measures include prevalence of stunting (height for age Z - HfA), underweight (weight for age - WfA), wasting (weight for height WfH), weight gain, growth faltering (trend of weight gain), body mass index (BMI), middle-upper arm circumference (MUAC); average HfA Z score (HAZ), WfA Z score (WAZ), WfH Z score (WHZ); proportion of children/adults recuperating to defined cutoffs (e.g. WAZ 80% median). Measures such as breastfeeding, vaccination rates, or numbers of ration recipients are NOT anthropometric.

Only include data for indicators that you monitor annually among direct beneficiaries. Annual data will be based on regular monitoring of your program beneficiaries and not on a representative sample survey of a broader population. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION

Indicators	Desired direction (+/-)	FY 08	FY 07
		actual %	actual %
17.1			
17.2			
17.3			
17.4			

2B: Behavior Change: Health, Nutrition, Hygiene

18 **Did your program implement activities to improve the health, nutrition, or hygiene behaviors of beneficiaries in FY 08?**

Yes/No

No ----->

If No, go directly to Question 20

19 What behavior change indicators does your program use for regular monitoring of beneficiaries?

For each indicator, fill in data on the FY 08 indicator value (i.e. the result achieved) and the number of beneficiaries reached in FY 08. Please provide future year targets for the indicator, as applicable.

Use the drop down menu to select the indicator on which you are reporting. Give the percentage (%) of beneficiaries adopting the improved health, nutrition or hygiene behaviors. You may take a census or a sample of your beneficiaries. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION. Only the indicators on the drop down menu can be included.

See FFP Information Bulletin 07-02 for further information on these indicators. For indicators with an *, the specific behaviors that comprise these indicators are to be defined by the cooperating sponsor. See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "beneficiaries".

Indicators	FY 08		Future Targets			
	actual %	# beneficiaries	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
	target %	target %	target %	target %	target %	
19.1	%	#	%	%	%	%
19.2	%	#	%	%	%	%
19.3	%	#	%	%	%	%
19.4	%	#	%	%	%	%

2C: Agricultural Extension

20 Did your program provide farmers with extension/outreach services in FY 08?

Yes/No
Yes

If No, go directly to Question 26

21 How many farmers (individuals, not households) received extension/outreach services in FY 08?

Please provide future year targets for number of farmer beneficiaries, as applicable.

# farmers	Future Targets				
	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
	# farmers	# farmers	# farmers	# farmers	# farmers
405	10,975	7,405	5,620	0	

These targets are annual (per year) as opposed to cumulative.

22 How many sustainable agricultural technologies did your program transfer in FY 08?
See the "Definitions" tab for more information about "agricultural technologies"

technologies
0

23 What are the sustainable agricultural technologies your program made available for transfer in FY 08?

If you transferred more than 10 technologies, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

23.1	
23.2	
23.3	
23.4	
23.5	
23.6	
23.7	
23.8	
23.9	
23.10	

24 What is the minimum number of sustainable agricultural technologies your program would like an individual farmer to use/adopt as a result of your program's assistance?

See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "minimum number"

technologies
2

numerator is # of producers using at least 2 sustainable agricultural technologies, denominator is 24,000 of LOP farmers trained

25 What percentage (%) of program beneficiaries (farmers) adopted the minimum number of technologies in FY 08?

Please provide the future year targets, as applicable.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

% beneficiary farmers	Future Targets				
	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
	% beneficiary farmers				
N/A	41%	53%	69%	69%	

2D: Disaster Early Warning Systems

26 Did your program assist communities to develop disaster early warning and response systems in FY 08?

See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "disaster early warning and response system".

Yes/No
Yes

If No, go directly to Question 29

27 How many communities does your program plan to assist to develop disaster early warning and response systems over the life of the agreement?

communities
165

28 How many of your program's targeted communities had disaster early warning and response systems in place in FY 08 as a result of your program's assistance?

Please provide the future year targets for # of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have early warning systems in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

# communities	Future Targets				
	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
35	41	74	132	149	
(Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	21%	25%	45%	80%	90%

The program will work with 165 communities and expects that 90% of them will develop early warning and response systems (149) by the end of project.

2E: Infrastructure To Mitigate Shocks

Did your program assist communities to improve or develop physical infrastructure to mitigate

29	the impact of shocks in FY 08? See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "infrastructure"	Yes/No	If No, go directly to Question 33
		No ----->	

30	How many communities does your program plan to assist to improve or develop infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks over the life of the agreement?	# communities

31	What kinds of physical infrastructure did your program improve or develop in FY 08? If there are more than 5 kinds of infrastructure, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.	31.1	
		31.2	
		31.3	
		31.4	
		31.5	

32	How many of your program's targeted communities had improved physical infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks in FY 08 as a result of your program's assistance? Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have infrastructure in place in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION. (Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	Future Targets				
		FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
		# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
		#	#	#	#	#
		#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

2F: Safety-Nets

33	Did your program assist communities to strengthen safety-nets to address the needs of their most vulnerable members in FY 08? A community-based safety net supported under a MYAP can be a broadly defined system for addressing the food security needs of a community's most vulnerable members during a shock. A community-based safety net is: managed and maintained by the community; internally resourced, at least in part; and can be year round or seasonal. Examples include community food banks or insurance schemes.	Yes/No	If No, go directly to Question 36
		No ----->	

34	How many communities does your program plan to assist to strengthen safety-nets over the life of the activity?	# communities

35	How many of your programs targeted communities had safety-nets in place in FY 08 as a result of your program's assistance? Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have safety nets in place in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION. (Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	Future Targets				
		FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
		# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
		#	#	#	#	#
		#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

