

PD-ABP-723

MASTER COPY

**USAID/BHR/FFP
Strategic Objective 2
FY 99 Results Report and Resources Request (R4)**

u:\ffpd\docs\r4so2.530

List of Acronyms

BHR	Bureau for Humanitarian Response
CFW	Cash-for-work
CS	Cooperating Sponsor
DA	Development Assistance (funds)
DAP	Development Activity Proposal
EU	European Union
FACG	Food Aid Consultative Group
FAMP	Food Aid Management Plan
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFP	Office of Food for Peace (in BHR Bureau)
FFP/DP	Development Programs Division in FFP
FFP/ER	Emergency Response Division in FFP
FFPO	Food for Peace Officer
FFW	Food-for-work
FTE	Full-time equivalent (direct-hire staff)
GHAI	Greater Horn of Africa Initiative
IO	International organization
IR	Intermediate Result
ISG	Institutional Support Grant
MCH	Maternal-child health
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OE	Operating Expense (funds)
P.L. 480	U.S. Public Law 480
PVO	Private voluntary organization
REDSO	Regional Economic Development Support Office
SO	Strategic Objective
SO1	BHR/FFP's Strategic Objective #1
SO2	BHR/FFP's Strategic Objective #2
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization

Table of Contents

I.	OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE	1
A.	Introduction	1
B.	Overview of Activities	3
C.	Factors Affecting Program Performance	3
II.	PROGRESS TOWARD OBJECTIVES	6
A.	SO2 Indicators	6
B.	IR1 Indicators	10
C.	IR2 Indicators	17
D.	Performance Data Tables	20
III.	STATUS OF MANAGEMENT CONTRACT	26
IV.	RESOURCE REQUEST	27
A.	Workforce Requirements	27
B.	Operating Expense (Non-Personnel) Requirements	30
C.	Development Assistance (DA) Resource Requirements	31
D.	Food Aid Commodity Requirements	34
E.	Prioritization of Objectives	36
F.	Performance Weights and Measures	36
G.	Environmental Compliance	37
ANNEX 1:	Criteria for Adequate DAP/PAA Indicators	A1
ANNEX 2:	Title II Generic Performance Indicators for Development Activities	A3
ANNEX 3:	DAP Review Scoring System	A5
ANNEX 4:	DAP Guidance Quality Survey	A7
ANNEX 5:	FFP Support Quality Survey	A8
ANNEX 6:	Consolidated FFP Budget Tables	A10

PART I. OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

I.A. Introduction

No concern facing the poorest members of developing countries is more fundamental and important than attaining food security. The Bureau for Humanitarian Resources (BHR) Food for Peace office (FFP) is committed to reducing food insecurity in the world through the provision of Public Law 480 (P.L. 480) Title II food aid for emergency and development activities. For its emergency programs, FFP has developed Strategic Objective 1 (SO1), and for its development programs, Strategic Objective 2 (SO2). Each Strategic Objective is represented by a corresponding SO Team, with its own Strategic Plan. This report addresses the results reporting and resource requirements for FFP's SO2 Team. The SO2 Team consists of team members in BHR who make up the "core" SO2 team, as well as members from Regional and other Central Bureaus who are part of the "expanded" SO2 Team. The SO2 Team's "partners" are those PVOs and Missions which are implementing Title II development activities. The SO2 Team's "ultimate customers" (who are served indirectly through PVOs and Missions) are the food insecure participants and beneficiaries of Title II development activities.

The *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper* was developed in 1995 to guide program priorities and resource allocations for USAID-administered food aid activities. Based on the policy paper and other policy guidance inputs, FFP's SO2 Team has initiated major changes to improve the way it supports Title II development activities. These changes were initiated in FY 96, and led to development of a revised Strategic Plan for SO2 in FY 97. A key change of the revised Strategic Objective 2 is that FFP's performance indicators are defined not in terms of specific people-level impact targets, but rather in terms of the degree to which its Mission and PVO partners are able to achieve the people-level targets that *they* set. This change in approach reflects both the SO2 Team's efforts to re-engineer towards a *managing-for-results* system for administering Title II activities, and the fact that FFP's role is not to implement the activities, but rather to facilitate and strengthen its partners' capabilities to manage, implement and demonstrate the results of Title II activities.

The revised SO2 strategic plan has allowed the SO2 Team to make great strides in bringing Title II development activities in line with the reengineering and managing-for-results principles established by USAID. However, because the strategic plan is new, this Results Report and Resources Request (R4) cannot yet report on the achievement of planned targets. Rather, the R4 will report on baselines and targets that have been established for the Strategic Plan indicators, as well as selected case examples which demonstrate the progress achieved to date with respect to these indicators. A summary of the SO2 Strategic Plan and indicators is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: FFP SO2 Strategic Plan Results Framework Summary

Goal: Improved household nutrition and agricultural productivity among targeted vulnerable groups.

Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity

SO2 Indicators:

1. Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance.
2. Percentage of partners' activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively measurable indicators within first year of implementation.
3. Percentage of partners' annual targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators.

Intermediate Result 1:

Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs.

IR1.1: Indicators of PVO capabilities

- a. Percentage of DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.
- b. Percentage of PAAs for which Missions assess that PVOs have adequate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring programs.

IR1.2: Indicators of USAID Mission capabilities

- a. Percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions.
- b. Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority.

IR1.3: Indicators of FFP capabilities

- a. Percentage of scores 3 or above by PVOs on surveys of DAP guidance quality.
- b. Percentage of scores of "good" or "excellent" by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.

Intermediate Result 2:

Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.

IR2.1: Indicators of integration of activities

- a. Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO has coordinated its activities with other PVO, host country, private sector and IO activities to great extent or better.
- b. Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities.

IR2.2: Indicators of integration with Missions

- a. Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO activities contribute to Mission objectives to a great extent or better.
- b. Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs to great extent or better.

IR2.3: Indicator of integration with other donors

- a. Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed.
- b. Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.

I.B. Overview of Activities

As an overview, FFP currently supports 53 PVO-implemented Title II development activities, operating in 24 countries in 3 regions (Africa, Asia and LAC). The greatest number of these activities (31) are located in Africa, though the largest share of resources (about 40%) is allocated to activities in Asia, due to the large size of the India and Bangladesh programs. Title II development activities support many types of components related to food security and disaster prevention/mitigation, and most activities are multi-dimensional integrating a few of the following types of components: (1) health and nutrition; (2) water and sanitation; (3) agricultural productivity; (4) natural resource management; (5) education; (6) humanitarian assistance; (7) roads and infrastructure; and (8) microenterprise development. Nonetheless, health/nutrition and agricultural productivity are the two primary focal areas of the Title II program, with approximately 80% of activities including a health and nutrition component, and 70% including an agricultural productivity component. In the last two years most of the portfolio has been turned over, as almost 90% of current activities were approved in either FY 96 or FY 97, with 5-year lifespans extending through FY 00 or FY 01. Table 2 provides a summary of FY 97-approved Title II development activities, including the countries where they operate, the implementing PVOs, approximate resource levels, and the types of interventions.

In addition to these development food aid resources managed by FFP, USAID expects to provide approximately \$46.3 million in Title II development resources in FY 97 to the World Food Program, as well as \$38.5 million in Title III resources directly to governments. Because these resources are not within the SO2 Team's manageable interest, however, results related to these resources are not included in the SO2 Team's Strategic Plan, and therefore, not in this R4.

I.C. Factors Affecting Program Performance

Factors that will affect FFP's ability to meet its SO2 performance targets include: (1) the critical need for increased Workforce, Operating Expense (OE) and Development Assistance (DA) resources available for managing Title II development activities; (2) the transition of countries from emergency to development programs; and (3) the need for close collaboration between FFP and its PVO and Mission partners, including further consensus on which indicators need to be reported and targeted. Each of these factors is discussed below:

- (1) The SO2 Team's ability to achieve its Strategic Plan results, and to provide effective Title II program management, is contingent upon the office's ability to secure increased direct-hire staff, as well as OE and DA funds. These additional resources are essential for more effective country backstopping; for strengthening our PVO, Mission and WFP partners; and for improving monitoring and evaluation systems to measure the impact of Title II-supported activities on increasing food security. Currently, the SO2 Team has four Country Backstop Officers supporting 53 activities in 24 different countries, and administering over \$300 million in Title II resources (an average of about 13 activities, 6 countries and \$75 million per officer). Without increases to requested resource levels, FFP may be forced to reduce the number and scope of approved activities, and/or amend or abandon the SO2 Strategic Plan in its current form. These consequences are described in more detail in the Resources Requirements section of this R4.

Table 2: Approved FY 97 PVO-Implemented Title II Development Activities (as of 5/13/97)

No.	Region	Country/Sponsor	LOA	Title II (Estimated)		202(e)	Types of Components									
				Tons	\$(000)	\$(000)	HN	WS	AG	NR	ED	HA	RI	ME		
1.	Africa	Benin/CRS	96-00	4,680	1,911.9	262.2	X					X		X	X	
2.	Africa	Burkina Faso/CRS	97-01	19,780	11,417.2	193.4		X				X	X			
3.	Africa	Cape Verde/ACDI	97-01	4,810	2,626.3	335.5			X					X	X	
4.	Africa	Chad/Mali/Africare	97-01	3,600	1,800.0	pending	X	X	X					X		
5.	Africa	Eritrea/Africare	95-97	800	735.2	139.8	X	X	X						X	
6.	Africa	Eritrea/PCI	97-00	0	0.0	176.3	X									
7.	Africa	Ethiopia/CARE	97-01	7,630	4,423.1	553.5	X	X	X					X		
8.	Africa	Ethiopia/CRS	97-01	19,060	10,577.5	320.5	X		X		X	X			X	
9.	Africa	Ethiopia/FHI	96-98	3,910	2,292.3	186.5	X	X	X		X					
10.	Africa	Ethiopia/REST	96-98	8,090	3,796.7	66.7	X	X	X		X					
11.	Africa	Ethiopia/SCF	96-98	370	377.0	216.3		X	X		X				X	
12.	Africa	Ethiopia/WVRD	95-97	5,260	2,472.8	43.5										
13.	Africa	Gambia/CRS	97-01	3,710	1,863.6	0.0	X		X			X			X	
14.	Africa	Ghana/ADRA	97-01	11,360	2,968.5	416.2		X	X		X					
15.	Africa	Ghana/CRS	97-01	14,490	4,584.4	125.6	X				X	X				
16.	Africa	Ghana/TechnoServe	97-01	16,000	3,840.0	0.0			X							
17.	Africa	Guinea/Africare	96-00	0	0.0	107.8	X		X							
18.	Africa	Guinea/OICI	96-00	480	463.6	130.8										
19.	Africa	Guinea Bissau/Africar	95-98	0	0.0	217.3										
20.	Africa	Kenya/CRS	97-00	2,430	634.9	0.0	X									
21.	Africa	Kenya/WVRD	97-00	2,910	698.4	20.7	X	X	X							
22.	Africa	Madagascar/CRS	95-98	7,280	3,699.9	277.7	X				X	X				
23.	Africa	Mauritania/Doulos	96-00	1,460	641.7	66.5	X					X				
24.	Africa	Mozambique/ADRA	97-01	7,850	1,897.6	135.9	X		X		X			X		
25.	Africa	Mozambique/Africare	97-01	4,620	1,116.5	88.3	X		X							
26.	Africa	Mozambique/CARE	97-01	5,440	1,314.9	93.1			X						X	
27.	Africa	Mozambique/FHI	97-01	7,030	1,669.3	127.6	X		X						X	
28.	Africa	Mozambique/SCF	97-01	6,490	1,570.9	105.8	X		X		X			X		
29.	Africa	Mozambique/WVRD	97-01	29,170	9,740.3	770.0	X		X		X			X	X	
30.	Africa	Uganda/ACDI	97-01	3,490	3,671.1	234.2			X						X	
31.	Africa	Uganda/Africare	97-01	4,530	1,766.7	182.0			X		X			X		
AFRICA SUBTOTAL				206,730	84,572.3	5,593.7	20	9	21	9	5	6	8	10		
32.	Asia	Bangladesh/CARE	94-99	80,000	19,200.0	0.0			X					X	X	
33.	Asia	India/CARE	97-01	153,050	69,524.3	457.9	X									
34.	Asia	India/CRS	97-01	45,370	17,840.5	1,087.7	X	X	X		X	X			X	
ASIA SUBTOTAL				278,420	106,564.8	1,545.6	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	

35.	LAC	Bolivia/ADRA	97-01	13,480	6,193.9	202.1	X	X	X				X	
36.	LAC	Bolivia/Caritas	97-01	17,960	8,522.2	0.0	X	X	X		X		X	
37.	LAC	Bolivia/FHI	97-01	7,500	3,417.2	215.1	X	X	X		X			
38.	LAC	Bolivia/PCI	97-01	5,050	2,394.3	326.1	X	X	X		X		X	
39.	LAC	Guatemala/CARE	96-00	11,470	5,177.9	377.3	X	X	X				X	
40.	LAC	Guatemala/CRS	97-01	5,480	2,492.5	240.5	X		X					X
41.	LAC	Guatemala/FTC	97-01	930	475.9	84.8	X							
42.	LAC	Guatemala/SHARE	96-00	4,840	2,333.0	330.1	X		X	X				X
43.	LAC	Haiti/ADRA	96-00	6,040	2,712.0	0.0	X		X		X	X		
44.	LAC	Haiti/CARE	96-00	3,000	1,315.4	0.0	X					X		
45.	LAC	Haiti/CRS	96-00	4,080	1,949.0	0.0	X				X	X		
46.	LAC	Honduras/CARE	96-00	11,990	4,676.8	334.7	X		X		X	X		
47.	LAC	Nicaragua/ADRA	96-00	350	142.5	50.0	X							
48.	LAC	Nicaragua/PCI	97-01	1,450	604.9	298.7	X		X					
49.	LAC	Nicaragua/SCF	96-00	1,500	656.3	50.0	X							
50.	LAC	Peru/ADRA	96-00	16,330	8,865.6	231.3	X	X	X					X
51.	LAC	Peru/CARE	96-00	28,910	17,778.9	0.0	X		X	X		X		X
52.	LAC	Peru/Caritas	96-00	21,810	11,241.6	354.0	X	X	X			X		X
53.	LAC	Peru/PRISMA	96-00	19,650	11,083.3	264.5	X		X					X
LAC SUBTOTAL				181,820	92,033.2	3,359.2	19	7	14	2	6	6	4	6
TOTAL APPROVED:				666,970	283,170.3	10,498.5	41	17	37	12	12	13	13	18