2G: Community Capacity

36	Did your program assist communities to strengthen community capacity in FY 08? Community capacity refers to a community's ability to govern itself; to organize, analyze, plan, manage, problem-solve, implement actions, and represent its interests and participate in broader fora. This goes beyond targeted efforts to strengthen communities in nutrition, agriculture, infrastructure, early warning, or other topics covered elsewhere in the SAPQ.	Yes/No	If No, you are FINISHED. Submit the SAPQ.
		No ----->	

37	How many communities does your program plan to assist to strengthen community capacity over the life of the agreement?	# communities

38	What are the components of community capacity that your program strengthened in FY 08? Select from the drop down menu. If there are more than 10 components, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.	38.1	
		38.2	
		38.3	
		38.4	
		38.5	
		38.6	
		38.7	
		38.8	
		38.9	
		38.10	

39	How many of your program's targeted communities had strengthened community capacity in FY 08 as a result of your program's assistance? Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have strengthened capacity in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION. (Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	Future Targets				
		FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12
		# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
		#	#	#	#	#
		#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

SAPQ DEFINITIONS

Agriculture technologies	Agriculture technologies refer to the practice of combining land, labor, capital, and knowledge to produce, market, distribute, utilize, and trade food, feed, and fiber. Illustrative sustainable agriculture technologies may include, but are not limited to, low-input approaches, crop rotation (i.e., for soil fertility enhancement and/or pest management), intercropping, integrated farm systems (for example, tree-crop-fish pond-livestock systems), reforestation, water conservation and harvesting, cover cropping, green manure, effective composting, erosion control, improved seed varieties, non-invasive species, and integrated pest management. CSs are free to define "technology". One approach, however, is to say that agricultural technologies are transferred as a <i>package</i> of technologies that, when used in combination, have a proven <i>desired outcome</i> , such as increased yield or reduced soil erosion or a decrease in post-harvest losses. For instance, an Integrated Rice System is a package designed to increase rice yields. It consists of five technologies: seed selection, transplanting, water control, weeding, and fertilizing. Research shows a 50% increase in yield if all 5 technologies are used. Yield will still increase, but not by 50%, if 3 or 4 of the technologies are used.
Anthropometric indicators	The quantitative measurement of the human body. Anthropometric techniques are used to measure the absolute and relative variability in size, shape, and weight of the human body. Anthropometry follows a rigorous set of guidelines that include standardization of the measurement techniques and uniform reference standards and cutoffs.
Beneficiaries	<i>Direct beneficiaries</i> are those who come into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the program in each technical area. Individuals who receive training or benefit from program-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. Note: all recipients are beneficiaries, but not all beneficiaries are necessarily food ration recipients. Services include training and technical assistance provided directly by program staff, and training and technical assistance provided by people who have been trained by program staff (e.g., agricultural extension agents, village health workers). If cooperatives or organizations receive training or technical assistance from the program, all members of the cooperative/organization are considered direct beneficiaries. In a Food for Training (FFT) program, the direct beneficiaries are those trained under the program. In a Food for Work (FFW) or Food for Assets (FFA) program that is implemented as a stand-alone activity (e.g., not as part of a wider set of interventions in the technical sector), direct beneficiaries are those who directly participate in the activity (i.e., receive a ration), not all of those who use or benefit from the infrastructure/asset created. <i>Indirect beneficiaries</i> do not include those who benefit indirectly from the goods and services provided to the direct beneficiaries, e.g., members of the household of a beneficiary farmer who received technical assistance, seeds and tools, other inputs, credit, livestock, etc.; farmers from a neighboring community who might observe the effects of the training and demonstration plots in the target community and decide to adopt or model the new practices themselves; the population of all of the communities in a valley that uses a road improved by FFW; or all individuals who may have heard a radio message about prices, but who did not receive the other elements of an agricultural intervention necessary to increase incomes. Such individuals are considered <i>indirect beneficiaries</i> .
Communities	This is intentionally left undefined so that programs may use their own definition of what constitutes a "community". A "community" could be a village, but it doesn't necessarily have to be. A community is meant to be a geographic grouping (neighborhood, village, commune...); it does not refer to a group of people who all have a similar characteristic, like women or farmers.
Community Capacity	In this context, community capacity refers to a community's ability to govern itself; to organize, analyze, plan, manage, problem-solve, implement actions, and represent its interests and participate in broader fora. This goes beyond targeted efforts to strengthen communities in nutrition, agriculture, infrastructure, early warning or other topics covered elsewhere in the SAPQ.
Disaster early warning and response system	A community-based system that identifies increasing stress or oncoming shocks, indicates when actions need to be taken, and what the appropriate responses should be.
Household dietary diversity score	A standard food access indicator measuring the number of different food groups consumed by a household over a 24 hour recall period. This indicator is a proxy for household socioeconomic status and not a measure of dietary quality. It is collected through a household questionnaire consisting of one single question, using 12 standard food groups, asked of the person responsible for food preparation in the household. The population-based survey is usually conducted during the hungry season, on all the households selected in a representative sample. The questionnaire and instructions for data collection, tabulation, and analysis can be found in the Indicator Guide at http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/hdds_mahfp.shtml .
Minimum number of agricultural technologies	This is left to each program to define. Of the technologies being transferred, what minimum number of them are farmers expected to be able to realistically adopt while still having a significant desired outcome (i.e. increased yield)? Also see <i>Agriculture Technologies</i> above.
Number of months of adequate household food security	A standard food access indicator measuring the number of months a household had enough food to meet the family's needs over the last year. It is collected through a household questionnaire consisting of two questions asked of the person responsible for food preparation in the household. The population-based survey is usually conducted during the hungry season, on all the households selected in a representative sample. The questionnaire and instructions for data collection, tabulation, and analysis can be found in the Indicator Guide at http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/hdds_mahfp.shtml .
Physical infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks	Includes structures such as cyclone shelters, natural and artificial barriers such as flood embankments and tree plantations, and soil and water conservation and retention structures such as gully plugs.
Safety net	A community-based safety net supported under a MYAP can be a broadly defined system for addressing the food security needs of a community's most vulnerable members during a shock. A community-based safety net is: managed and maintained by the community; internally resourced, at least in part; and can be year round or seasonal. Examples include community food banks or insurance schemes.
Shock	A rapid or slow onset event (or set of events) having a detrimental effect on a population's food security status by impeding one or more of the three elements of food security (availability, access, utilization). Shocks can occur occasionally or recurrently. The source of the shock(s) can be: natural (drought, floods, earthquake, hurricane, etc.); political (conflict, civil war); economic (employment insecurity, hyper-inflation, collapsed terms of trade); and/or, health-related (epidemics, endemic disease, and widespread malnutrition).
Sustainable agriculture	A sustainable agriculture system provides needed nutrition and economic growth while promoting natural resource management to protect or enhance the environment (i.e., natural resources and/or human health). This system is economically viable and market driven while ensuring local replicability, gender equity, and social acceptability (e.g., sensitive to potential for conflict over scarce resources). Such a sustainable agriculture system uses agriculture technologies to offset losses of and/or regenerate soil fertility, prevent erosion of topsoil, safely and affordably manage pests, protect water quality and quantity, reduce post-harvest storage losses, and enhance resiliency to climatic fluctuations. An appropriate agriculture system relies on agricultural technologies that rely on market-driven demand to maximize return and predictability of income generation and consider the capacity and seasonality of labor input that a household can allocate to agriculture, particularly those households affected by chronic disease (e.g., HIV/AIDS and TB). A sustainable agriculture system balances community needs assessed via a participatory rural appraisal with the community's capacity to maintain access to the intervention once the USAID program has successfully ended.