HN= health/nutri.; WS= water/sanit.; AG= agriculture; NR= nat. resources; ED= education; HA= human. assistance; RI= roads/infra.; ME= microenterprise

- (2) Both the SO1 and SO2 Teams are being increasingly challenged to help countries transition from relief to development. To do this, the SO1 Team is encouraging effective "relief exit" strategies for its activities, and the SO2 Team is providing support to Title II PVOs and Missions for designing new development activities in countries that are ready to make the relief-to-development transition. A recent example of such efforts is the successful transition of Mozambique from emergency to development activities (see Case Example below). Other transition countries are expected to follow in the near future, such as Angola and Rwanda. While the transition to development is positive, adding new transition countries to the SO2 portfolio increases the need for strengthening our partners' capacity, and increases the SO2 Team's workload, presenting additional challenges for the Team.

Case Example: Transition from Relief to Development in Mozambique

The Title II program in Mozambique is an excellent example of effective teamwork between FFP's SO1 and SO2 Teams resulting in a successful transition from emergency to development food aid activities. FFP and USAID/Mozambique began administering a massive emergency food aid relief program in 1992, implemented by several PVOs. During 1995 and 1996, the program changed its focus toward transitional and development activities with resources being used for food/cash-for-work projects that rebuilt critical infrastructure such as health clinics, agricultural posts, irrigation systems, roads and schools that had been destroyed by war. During 1996, substantial support from the SO2 Team and USAID/Mozambique contributed to the successful design and approval of six PVO DAPs for Title II development activities to be initiated in FY 97. Not only has the Title II program in Mozambique been an example of successful transition from relief to development, but also the close coordination among the Title II PVOs in the design of their activities and the development of a joint monitoring and evaluation system has made the program a model of PVO integration.

- (3) SO2 Team performance is also critically dependent on the performance and collaboration of its PVO and Mission partners. While FFP administers a wide variety of Title II development activities, it does not directly implement the activities, but rather works through its partners to achieve and measure impacts. Nevertheless, there is a need to consolidate and report on the overall effect of food aid in addressing food security. Therefore, one area where cooperation is critical is PVO acceptance and use of a core set of indicators so that data on similar types of results can be consolidated and assessed. While a set of generic Title II development performance indicators has been developed collaboratively by USAID and Title II PVOs (see Annex 2), and the PVOs are being encouraged to use them, further consensus is still needed on their application, as some PVOs still prefer to develop their own indicators and are reluctant to change indicators for long-standing projects.

PART II. PROGRESS TOWARD OBJECTIVES

II.A. SO2 Indicators

Three indicators have been identified as measures of achievement of SO2. These indicators follow a progression from (1) PVOs identifying indicators and targets for PVO programs, to (2) their measuring program impacts with respect to these indicators and targets, to (3) their demonstrating achievement of the targets. Specifically, the SO2 indicators and targets are:

- SO2.1. Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance;*
- SO2.2. Percentage of partners' activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively measurable indicators within first year of implementation;*
- SO2.3. Percentage of partners' annual targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators.*

Indicator SO2.1: Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance

How effectively FFP's partners' programs can demonstrate measurable impacts depends foremost on whether appropriate measurable indicators are identified in the activity design. To encourage the use of better indicators as well as minimize subjectivity in assessing their adequacy, explicit criteria for adequate indicators were included in this year's guidance for FY 1998-2001 Development Activity Proposals (DAPs), and will also be included in future DAP guidance. These criteria, which are provided in Annex 1, will also be used by DAP reviewers in assessing the adequacy of indicators identified in DAPs. Scores given by reviewers on the adequacy of indicators as part of the DAP review scoring system will be the means of verification for SO2.1 (see Annex 3, question # 3). Those DAPs that are assessed to have inadequate indicators will be required to re-identify and submit new indicators either prior to or shortly after activity approval.

A baseline of the percentage of DAPs that have defined indicators which meet the above criteria was determined by reviewing a random sample of FY 97 DAPs which were submitted in FY 96. This review indicated that 20% of FY 97 DAPs had indicators assessed to be adequate in each of these criteria. This number should dramatically increase, however, due to: (1) more explicit guidance on correctly defining indicators in the FY 98 DAP guidance; (2) feedback provided on indicator issues to PVOs by SO2 Team project officers; and (3) technical assistance that is being provided to Title II PVOs and Missions by the Global Bureau's IMPACT Project. The target is to have adequate indicators (as determined by scores given by DAP reviewers) identified in more than 50% of new approved DAPs submitted in FY 97 (i.e. FY 1998-2001 DAPs), more than 70% in FY 98, more than 80% in FY 99, more than 90% in FY 00, and 100% in FY 01.

Case Example: Improved Performance Indicators for Cape Verde/ACDI

FFP's transition to a managing-for-results system began in FY 96, with the collaborative development of generic Title II development performance indicators, and a more rigorous review of indicators and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans in FY 1997-2001 DAPs. The more rigorous review of M&E plans has led many Title II PVOs, often with FFP assistance, to redevelop their performance indicators and measurement plans, resulting in more objective and verifiable indicators, and an improved ability to measure the results of their programs. One such example is the Agricultural Cooperative Department International (ACDI) activity in Cape Verde. While the proposed interventions, training activities, and overall quality of the Cape Verde/ACDI DAP was assessed favorably by reviewers, the monitoring and evaluation system was assessed to be weak. In particular, reviewers noted that most of the performance indicators had not been well identified, often lacking precise definition, objective measurement criteria, or clear means of verification. Subsequent to the DAP, however, ACDI made a major effort to redesign the M&E plan and indicators for its Cape Verde activity, including utilizing FFP assistance through its IMPACT Project. The result has been a greatly strengthened M&E plan, with more precisely defined, measurable indicators, including Title II generic performance indicators.

Indicator SO2.2: Percent of partner activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively measurable indicators within first year of implementation

Identifying the anticipated results of activities, and measuring progress towards achieving them, is central to the SO2 Team's ability to manage for results, and depends first on establishing baseline data for the selected performance indicators. This baseline data, in addition to providing a standard against which to measure impact, allows for more reasonable identification of performance targets. Since Title II PVOs typically do not have the resources necessary for conducting full baseline studies prior to their receiving funding after approval of their proposals, they will be expected to complete baseline data collection and set performance targets based on this baseline information during the initial year of implementation.

A review of this year's PVO Results Reports and PAAs for FY 1996-2000 activities indicated that 39% of the activities had completed collection of their baseline data and established targets consistent with this data in the first year of their implementation. This low percentage can be attributed to the newness of the transition of Title II activities to a managing-for-results system, the limited technical and financial capacity of many Title II PVOs, and the limited FFP staff capacity to support the monitoring and evaluation efforts of these PVOs. The SO2 Team and its PVO and Mission partners are making a concerted effort in FY 97 to improve baseline data collection efforts through developing monitoring and evaluation guides and providing technical and financial assistance to its partners. In future years, the targets established are that 60% of new activities in FY 97 will complete baseline data and establish targets within first year, 70% in FY 98, 80% for FY 99 and 90% for FY 00 and 01.

Case Example: Baseline Study and Target Setting by Honduras/CARE

The multisectoral Title II activity being implemented by the Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) in Honduras, which was initiated in FY 96, provides an example of the type of high quality baseline study which FFP seeks to promote in all its Title II activities. CARE's study utilized an integrated team of professionals having expertise in many areas including health, nutrition, economics, agroforestry, and social work. This team reviewed the activity's logical framework and determined the types and sources of information needed for each activity area and the methodology to be implemented. The baseline included data on targeted households, as well as a control group of non-targeted households, and measured both impact indicators and annual monitoring indicators. Because of its high quality baseline study, its clear identification of performance targets, and its detailed description of its data collection methodology, CARE will be able to clearly demonstrate the overall impact of its activity by comparing baseline data with data from evaluations at the midterm and end of the activity.

Indicator SO2.3: Percentage of partners' annual targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators

Ultimately, the degree to which targets are met, and impacts achieved, is the most important indicator of the effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out their development activities. Initially, the achievement of annual monitoring targets, which reflect intermediate program results, should be demonstrated. Subsequently, Results Reports emanating from midterm and final evaluations should demonstrate achievement of ultimate impact targets.

Indicator SO2.3 links FFP's "partner strengthening" activities with ultimate people-level impacts in the field. However, rather than defining specific targets for increases in household nutrition, agricultural productivity, etc., FFP performance will be assessed in terms of how effectively its partners achieve the specific targets they set. This approach for measuring FFP's performance recognizes the fact, as noted previously, that FFP does not directly implement programs, but rather works through its partners to achieve program impacts.

In addition to indicating whether actual results reached anticipated target levels, Results Reports should demonstrate, and evaluators and reviewers should verify, that the results were obtained based on objectively measured indicators. It is too early to create a comprehensive baseline for the FY 96 Results Reports which are the basis for this R4, as the transition to FFP's *managing-for-results* system is still in its initial phases. Nevertheless, some of FFP's PVO partners have already been developing objectively verifiable indicators, carrying out baseline surveys, and demonstrating results. A few case examples are presented below. A comprehensive baseline of the percentage of PVO targets being achieved will be established for the FY 97 Results Reports which will be submitted in FY 98, and targets for subsequent years determined after the baseline is established. A system for consolidating the results data from the Results Reports into a database will be developed during CY 97. A key to the success of this data consolidation effort, however, will be the degree to which Title II PVOs agree and adhere to the use of generic Title II performance indicators for development activities.

Case Example: Achievement of Targets by Peru/PRISMA

PRISMA is currently implementing a Title II activity in Peru which includes interventions related to health and nutrition, microenterprise development, and agricultural productivity. This activity was initiated in FY 96 and continues through FY 00. In its FY 96 Results Report, PRISMA carefully measured and documented its achievements with respect to the targets (both input-oriented and results-oriented) it had set the previous year. Of its results targets, PRISMA demonstrated that it fully achieved 55% of them. In addition, 73% of its targets were at least 90% achieved, and 82% were at least 80% achieved. Examples of results for which PRISMA fully achieved or exceeded its targets in the first year of its activity include:

- (1) more than 55% of families in MCH program within six months meet graduation criteria of (a) no child suffering from acute malnutrition during previous three months, (b) all children having complete vaccination schedules, (c) pregnant women receiving regular ante-natal care, and (d) all mothers receiving family planning counseling;
- (2) 95% repayment rate for microenterprise development loans; and
- (3) more than 1000 metric tons of agricultural production.

Case Example: Results of Infrastructure Projects Demonstrated by Bangladesh/CARE

The CARE activity in Bangladesh, which was initiated in FY 94 and continues through FY 99, has also measured and documented the degree to which it has met its targets. Although this activity was approved prior to the transition of Title II activities to a managing-for-results system, CARE initiated and has successfully established a monitoring and evaluation system for measuring and reporting on performance. In the rural infrastructure component of its activity, CARE reported that in FY 96 it exceeded its targets for infrastructure development for businesses and irrigation, and achieved over 90% of its target levels for road passability. Furthermore, CARE reported that the increased road passability resulting from their road improvement activities had led to an increase in vehicular traffic of 22% over baseline levels.

Case Example: Results Demonstrated by Multiple Title II PVOs in Ethiopia

A number of Title II PVOs have been implementing and demonstrating results of Title II development activities in Ethiopia. In particular FY 96 Results Reports submitted by CARE, CRS and WVRD indicated the degree of achievement of both output-oriented and impact targets. CARE, for instance, reported that the introduction of improved agronomic packages resulted in yields 2 to 3 times higher for participating farmers. As another example, CRS was able to report an increase of 10 to 20 percent in income as a direct result of their credit and savings project. WVRD also provided a table in its Results Report which clearly linked its targets, accomplishments and the degree to which it reached its targets.

Case Example: Achievement of Results Targets by Peru/CARE

Another good example of a Title II activity demonstrating achievement of targeted results is CARE's activity in Peru. Examples of targets fully achieved or exceeded in FY 96 included:

- (1) 75% of targeted children rehabilitated from acute malnutrition;
- (2) 80% of targeted children immunized by 12 months of age; and
- (3) over 7,000 hectares under improved natural resource management practices.

II.B. IR1 Indicators

The first intermediate result (IR1) is *strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs*. FFP has supported numerous institutional strengthening and training activities, including an annual Food Aid Managers Course for all Washington-based and overseas USAID staff managing food aid activities; on-going FFP officers training; and on-going workshops and meetings with our partners on food security issues and strategic planning. The SO2 Team also supports partners by participating as virtual members on Mission SO Teams, by providing TA support as needed, by working with Title II PVOs in the field and at their headquarters, and by interacting with the Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) and Food Aid Management (FAM) on issues of PVO strengthening and support.

Additionally, grants are provided to Title II PVOs for their capacity strengthening, including Title II-funded 202(e) grants to support operations and institutional strengthening of individual country activities (see Table 2); and DA-funded Institutional Support Grants (ISGs) to strengthen the technical and managerial capacity of PVO headquarters and regional offices, which provide essential support to country offices. These support services include carrying out assessments and feasibility studies, helping design activities and associated monitoring and evaluation plans, and hiring, orienting and training field staff. A breakdown of ISG funding levels for Title II PVOs for FY 97 activities is provided below. As discussed in the Resource Requirement section, the level of ISG funding for development activities needs to increase to \$7.0 million given the requirements for PVOs to strengthen their monitoring and evaluation systems, refocus and demonstrate the impact of their activities on food security, meet the new BHR requirements for environmental reviews, and increase PVO staff participation in Missions' and FFP's strategic planning efforts.