FY 2008 FFP Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ)

Purpose

The Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ) allows Food for Peace (FFP) to collect standardized data across all Title II programs and countries on an annual basis. These data are aggregated at an Agency level so that FFP can report to the U.S. Congress and other stakeholders on progress made against its Strategic Plan FY 2006-2010 objective of reducing food insecurity among vulnerable populations. The questions asked in the SAPQ correspond to the indicators in the FFP Performance Management Plan (PMP).

The SAPQ is strictly a reporting tool for collecting data from all programs and aggregating it together. The SAPQ is NOT used to evaluate or manage individual programs. It will not be reviewed by Country Backstop Officers. Please provide only the information requested in the manner requested, and do not modify or insert additional indicators or information. The Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) for MYAPs and Results Report narrative (for both MYAPs and SYAPs) are the appropriate place to tell the full story of your program, not the SAPQ.

Submission

Cooperating Sponsors (CS) should submit their Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire(s) **no later than DATE**. SAPQs should be sent with program Results Reports via both mail and email to: AMEX International, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 440, Washington, DC 20004; ffpdocs@amexdc.com.

Applicable Programs

All Cooperating Sponsors implementing Title II programs in FY 2008 must complete and submit one SAPQ per program in tandem with their annual Results Report. This includes Single-Year Assistance Programs (SYAPs), Multi-Year Assistance Programs (MYAPs) and Development Activity Programs (DAPs) implemented by Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), and the World Food Program (WFP). The only exception is partners implementing programs through the International Food Relief Partnership (IFRP). Again, results reported should be for all activities *implemented* in FY 2008, October 1, 2007 - September 30, 2008, regardless of when funding and commodities were actually provided and/or if the program began late in the FY and has few activities and results to report on.

If no activities were implemented in FY 2008, due to late commodity arrivals, etc., there is a question to that effect in the SAPQ. Please still fill out the SAPQ.

Formatting Issues and Input

Please do not reformat the questionnaire or its contents, i.e., insert or delete rows or columns, change font sizes or print parameters, etc. At the same time, CSs are encouraged to provide recommendations as to how to improve the functional use of this questionnaire, such as formatting, data entry, etc.

Please do not save the SAPQ in a different format such as .pdf. FFP needs to receive the SAPQ in the Excel format provided.

Please round figures to the nearest whole number. Do not report decimals. i.e. report 14% not 13.5%.

Questions

Questions directly related to the SAPQ may be directed to Hilary Hartman, AMEX International, at 202-962-0048, hhartman@amexdc.com, respectively. Please copy Vicky Michener, AED/FANTA Project, on all email correspondence at vmichener@aed.org. Questions related to individual country programs and performance should be directed to the respective FFP Country Backstop Officer or AMEX International support staff member.

SAPQ Instructions

CS Program and Contact Information

CS Name(s): Formal organization name or acronym is acceptable. If the program is implemented by a consortium, list the lead CS name and include the names of the partner organizations in parentheses.

Country(ies): Fill in the name of the country(ies) where activities are implemented.

Project location(s) in country: List regions (and specify country, if unclear) where activities take place.

Program Start Date: List the program start date as provided on the original Transfer Authorization. Dates should be provided in the following format: (MM/DD/YY).

Program End Date: List the program end date as provided on the original Transfer Authorization (TA) or subsequent TA modifications, as appropriate. Dates should be provided in the following format: (MM/DD/YY).