FY 96 Approved ISG Funding:

ACDI:	\$ 110,463	ADRA:	\$ 700,000		
Africare:	\$ 400,000	CARE:	\$1,250,000		
CRS:	\$1,000,000	FAM/CARE:	\$ 163,722		
OICI:	\$ 59,750	PCI:	\$ 87,400		
SAVE:	\$ 491,245	WVRD:	\$ 419,403	TOTAL:	\$4,681,983

Indicators of strengthened capabilities for Title II PVOs, Missions and FFP are listed below.

IR1.1: Indicators of PVO capabilities

- a. *Percentage of DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.*
- b. *Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess that PVOs have adequate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring activities.*

IR1.2: Indicators of USAID Mission capabilities

- a. *Percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions.*
- b. *Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for*

redelegating Title II program authority.

IR1.3: Indicators of FFP capabilities

- a. *Percentage of scores of 3 ("good") or above given by PVOs on surveys of DAP/PAA guidance quality.*
- b. *Percentage of scores of "good" or "excellent" given by PVOs and Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.*

IR1.1: Indicators of PVO Capabilities

Capability has a very intangible nature, making its measurement in an objective, quantitative sense, quite difficult. To minimize subjectivity in the assessment of PVO capabilities, the FFP indicators will measure these capabilities in two ways -- first by having DAP reviewers assess how well Title II PVOs design programs, and second by having Missions assess how well PVOs demonstrate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring their programs. The first indicator will involve the application of the previously mentioned DAP review scoring system which is provided in Annex 3. The second indicator will use a single scored question asked of USAID Missions commenting on PAA submissions.

The DAP review scoring system is designed to more rigorously assess the quality of DAPs that are submitted, and thus the capacity of Title II PVOs for designing effective Title II development activities. More specifically, the scoring system includes assessments of: (1) project rationale; (2) activity objectives; (3) performance indicators and targets; (4) proposed interventions; (5) ration sizes and composition; (6) sustainability; (7) integration with other activities; (8) logistics; (9) monitoring and evaluation plans; (10) disincentive analyses; and (11) overall clarity. A baseline score for FY 96 has been developed by a group of reviewers reviewing a random sample of FY 1997-2001 DAPs (hereafter called FY 97 DAPs), which were submitted in FY 96, based on this scoring system. For each DAP, the percentage of scores given by reviewers that were 3 or above was calculated. (This is based on a 4-point scale in which 3 indicates that the criteria was met "to a great extent"). The baseline revealed that none of the sampled DAPs submitted in FY 96 scored a 3 or higher on 75% of the review scores (i.e. baseline = 0%). Specifically, the average percentage of scores 3 or above for all the sampled DAPs was 50%, with the range of scores for the individual DAPs between 40% and 59%.

While the baseline for this indicator is 0%, due to a number of efforts made by the SO2 Team this past year, there are good reasons to believe that DAP review scores will increase dramatically in FY 97 and subsequent years. One reason is that the SO2 Team, working collaboratively with its PVO and Mission partners, put much effort into rewriting and improving its DAP guidance for FY 98 DAPs, including defining explicit criteria for what is expected in DAPs and more detailed guidance on identifying measurable indicators and targets. The SO2 Team also used a formal survey of Title II PVOs (see discussion of Indicator IR1.3a) to get their feedback on the quality of the previous year's DAP guidance and ways to improve it. A planned increase in ISG grant support to PVOs is also expected to result in an increase in the quality of new submitted DAPs. Another reason why DAP quality scores are expected to increase is that last year the SO2 Team, including expanded Team members from Global and Regional Bureau offices, conducted very rigorous reviews of the FY 97 DAPs. The feedback to PVOs from these reviews is expected to aid them in developing higher quality DAPs this year. Future years should continue to improve as the SO2 Team continues to improve its DAP guidance based on PVO input. Also the DAP review scoring system is expected to increase the rigor and quality of feedback of DAP reviews.

Although establishing performance targets for subsequent years for this indicator is quite speculative, the SO2 Team expects, based on the reasoning above, that during FY 97 50% of the FY

15

1998-2001 DAPs will be scored as satisfying 75% of the criteria and that these numbers will increase to 60% in FY 98, 70% in FY 99, 75% in FY 00 and 80% in FY 01.

The second indicator of PVO capacity strengthening goes beyond project design by having Missions assess the demonstrated technical capacity of Title II PVOs to implement, monitor and evaluate their programs. This will be done through two scored questions included in the section of the annual DAP/PAA guidance regarding Mission comments on PAA submissions. A baseline will be created based on scores provided by Missions on FY 98 PAAs, and targets determined subsequently. Specifically, the questions asked of Missions are:

The Cooperating Sponsor has demonstrated adequate technical capacity for implementing its development activities.

_____ 1 = Not True; 2 = True to some extent; 3 = True to great extent; 4 = True without exception

The Cooperating Sponsor has demonstrated adequate technical capacity for clearly measuring and reporting the results of its activities.

_____ 1 = Not True; 2 = True to some extent; 3 = True to great extent; 4 = True without exception

Case Example: Strengthening Capabilities of the Doulos Community in Mauritania

The Doulos Community, which is implementing a Title II activity in Mauritania, is an example of a PVO which, through effective capacity strengthening efforts, has been able to operate successfully in a "non-presence" country. Doulos has been able to face the challenge of implementing its activity without USAID Mission support due to its highly experienced and skilled staff, whose salaries and development have been supported through 202(e) grants, and technical support provided by FFP. FFP also has provided technical expertise to assist Doulos in the design of its current Title II activity, largely through detailed comments on its proposal. This activity, which began in 1996, represents a well-integrated supplemental feeding, health and nutrition program, with thorough targeting, supervision, client responsiveness and partnerships with the community. With FFP support, Doulos has also implemented a coherent monitoring and evaluation system which is expected to yield useful information over the life of the activity. The activity will be reviewed at a midterm evaluation being planned for 1998 with USAID participation.

Case Example: Institutional Support Grants: The Key to PVO Strengthening

Institutional Support Grants (ISGs) are a key tool used by FFP to strengthen the capacities of its PVO partners. These grants have led to great improvements in the design and execution of their programs, and the documenting of results, including improvements in:

- (1) the logistics of food delivery, and accountability for commodities;
- (2) needs assessments for identifying vulnerable groups and appropriate interventions;
- (3) the technical soundness of activity designs;
- (4) transferring skills and expertise to country program staff;
- (5) defining impact indicators and setting up impact monitoring and evaluation systems;
- (6) the development of computer-based information systems;
- (7) the efficiency and consistency of programming among PVO organizations;
- (8) participation in strategic planning efforts with FFP, Missions and other donors; and
- (9) development of conceptual models for guiding food aid activities, such as CARE's food and livelihood security model, which has become the central strategy for all CARE programming.

IR1.2: Indicators of Mission Capabilities

Consistent with the decentralization element of USAID's reengineering strategy, FFP is embarking on a process of re delegating decision making and resource allocation responsibilities for Title II development activities to selected USAID Missions that demonstrate the capacity to effectively administer Title II resources to address food security. In doing so, the SO2 Team must ensure Missions develop the necessary capabilities. Two indicators will be used to assess Mission capability -- the percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions, and the number of Missions selected for developing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with FFP outlining specific plans for re delegating Title II program authority.

FAMPs (Food Aid Management Plans for USAID Missions) are a tool which FFP, with Regional Bureau assistance, has used to assess the program management capabilities of USAID Missions. Per USAID Handbook 9, Missions are required to submit FAMPs prior to approval of Title II activities, and a request for Missions to submit FAMPs has been included in the FY 98 DAP/PAA guidance. To use these FAMPs as an indicator to track Mission capabilities over time, scoring criteria need to be developed, and the FAMPs need to be reviewed by FFP staff. However, FFP is currently assessing whether its current FAMP document is the most appropriate measure of a Mission's food aid management capability, and if so, the form which the document should take. Based on the conclusion of this assessment, the associated FAMP indicator may need to be amended. A review of the FAMPs submitted this year could serve as a baseline of Mission capabilities, after which targets would be set for subsequent years. In addition to tracking Mission capabilities, the FAMPs would serve as an input for determining which USAID Missions qualify for re delegation of Title II program management authority.

MOUs (Memoranda of Understanding) will be developed between FFP and USAID Missions which have been selected for re delegation of authority. These MOUs, which will be developed in collaboration with the Title II PVOs operating in-country, will describe the management responsibilities to be assumed by the Mission and will verify the Mission's capability to carry out these responsibilities. Initially, the MOUs will only delegate PAA approval authority to these Missions (subject to overall country allocation levels). Eventually, DAP approval authority is expected to be extended as well. For the purposes of the FFP/SO2 Results Framework, the number of Missions which sign such MOUs will

be used as an additional indicator of strengthened Mission capabilities. MOUs for three Missions -- Peru, Ethiopia and Bangladesh -- are being developed in FY 97 (see Case Example below). The number of Missions signing MOUs and assuming redelegation of authority is expected to increase each year. Specifically, cumulative targets for subsequent years are a total of 5 Missions by FY 98, 7 by FY 99, 9 by FY 00, and 10 by FY 01. Although redelegation of authority will result in increased Mission responsibility for Title II activities, FFP will remain virtual members of each Mission Team managing the Title II activities and will retain commodity procurement responsibilities.

Case Example: Redelegation of Authority Underway in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Peru

MOUs are currently being developed between FFP and Missions in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Peru, for the redelegation of management authority for Title II development activities. These countries were selected because they had Title II development programs that were well-integrated with Mission objectives, had demonstrated sound management of Title II programs, and have qualified food aid management staff available to support the activities. Initially, the MOUs will only delegate PAA approval authority to these Missions (subject to overall country allocation levels). Eventually, DAP approval authority is expected to be extended as well. The MOUs will establish standards for Mission capabilities and the degree of Title II integration with Mission Strategic Plans, and will require the Missions to ensure the provision of adequate staff and resources for effective oversight of food aid activities.

IR1.3: Indicators of FFP Capabilities

This indicator focuses on FFP capabilities to support the effectiveness of its partners' programs. FFP capability will be measured via assessments by Title II PVOs and Missions on the quality of guidance and support FFP provides. This entails two brief surveys per year. The first, sent to PVOs only, assesses the clarity, timeliness, criteria and overall quality provided by FFP to its partners in its annual DAP/PAA guidance. The second, sent to Title II PVOs and Missions, assesses the quality of FFP's support for the design and implementation of activities, food aid management and logistics, monitoring and evaluation, and the efficiency and timeliness of program actions.

The first survey was distributed to PVOs in December, 1996, requesting their assessment of the usefulness and clarity of the past year's FY 97 DAP guidance. The responses to this survey provide a baseline with respect to the quality of the FY 97 DAP guidance, which was distributed in FY 96. Repeating this survey at the end of every proposal cycle will provide a means of tracking improvements in the guidance. A copy of the survey questions and scoring system are provided in Annex 4, and a summary of the survey results are provided below.

Baseline Results of PVO Assessment of FFP FY 97 DAP Guidance Distributed in FY 96

Question #1: CLEAR AND DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS

(1 = No; 2 = Somewhat; 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions); 4 = Yes)

Percent of Responses > or = 3: **71%**

Question #2: REVIEW CRITERIA EXPLAINED

(1 = No; 2 = Somewhat; 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions); 4 = Yes)

Percent of Responses > or = 3: **14%**

Question #3: TIMELY DISTRIBUTION

(1 = No; 2 = Somewhat; 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions); 4 = Yes)

Percent of Responses > or = 3: **0%**

Question #4: OVERALL QUALITY

(1 = Poor; 2 = Mediocre; 3 = Good; 4 = Excellent)

Percent of Responses > or = 3: **71%**

The targets set for this indicator for FY 97 (i.e. FY 98 DAP guidance) are for 75% percent of scores to be 3 or higher for each category above. This percentage should increase to 80% in FY 98, 85% in FY 99, and 90% in FY 00 and FY 01. As can be seen from the results of the survey, two areas where FFP performance was far from these targets are the explanation of the review criteria and the timeliness of distributing the guidance. In this year's guidance for FY 98 DAPs, much improvement was made in providing more explicit review criteria, and it is expected that survey results will improve considerably in this area.

Guidance on activity design is only one area in which FFP provides support to its partners. A second survey has been sent to PVOs and Missions which will be used as an indicator of the quality of support provided by FFP in other important areas including: (1) activity design and implementation; (2) program and logistics management; (3) monitoring and evaluation system development; and (4) efficiency and timeliness of program actions. This survey is included in Annex 5. The survey was distributed to PVOs and Missions in April, 1997, requesting their assessment of FFP's performance in these areas. The responses to this survey provide a baseline with respect to the quality of overall FFP support to its partners. Repeating this survey annually will provide a means of tracking improvements in FFP support. FFP expects to share the results of this survey with its partners as a basis for further discussion on how FFP can better support its partners. The baseline survey results are provided below.

Baseline Results of PVO and Mission Assessment of Quality of FFP Support

Each question below is rated according to the following scale:

1 = FFP support has been very inadequate; 2 = FFP support has been inadequate in some areas;
3 = FFP support has been generally adequate; 4 = FFP support has been excellent

Question #1: SUPPORT FOR ACTIVITY DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Percent of Responses > or = 3: 91%

Question #2: SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM AND LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT

Percent of Responses > or = 3: 80%

Question #3: SUPPORT FOR MONITORING & EVALUATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

Percent of Responses > or = 3: 63%

Question #4: EFFICIENCY AND TIMELINESS OF PROGRAM ACTIONS

Percent of Responses > or = 3: 60%

As can be seen from these baseline results, FFP support is relatively weak in the areas of supporting monitoring and evaluation system development and supporting efficiency and timeliness. The survey thus suggests that FFP needs to make a concerted effort to improve its performance in these areas. As discussed in the Resource Requirements section of this R4, improvements in these areas will only be possible with significant increases in the level of Workforce and OE resources allocated to the SO2 Team. With such additional resources, the targets established are for 80% of scores to be 3 or greater in all categories for FY 97, 85% for FY 98, and 90% for FY 99 through FY 01.