Program Name: List the formal name of the program as promoted by the CS, if available.

TA or Project Number: A Transfer Authorization (TA) is a document signed by the CS and FFP that describes the commodities being requested and the program in which they will be used. TA numbers are usually found on the first page or pages of FFP agreements. In the case of WFP, Project Numbers should be provided.

CS Contact Information: Include the name, email address, address, and phone number of the main person(s) responsible for completing the program's SAPQ. Should additional information be required, this person will be contacted by Food for Peace.

Definitions

- The terms used in the SAPQ questionnaire are defined in the "Definitions" tab.
- Age groups such as "0-59 months" mean children from 0-59.9 months of age; in other words, children under 60 months of age.
- The indicators of Number of months of (in)adequate food provisioning and Household dietary diversity are measured in particular ways that are explained in the "Definitions" tab. If you do not use the same method that is described, please do not provide data. If you have particular indicators you want to share with FFP (which do not match the indicators in this SAPQ) please report them in the IPTT, not the SAPQ.

SAPQ General Instructions

- *MYAPs awarded in FY07 and later* are required to report each year on all the Annual indicators that are applicable to their programs and on the applicable Impact indicators in the years for which they are available (e.g., baseline and final evaluation).
- *MYAPs awarded prior to FY07 and all SYAPs (including IFRP programs)* are asked only to provide the data if they have them.
- For many SYAPs (including IFRP programs), the majority of the SAPQ questions will not be applicable; however, SYAPs should still fill in the relevant sections of the SAPQ.
- See FFP Information Bulletin 07-02 for more information on which indicators apply to which programs, available online at http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/ffp/fy08_ffpib_new_reporting.pdf.
- ~~Submit one SAPQ per program. If you are working in several different regions in a country under a single MYAP or SYAP, submit a single SAPQ covering the entire program. If you are implementing more than one MYAP or SYAP in the same country, submit one SAPQ for each. Similarly, submit separate SAPQs for each MYAP and SYAP, i.e., do not combine data for a MYAP and a SYAP on the same form.~~
- For regional programs that cover more than one country, if your data are country-specific, please insert additional worksheets to ~~report on each country in addition to reporting the aggregated, program-wide data~~.
- Yes/No questions determine whether an indicator is applicable to your program or not. Notice the "skip" instructions to the right of the Yes/No questions. If you answer "No" to a question, you are asked to skip ahead, instead of providing indicator data for an area that does not apply to your program.
- ~~Annual beneficiary-based indicators are those for which you collect data every year based on beneficiary monitoring. Impact indicators are those collected periodically, at a minimum at baseline and final evaluation, through a population-based representative sample~~
- Type in the white cells only. Some cells contain drop-down menus and others allow you to enter a freeform response. Where there are drop-down menus, you must pick from the available choices --- do not modify the choices or substitute different indicators. When you are asked to type something in, notice what kind of information is being asked for. It could be a number (#), a percentage (%), a year (FY), or text.
- If your data do not exactly correspond to the particular indicator for which we are asking, please do not provide any data in those cells. For example, if you measure WfA for children aged 6-36 months, but we have asked for WfA for children aged 0-59 months, please do NOT provide your data as they are not exactly what we are asking for.
- All questions in the SAPQ ask you to provide data from the FY that has just ended. In addition, some questions ask for data collected (a) the previous fiscal year, in the case of annual indicators that show a change from year to year; or, (b) the last time you collected the indicator, in the case of impact level indicators, where you are also asked to write in the year that the data were collected. Please provide only the data for the years requested.
- When you are asked to provide future year targets, provide your most current thinking on those targets, even if you made a change to your targets and the change hasn't yet been approved by FFP.
- On some of the SAPQ questions, you are asked to provide the overall number of people, households, or communities affected by your program (for annual indicators) or in the target population (for impact level indicators). Please provide this information, which is necessary to create weighted averages for all Title II programs. FFP cannot use your data unless you provide this information.

INSTRUCTIONS

The Summary Request and Beneficiary Tracking Table allows the Office of Food for Peace (FFP) to analyze and compare a Cooperating Sponsor's (CS) fiscal and beneficiary data throughout the life of the program. After reading the Definitions tab, CSs should begin by entering data into the Summary Request Table, followed by the Beneficiary Table.

Please read the instructions below to ensure that the form is completed correctly. Commodities, formulas and other data have been provided in advance to ensure accuracy and conformity. Many of the cells are automatically calculated and are protected. These cannot be changed. To change the size of the document on the screen or the size of the drop down lists, go to the toolbar on your screen and select "View" followed by "Zoom" on the drop down menu, and alter the magnification number according to your needs.

For additional questions concerning how to complete the Summary Request and Beneficiary Tables, please contact AMEX International, FFP's institutional support contractor, at 202-962-0048 or dhouston@amexdc.com, or your relevant Country Backstop Officer at Food for Peace.

FY08 Summary Request Table

Complete this sheet prior to the Beneficiary by Sector table. CSs should capture ALL costs associated with their programming within this table, assigning them to the applicable technical sector(s). This includes monetization, support funds (ITSH, Section 202(e), etc.), NICRA/indirect costs, etc.

Country: Enter the name of the country covered by the Summary Request Table. In cases where one program operates in multiple countries or in a geographical region, please specify those countries/region.

Cooperating Sponsor: Enter the name or initials of the Cooperating Sponsor (implementing organization).

Submission Date: Enter the date of submission of the document in MM/DD/YYYY format.

Submission Type: Enter the submission type from the drop down list: Original, Revision #1, Revision #2, etc.

Fiscal Year (FY): From the drop down list, enter the fiscal year of implementation for which reporting is being provided.

Technical Sector: Enter the applicable technical sectors (HIV or non-HIV) covered by your program, separating those activities that target HIV beneficiaries. Once complete, you will now enter commodity and dollar resources based on the disaggregation of technical sectors, which will subtotal at the bottom of the table. Definitions for each sector are provided on the 'Definitions' tab of the table, along with instructions for defining HIV beneficiaries within technical sectors. For most IFRP programs, the appropriate technical sector will be Vulnerable Group Feeding/Social Safety Net.

Commodity: Enter the final metric tonnage (MT) totals received by your program in FY08.

Cash Resources - Specify: Enter any other final resource totals for your program for FY08. Write the complete dollar amount, and specify the source (IFRP, mission, private sector, or host government, etc.).

HIV Programming: Complete this section as appropriate.

Beneficiaries by Sector Table

Complete this table after completing the FY08 Summary Request Table, as the entire top portion of the table will prepopulate. In addition, all of the technical sectors selected in the Summary Request Table will have carried over as well.

Programs operating in more than one country should provide an aggregate total here, as well as provide totals per country on the Regional Bens by Sector tab. The instructions for both tabs, however, are the same. Regional programs, however, will need to disaggregate data for each country of operation.

FY08 Results Report Data: (blue columns) For each technical sector chosen, report the number of direct beneficiaries that the program originally planned to reach and the final FY08 total of direct beneficiaries actually reached.

Outyear Estimates: (yellow columns) Provide outyear estimates of beneficiary totals, as applicable. Outyear targets are most applicable for MYAPs. However, SYAPs/IFRP programs that continue into FY09 should provide planned direct beneficiary targets for that fiscal year.

Totals: Do not fill in these cells. This is a formula that will automatically generate beneficiary totals. These totals should match those provided in your annual report narratives.

IDPs and Refugee Beneficiary Data: Enter whether your program provides activities directly impacting one or both of these groups, and enter the total direct beneficiaries within these groups that your program originally planned to reach and the final FY08 total of direct beneficiaries actually reached. Provide FY09 targets as well, if applicable. Definitions are provided on the 'Definitions' tab of the table. Regional programs should provide an aggregate total here, but should provide totals per country on the 'Regional Bens per Sector' tab.

Contact Information: Provide the name and contact information of the person primarily responsible for completing the beneficiary table. This person would serve as the primary contact for future questions on the data provided, where applicable.

DEFINITIONS

Updated September 2008

Funding Sources (Emergency / Non-emergency Resources):

ER/Emergency Resources: Title II resources used to fund emergencies and disaster mitigation-type activities. SYAP activities are generally funded with emergency resources. Emergency resources may be used in a MYAP for expanded safety net and asset protection activities that target populations suffering from transitory food insecurity during a shock or transition from an emergency situation; as well as to fund mitigation and early warning activities.

NER/Non-emergency Resources: Non-emergency resources are used in MYAPs for activities that target chronically food insecure populations. These activities include long-term safety nets and interventions to enhance human capacities, livelihood capabilities, and community resiliency and capacity.

Technical Sectors:

Agriculture/Natural Resources Management: Objectives include reducing risks during the agricultural production cycle, increasing agricultural productivity, and promoting natural resource management in a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable manner. Includes activities related to production, processing, marketing, distribution, use, and trade of food, feed and fiber produced by a sustainable agriculture system in a manner that is non-degrading to the environment, technically appropriate, economically viable, market-driven, locally replicable, equitable and socially acceptable. Activities promote agriculture technologies that: offset losses of and/or regenerate soil fertility; prevent erosion of topsoil; protect water point quality and quantity; employ a judicious use of affordable purchased inputs; reduce post-harvest storage losses; diversify and/or integrate crops, livestock, agro-forestry, fisheries production systems to enhance resiliency to climatic fluctuations; and rely on market-driven demand to maximize return and predictability of income generation. Food rations are used to build agriculture-related physical and human assets.

Civil Society Strengthening: Objectives include increasing the communities' capacity to influence the factors that affect their food security and strengthening the financial, management and administrative capacity of community and implementing partner organizations. Activities include training and technical assistance to strengthen community based groups' and implementing partner organizations' ability to: conduct food security assessments; plan, organize and implement food security-related activities; advocate for and manage resources; be accountable and responsive to population's concerns; and, become active and influential participants in the decision-making process beginning at the local level.

Education: Objectives include: increasing enrollment, attendance, retention and educational achievement of children, often with an explicit focus on girls. Includes programs aimed at improving early childhood development, primary education, secondary education, and training in literacy, numeracy, and other basic skills for adults and out-of-school youth. Activities include provision of school meals and take-home rations, increasing parent and community involvement in schools, and coordination with government and other donors to ensure that activities to improve the quality of education (e.g., teacher training, curriculum improvement) and the health and nutrition of the children also are taking place in the schools that the food aid recipients are attending. On-site and take home food rations are used to encourage enrollment and attendance.

Emergency Preparedness/Disaster Mitigation: Objectives include improving the ability of communities and other partners to prepare for and mitigate the effects of disasters, including both natural disasters and complex emergencies. Activities include efforts to enhance the capacities of national host-country authorities, humanitarian assistance providers, and local communities to engage in disaster reduction and response activities, including early warning information systems and disaster response plans.