Both surveys of SO2 Team performance have indicated timeliness to be a problem. To some extent, this may continue to be a problem due to the huge and increasing workload of FFP staff, the large number of clearances required in USAID/Washington, and debates that have occurred among USAID/Washington bureaus on issues such as the approval of Title II development activities in non-presence countries, or countries where Title II activities do not contribute to a Mission's Strategic Objective(s). (Note that for non-presence countries, the Agency has mandated a multi-bureau approval process that requires inordinate amounts of FFP staff time and up to a year for each activity approval.)

II.C. IR2 Indicators

The second intermediate result towards achieving SO2 is *improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies*. There is substantial evidence that food aid, programmed by itself, does not achieve the maximum impact possible. Rather, food aid is more effective when used in conjunction with other resources in promoting increased agricultural productivity and improved household nutrition. This includes complementary dollar-funded technical assistance, training, and other resources that food aid alone cannot provide. Food aid activities should also be coordinated with host country policy reforms to maximize their impact on food security. The *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper* has also emphasized that food aid "should be integrated to a greater extent with other USAID assistance resources."

To achieve greater integration of Title II with other resources, the SO2 Team has been encouraging Agency regional and central bureaus and Missions to better integrate food aid activities into Agency operating unit strategic plans and results reports, and encouraging Missions to complement Title II activities with DA resources. FFP has also been one of the main supporters of Title III food aid programs which are a key mechanism to support policy reforms to enhance food security, as Title II

food cannot be used for such purposes.

In addition, FFP has encouraged and supported greater coordination in country food security assessments, in program design, and in program monitoring and evaluation among USAID Missions and Title II PVOs, including development of joint strategies and memoranda of understanding among USAID, PVOs and donors, such as the European Union (EU) and the World Food Program (WFP). Title II PVOs are also encouraged to work with and strengthen host country institutions, including government and non-government organizations, as well as private sector participants. Such linkages are supported by a combination of food and non-food resources with dollar or local currency resources, which are provided by USAID Missions, PVOs (from non-AID sources), monetized food aid, and 202(e) and ISG grants. However, the level of these integration efforts has been constrained by a lack of dollar resources.

Indicators of improved integration of Title II development activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies, are listed below.

IR2.1: Indicators of integration with other host country activities

- a. *Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO has coordinated its activities and other host country, private sector and IO activities to great extent or better.*
- b. *Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities.*

IR2.2: Indicators of integration with Missions

- a. *Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO activities contribute to Mission objectives to a great extent or better.*
- b. *Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs to great extent or better.*

IR2.3: Indicator of integration with other donors

- a. *Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed.*
- b. *Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.*

IR2.1: Indicators of Integration With Other Host Country Activities

Because FFP recognizes the importance of integrating Title II activities with each other and with other host country activities, FFP will track two indicators of how well activities and monitoring efforts are coordinated among cooperating sponsors, host countries, WFP, private sector participants, and other donors. The first indicator is Mission assessments of how well activities are integrated with other activities. This will be measured by including a scored question in the section of the annual DAP/PAA guidance regarding Mission comments on PAA submissions. Specifically, the question is: *The Cooperating Sponsor has worked with and coordinated its activities with other PVO, host country, private sector and international organization development activities in country.*

___ 1 = Not True; 2 = True to some extent; 3 = True to great extent; 4 = True without exception

FY 97 will be the baseline year for this indicator. A baseline will be generated from Mission scores on this question in the FY 98 PAA reviews, and targets determined based on the baseline.

The development of joint M&E activities among Title II PVOs engaged in similar activities in the same country is an area where better coordination among PVOs could be of great benefit, particularly considering the great expense of M&E activities and the limited technical capacity Title II PVOs currently have in this area. Not only can joint M&E activities (e.g., joint baseline data collection, joint

midterm evaluations) increase M&E efficiency, but by increasing communication among Title II PVOs, they can encourage better coordination of overall programming. Therefore, another indicator of integration among Title II activities which will be tracked is the number of country programs in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E programs. The target for FY 97 is three countries, with Title II PVOs working in Mozambique, Peru and Haiti having already committed to initiating joint M&E activities for their programs beginning in FY 97. The targets are to increase the cumulative total of countries to 5 by FY 98, 7 by FY 99, 9 by FY 00, and a total of 10 by FY 01. Special emphasis will be placed on encouraging joint M&E plans in countries where 2 or more PVOs are submitting new DAPS (e.g., Ethiopia in FY 98).

Case Example: Joint M&E System Development Among PVOs in Mozambique

FFP has approved activities in Mozambique for six different Title II PVOs. These activities began in FY 97 and will continue through FY 01. To increase efficiency and coordination, the PVOs in Mozambique have begun implementing a coordinated monitoring and evaluation system, including joint baseline data collection and the use of standardized M&E indicators and methods. This process has been supported by critical technical expertise provided by FFP through the IMPACT Project.

IR2.2: Indicators of Integration with Mission Objectives

Under current food aid legislation, PVO Title II programs are permitted to operate in countries without a USAID Mission, or in countries whose USAID Missions do not have food security objectives. In cases where Title II PVOs do operate in countries with USAID Missions, it is encouraged that Title II activities be integrated with Mission objectives, and that PVO results monitoring and reporting activities conform as much as possible with Mission results reporting needs.

Because Missions are in the best position to assess how well activities support their objectives and reporting needs, the two indicators of integration with Mission objectives are based on Mission assessments on scored questions included in the Mission comments section of the DAP/PAA guidance. The means of verification for both indicators would thus be through annual reviews of DAPs and PAAs, with targets set after a baseline is established in the FY 98 DAP/PAA reviews. Specifically, these indicators would be measured by Missions responding to the following two questions in their comments accompanying *DAP* and *PAA* submissions:

For Missions which have a food security-related strategic objective or IR, the PVO Title II activities contribute to achievement of the Mission objectives and results framework.

___ 1 = Not True; 2 = True to some extent; 3 = True to great extent; 4 = True without exception

For Missions which have a food security-related strategic objective or IR, the PVO's monitoring and evaluation plan and indicators address the Mission's results reporting needs.

___ 1 = Not True; 2 = True to some extent; 3 = True to great extent; 4 = True without exception

Case Example: Integration of Title II with Mission Strategic Planning in Peru

The Title II program in Peru is an example of the type of PVO-Mission integration that FFP wants to encourage. The Title II activities being implemented by ADRA, CARE, Caritas and PRISMA play an integral and integrated role in contributing to USAID/Peru's Strategic Objective of Increasing Incomes of the Poor, and to its Intermediate Result of Improved Capacity of the Extremely Poor. In support of these objectives, Title II activities have been designed to effectively reach and improve the capacity of the very poor and food insecure populations in Peru, with a focus on activities related to: investments in basic infrastructure; appropriate technological improvements; growth of small-scale income generation activities; skills enhancement; training for mothers, other community members and Ministry of Health personnel on health and nutrition practices; and nutritional rehabilitation of acutely malnourished children.

IR2.3: Indicators of Integration With Other Donors

USAID and the European Commission, the world's two largest food aid donors, agreed in September 1995 to implement joint food security strategies in five pilot countries -- Ethiopia, Eritrea, Malawi, Angola and Bolivia. An indicator of improved integration among food aid donors, therefore, will be the successful development and implementation of these and other joint strategies. The strategies for these five countries are expected to be in place by FY 98, and joint strategies for additional countries are anticipated in subsequent years. The targets for subsequent years are a cumulative total of 7 countries by FY 99, 9 by FY 00, and 10 by FY 01.