Health & Nutrition: Objectives include: reducing the prevalence of chronic undernutrition among young children; identifying, treating and preventing recurrence of cases of acute undernutrition; preventing, treating and mitigating the impact of chronic diseases such as HIV and TB; and, enhancing the nutritional status of women. Activities include: interventions to improve maternal and child survival, health, nutrition, productivity, growth, and development - - promotion of improved feeding behaviors, such as exclusive breastfeeding and appropriate complementary feeding of infants and young children; and, optimal dietary intake before, during and after pregnancy for women; prevention and treatment of preventable diseases, including diarrhea, malaria, and intestinal parasites; increased micronutrient consumption of women and children; and, improvements in ante, intra and postpartum care, including newborn care. Activities also include interventions to improve treatment, care and support of people living with HIV. Food rations are used to prevent and treat malnutrition while supporting participation in activities that improve overall survival, health and nutrition.

Non-agricultural Income Generation: Objectives include increasing and diversifying non-agricultural sources of income. Activities include: micro-finance and business development services, including provision of information on markets and technical assistance and training to increase capacity to identify and access markets; and vocational and business practices training and apprenticeship programs for youth and adults, including orphans and vulnerable children (OVC). Food rations are used to offset the opportunity costs of program participation and build human assets.

Vulnerable Group Feeding/Social Safety Net: Objectives include saving lives and providing food to low-income and other vulnerable individuals and populations who are unable to meet basic needs for survival and human dignity. Individuals may be unable to meet these needs due to an external shock, such as a natural disaster or war, or due to socioeconomic circumstances, such as age, illness, disability or discrimination. Such individuals are often dependent to some extent upon outside resources to meet their basic food and livelihood needs. Activities include provision of general or supplementary on-site or take home rations through unconditional safety nets, and food support to institutions assisting the destitute, terminally ill or highly vulnerable children and youth.

Water and Sanitation: Objectives include improving water and sanitation infrastructure and practices. Activities include: organizational, technical and financial support for water and sanitation services; promotion of practices that protect water supplies from contamination by improper handling of domestic water supplies, household waste and inadequate sanitation; promotion of improved hygiene practices and behavior change; and, provision of technical assistance and training to enable communities to properly operate and maintain the new/rebuilt facilities. Food rations are used to build water and sanitation-related infrastructure.

Beneficiaries:

Direct Beneficiaries: Direct beneficiaries are those who come into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the program in each technical area. Individuals who receive training or benefit from program-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. Note: all recipients are beneficiaries, but not all beneficiaries are necessarily food ration recipients. Services include training and technical assistance provided directly by program staff, and training and technical assistance provided by people who have been trained by program staff (e.g., agricultural extension agents, village health workers). If cooperatives or organizations receive training or technical assistance from the program, all members of the cooperative/organization are considered direct beneficiaries. In a Food for Training (FFT) program, the direct beneficiaries are those trained under the program. In a Food for Work (FFW) or Food for Assets (FFA) program that is implemented as a stand-alone activity (e.g., not as part of a wider set of interventions in the technical sector), direct beneficiaries are those who directly participate in the ac

Direct beneficiaries do not include those who benefit indirectly from the goods and services provided to the direct beneficiaries, e.g., members of the household of a beneficiary farmer who received technical assistance, seeds and tools, other inputs, credit, livestock, etc.; farmers from a neighboring community who might observe the effects of the training and demonstration plots in the target community and decide to adopt or model the new practices themselves; the population of all of the communities in a valley that uses a road improved by FFW; or all individuals who may have heard a radio message about prices, but who did not receive the other elements of an agricultural intervention necessary to increase incomes. Such individuals are considered *indirect beneficiaries*.

Reached: Defined as contact with a beneficiary regardless of the number of times or amount of assistance received in a given technical sector. If an individual benefits from multiple interventions within a sector, s/he should only be counted once. If an individual benefits from interventions in multiple sectors, s/he should be counted once in each sector from which s/he has received benefits.

HIV and Non-HIV Recipient Categories and Technical Sectors:

CSs are asked to disaggregate HIV and non-HIV activities within each recipient category (in the AER and Executive Summary Tables) and technical sector (in the Summary Request and Beneficiary Tracking Table). Specifically, programs should select the HIV designation when objectives and sector activities directly target people infected or affected by HIV or when HIV-related criteria (such as chronic illness) are among the vulnerability criteria used for program entry. This includes People Living with HIV (PLHIV), including children; clients of Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission (PMTCT) programs; Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC); the families and caregivers of PLHIV and OVC; and service providers supported through Title II Food for Training (peer educators, home-based care volunteers, etc.). In the case of HIV prevention messages funded through monetization, CSs should choose the "Monetization – HIV" recipient category and the HIV designation for technical sector(s) under which those messages are provided when the HIV prevention messages are part of a program component specifically focused on HIV. If prevention education is part of a broader educational or behavior change curriculum (e.g., in an agriculture, maternal and child or reproductive health, or Food for Education program), the HIV prevention elements would be subsumed within the broader activity and captured under "Monetization - Non-HIV" for the recipient category(ies) and the Non-HIV designation for the technical sector(s).

Note: Orphans are defined as children under the age of 18 years who have lost either a mother or father, and vulnerable children are those affected by HIV through the illness of a parent or principal caregiver. If there is a national-level definition of OVC, CSs should use the national definition instead.

IDPs, or Internally Displaced Persons: Persons displaced internally within their country of origin and with no access to their previous (pre-crisis) source of livelihood.

Refugees: Persons displaced outside their country of origin.

Beneficiary Data by Technical Sector

Remember: Programs operating in more than one country should provide their program total here and complete the Regional Bens by Sector tab to provide this information broken down by individual country as well.

Country, Countries, Regional
Haiti

Cooperating Sponsor
ACDI/VOCA

Submission Date (mm/dd/yy)
11/21/08

Submission Type
Original

Fiscal Year
2008

FFP Funding Source
Non-emergency Funding

Technical Sector	FY08 Results Report Data						Outyear Estimates					
	Planned Beneficiaries FY08			Reached Beneficiaries FY08			Planned Beneficiaries FY09			Outyear Estimates		
	Male	Female	FY08 Planned Total	Male	Female	FY08 Planned Total	Male	Female	FY09 Planned Total	FY10 Planned Total	FY11 Planned Total	FY12 Planned Total
Ag. / NRM - Non HIV	120	120	240	316	89	405	6,179	5,201	11,380	7,405	5,620	5,620
Health & Nutrition - Non HIV	0	0	-	0	0	-	10,690	11,360	22,050	37,000	38,500	17,000
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Direct Beneficiaries	120	120	240	316	89	405	16,869	16,561	33,430	44,405	44,120	22,620

IDP and Refugee Beneficiary Data			
Does your program implement activities to benefit IDPs or refugees?	No		
	Planned FY08	Reached FY08	Planned FY08
If yes, what was the number of IDP beneficiaries in FY08?			
If yes, what was the number of refugee beneficiaries in FY08?			

Name and Contact Information of Individual Completing this Form	
Name:	Nael Jean Baptiste
Complete Address:	92 rue Gregoir Petion-ville Haiti
Phone:	509 36 53 32 94
Email:	njean-baptiste @acdivoca-haiti.org

Attachment 5

Country

Haiti

PVO

ACDI/VOCA

Date of Submission

November 21, 2008

Type of Submission

Results Report

Monetization LOA Analysis TableInstructions

1. CSs should complete the following table for each fiscal year of the MYAP/DAP for the initial MYAP proposal and update it in subsequent PREPs and Results
2. Provide all monetary values in U.S. Dollars

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	TOTAL
Monetization Budget (as approved in TA Amend.)	\$ 1,321,189	\$ 3,593,790	\$ 4,254,456	\$ 4,143,884	\$ 3,736,339	\$ 1,232,983	\$ 18,282,641
Anticipated Monet. Proceeds Received	N/A	\$ 3,312,000	\$ 4,365,000	\$ 4,506,000	\$ 3,681,000	\$ -	\$ 15,864,000
Actual Monet. Proceeds Received	\$ 2,177,404	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 2,177,404
Please indicate if the Actual Monet. Proceeds are final*	Final						\$ -
Monet. Budget Request	\$ 1,321,189	\$ 3,593,790	\$ 4,254,456	\$ 4,143,884	\$ 3,736,339	\$ 1,232,983	\$ 18,282,641
Actual Monet. Proceeds Expended		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ -
* For Results Reports, please indicate whether the Actual Monet. Proceeds Received are final. If they are not please provide an explanation, and FFP <u>Explanation:</u>							
** LOA expenditures are expected to stay within approved LOA budget levels. Explain any deviations from approved fiscal year budget levels and <u>Explanation:</u>							

Attachment 5

Country Haiti
PVO CRS
Date of Submission November 21, 2008
Type of Submission Results Report

Actual Cost Recovery Table - FY 08

Instructions:

1. CSs should fill out this information for the Results Reports only. If final figures are not available for the Results Report, an updated version should be submitted alongside the PREP.
2. Provide all monetary values in U.S. Dollars
3. Formulas have been provided to summarize data, where necessary. Please do not enter data in these fields.
4. Some of the formulas will not calculate unless all of the necessary information is entered in appropriately.

	Call Fwd. 1	Call Fwd. 2	Call Fwd. 3	Call Fwd. 4	Call Fwd. 5	Average	Total
Commodity Request Number*	CCC 8403	CCC 8417	CCC8432				
1. Actual sale date (or period)	May 14th 2008	June 12th 2008	July 16th 2008				
2. Commodity	Wheat, Hard Red Winter, bagged	Wheat, Hard Red Winter, bagged	Wheat, Hard Red Winter, bagged				
3. Tonnage (MT) called forward	3,250	1,750	1,250				6,250
4. Exchange Rate at time of sale or sales agreement	38.54	39.19	39.67			38.94	
5. Actual Commodity Cost (\$/MT) **	\$426	\$364	\$382			\$400	\$2,498,795
6. Actual Ocean Freight (US or foreign flag) (\$/MT)	\$29	\$35	\$35			\$32	\$199,250
7. Actual Inland Freight (\$/MT)	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0
8. Partner / Consortium Monetization Fee (\$/MT) - if applicable***	\$2	\$2	\$2			\$2	\$12,384
9. Actual Taxes and Duties on Sale of Monetization Tonnage (\$/MT)	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0
10. Actual Total Cost to the USG (\$/MT) [lines 5+6+7+8+9]	\$457	\$401	\$419	\$0	\$0	\$434	\$2,710,429
11. Actual sales price \$/MT (anticipated average if multiple lot sales planned)	\$354	\$333	\$354			\$348	
12. Actual Monetization Proceeds [lines 3 x 11]	\$1,150,711	\$583,608	\$443,085	\$0	\$0		\$2,177,404
13. Actual Cost Recovery [line 11 / 10]	77.45%	83.20%	84.67%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	80.33%	

Notes:

- * From the Food Aid Request Entry System (FARES) call forward
- ** FAS Prices can be obtained from USAID OAA/T
- *** The amount that the Cooperating Sponsor pays as a fee to a partner or consortium lead for managing a monetization sale.

Attachment 5

Country: Haiti

PVO: ACDI/VOCA

Date of Submission: November 21, 2008

Type of Submission (MYAP Proposal, PREP, or Results Report): Results Report

Anticipated or Actual Monetization Results

Analysis of Monetization Sales Transaction(s) <i>(Results Reports only)</i>
<i>Based on the information provided in the Actual Cost Recovery Tab, provide a detailed analysis of the monetization transaction(s) that the CS was party to during FY 2008. If the actual sales price differed from the estimated price at the beginning of the program, state this.</i>
<p>The projected sales price in ACDI/VOCA's MYAP for FY08 was \$230/Mt. Due to the increase of wheat prices in the global market, the sales prices received during the fiscal year for the four vessels for all Cooperating Sponsors were higher than anticipated, specifically: \$354/Mt for the 1st vessel, \$333/Mt for the 2nd, \$354 for the 3rd, and \$340 for the last. On average, the wheat was sold at \$346/Mt. ACDI/VOCA's FY'08 tonnage was reduced from 8,000 MT to 6,250 MT, but this generated a total of \$2,177,404 in monetization proceeds. No major problems were encountered this year due to delivery delays or poor wheat quality. The monetization was led by CRS and the negotiations with the buyer went well.</p>
<i>If actual cost recovery (Line 13) was not achieved at 100%, explain why not.</i>
<p>The cost recovery per shipment were: 77.45%, 83.20%, 84.67%, and 87.22% respectively for the four vessels, for an average cost recovery of 81.90% for the year. As there is only one mill in Haiti: Les Moulins d'Haiti, the Haiti Monetization Consortium (HMC) has just one potential buyer of Hard Red Winter Wheat. In FY'08, the CS's and the mill opted for a price discovery method using a basket of wheat prices on the spot market to calculate the sales price. Although there was a drastic increase global wheat prices full cost recovery was not attained due to various deductions, including dockage, fees for the Bureau de Monetisation (GOH), and a discount to the mill for paying 100% upfront instead of using a 90-day Letter of Credit, etc.</p>
<i>Report on any problems with the implementation of the monetization transaction.</i>
<p>There were no major problems in FY'08 in the monetization program. Shipments were generally arrived on time, except for a 3 day delay for the 1st boat. The biggest setback was the tonnage cut for all CS's based on FFP's budget constraints caused by drastic increases in global commodity prices. Though the CS's planned to monetize a total of 47,250 MT, the Haiti Title II program was cut to 34,690 MT for monetization. As noted, ACDI/VOCA's FY'08 program was cut by 1,750 MT HRW. Though the partner planned to pilot vegetable oil for monetization in FY09, the partners decided to postpone this due to erratic commodity prices, particularly for edible oil and the late approval of the program did not provide sufficient time to research the feasibility of monetizing Title II cooking oil in Haiti. The partners plan to do a full Bellmon Analysis in early 2009 to research this possibility and to determine if food for sale or distribution presents a disincentive to local agricultural production.</p>
<i>Were any lessons learned?</i>
Monetization Results
1. Maximizing Value of Proceeds <i>MYAP Proposals/PREPs (anticipated results) and Results Reports (actual results)</i>
<i>CSs are asked to report on how they maximized or plan to maximize the value of monetization proceeds. Note whether the timing of the sale corresponds with the agricultural crop and market cycles in order to obtain the best sales price. (This information should also be reflected in the commodity pipeline tab of the AER/Pipeline).</i>

Attachment 5

Country: Haiti

PVO: ACDI/VOCA

Date of Submission: November 21, 2008

Type of Submission (MYAP Proposal, PREP, or Results Report): Results Report

Anticipated or Actual Monetization Results

How did/will the CS ensure that the value of monetized proceeds did/will not diminish due to currency fluctuations and/or devaluation?

The monetization sales contract with the mill was set in US Dollars, thus insulating the country from local currency fluctuations.

How did/will the CS compensate for a shortfall of monetization proceeds or modify their programming accordingly?

ACDI/VOCA benefitted from a strong sales price for its monetized wheat in FY'08. Though the program was cut, the proceeds were sufficient for FY'08 operations and a carry-over balance in FY'09 until the next wheat is sold in FY'09. The biggest challenge in the coming fiscal year concerns the drastic decrease in wheat prices compared to the anticipated sales price listed in the PREP of \$300/MT. It is likely to be below this amount.

How did/would an increase or decrease in proceeds affect activities and results?

Though most results were met for FY'09, the activities and results were affected more by the late start-up, February 2009, rather than insufficient monetization proceeds.

2. Monetization Sales Impacts

Results Reports only

Report on the outcome of the monetization transaction(s) including any impacts on the host country, including in terms of anticipated and unanticipated effects on local, regional or national production, and marketing of the monetized commodity or its substitutes.

A Bellmon Analysis was not completed in FY'08, so the impact on the local economy is not known. Nonetheless, the increase in commodity prices and significant loss of agricultural production following the hurricanes suggest that the country had significant food deficits in 2008. Furthermore, Haiti does not produce wheat grain, and is a net importer of wheat grain, thus the commodity does not compete with local production.

Discuss any food security impact of the monetization transaction itself.

Has the monetization resulted in negative impacts on local economies or markets? (Yes or No) If yes, then a detailed monetization plan must be provided as a separate attachment that will resolve issues in any future monetization activities, as outlined in the Title II Monetization Field Manual with reference to monetization criteria and FFP monetization policies. CSs should provide full justification for the monetization and describe the proposed mechanics.