The WFP is another large food donor with programs in many of the same countries as Title II PVOs. USAID also allocates a large proportion of its Title II development resources (\$46.3 million in FY 97) to WFP. WFP is also eligible for up to \$10 million of 202(e) funds annually. While there has been relatively good integration between WFP and Title II PVOs in some countries, including Bangladesh and India (see Case Example), greater integration is being encouraged throughout the portfolio, such as through more coordinated host country institutional strengthening and training efforts, and through better sharing of lessons learned.

An indicator of such integration will be the number of countries in which FFP's partners develop formal joint food security strategies with WFP. It should be noted here that in response to FAO/WHO initiatives resulting from the International Conference on Nutrition (1992), the WFP is in the process of working with governments in over 100 countries worldwide to develop national plans of action for health and nutrition. FFP's partners will be strongly encouraged to meld, wherever feasible, their efforts into these plans. Targets for PVO-WFP integration are: joint food security strategies in 3 countries by FY 98; a total of 5 countries by FY 99; 7 by FY 00; and 9 by FY 01.

Case Example: CARE and WFP Coordination in India

In India, CARE and WFP have worked closely in coordinating their food aid development activities. These two organizations, the major partners with the Government of India in the implementation of the Integrated Child Development Services Scheme, ICDS (the world's largest child survival program), have recognized a "convergence of interest" and have begun to work together on standardization and improvement of generic ICDS training materials, and refinement of the scheme's monitoring and evaluation system.

Case Example: EC-USAID Coordination on the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative

Another example of progress made towards better integration among donors is the Global Food Aid Code of Conduct drafted by the EC, in consultation with USAID, which will be considered for adoption by the International Food Aid Donors Forum this year. USAID is complementing this effort with a specific "food aid in the context of food security" code targeted at the Greater Horn of Africa (GHAI) countries. A working draft of this document is being sent to the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) for their formal consideration. These "codes" seek ratification by donors and recipient governments on a set of coordinated and mutually supportive food aid strategies for using food assistance.

II.D. Performance Data Tables

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 1

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 1: Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively-measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of new DAPs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: DAP review scoring sheets	1996	(baseline year)	20%
	1997	50%	
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	1998	70%	
	1999	80%	
Comments: Baseline is based on random sample of FY 97 DAPs submitted in FY 96.	2000	90%	
	2001	100%	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 2

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 2: Percentage of partners' activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively-measurable indicators within first year of implementation.			
Unit of Measurement: % of 1-year old activities	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: PVO Results Reports.	1996	(baseline year)	39%
	1997	60%	
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	1998	70%	
	1999	80%	
Comments: Baseline established by review of FY 96 Results Reports and FY 98 PAAs for FY 96-00 activities.	2000	90%	
	2001	90%	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 3

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 3: % of partners' targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of annual targets	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: PVO Results Reports	1996	(baseline year)	TBD
	1997	TBD	
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	1998	TBD	

Comments: Baseline for FY 96 to be determined at later date. Targets for subsequent years will be established after baseline is determined.	1999	TBD	
	2000	TBD	
	2001	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 4

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 1a: Percentage of DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of new DAPs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: DAP review scoring sheets	1996	(baseline year)	0%
	1997	50%	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as scoring 3 or above on DAP review scoring criteria	1998	60%	
	1999	70%	
Comments: Baseline established based on re-review of random sample of FY 97 DAPs submitted in FY 96.	2000	75%	
	2001	80%	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 5

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 1b: Percentage of PAAs for which Missions assess that PVOs have adequate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring programs.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of PAAs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Mission comments on PAAs	1996	N/A	N/A
	1997	(baseline year)	
Indicator Definition: "Adequate" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	1998	TBD	
	1999	TBD	
Comments: Mission comments submitted in FY 97 will form baseline and targets established subsequently.	2000	TBD	
	2001	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 6

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 2a: Percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions.			

Unit of Measurement: % of Missions with Title II development activities	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Mission FAMPs	1996	N/A	N/A
	1997	(baseline year)	
Indicator Definition: (to be further defined)	1998	TBD	
	1999	TBD	
Comments: This indicator is being reviewed and may be modified.	2000	TBD	
	2001	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 7

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: Approval Pending Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development			
Performance Indicator 2b: Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for redelegating Title II program authority.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of Missions	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source:	1996	0	0
	1997	3	
Indicator Definition:	1998	5	
	1999	7	
Comments:	2000	9	
	2001	10	

PERFORMANCE TABLE 8

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: Approval Pending Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development			
Performance Indicator 3a: Percentage of scores 3 or above by PVOs on surveys of DAP guidance quality.			
Unit of Measurement:	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Survey of PVOs on DAP guidance quality	1996	(baseline year)	71, 14, 0, 71
	1997	75% each	
Indicator Definition:	1998	80% each	
	1999	85% each	
Comments:	2000	90% each	

	2001	90% each	
--	------	----------	--

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 9

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 3b: Percentage of scores of "good" or "excellent" by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.			
Unit of Measurement:	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Survey of PVOs/Missions on quality of FFP support	1996	(baseline year)	91, 80, 63, 60
	1997	80% each	
Indicator Definition:	1998	85% each	
	1999	90% each	
Comments:	2000	90% each	
	2001	90% each	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 10

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 1a: Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess PVO has coordinated its activities and other PVO, host country, private sector and IO activities to great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of PAAs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Mission comments on PAAs	1996	N/A	N/A
	1997	(baseline year)	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	1998	TBD	
	1999	TBD	
Comments: Mission comments submitted in FY 97 will form baseline and targets established subsequently.	2000	TBD	
	2001	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 11

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 1b: Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of countries	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source:	1996	(baseline year)	0
	1997	3	
Indicator Definition:	1998	5	
	1999	7	
Comments:	2000	9	
	2001	10	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 12

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 2a: Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO activities contribute to Mission objectives to a great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of DAPs and PAAs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Mission comments on DAPs and PAAs	1996	N/A	N/A

	1997	(baseline year)	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	1998	TBD	
	1999	TBD	
Comments: Mission comments submitted in FY 97 will form baseline and targets established subsequently.	2000	TBD	
	2001	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 13

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 2b: Percentage of DAPs/PAAAs in which Missions assess that M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs to great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percentage of DAPs and PAAAs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Mission comments on DAPs and PAAAs	1996	N/A	N/A
	1997	(baseline year)	
Indicator Definition: "Great extent or better" defined as score of 3 or above (on 4 point scale) given by Missions	1998	TBD	
	1999	TBD	
Comments: Mission comments submitted in FY 97 will form baseline and targets established subsequently.	2000	TBD	
	2001	TBD	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 14

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 3a: Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of countries	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source:	1996	(baseline year)	0
	1997	0	
Indicator Definition:	1998	5	
	1999	7	
Comments:	2000	9	
	2001	10	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 15

Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives & with other donor strategies.			
Approved: Approval Pending		Organization: BHR/Office of Food For Peace - Development	
Performance Indicator 3b: Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of countries	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source:	1996	(baseline year)	0

	1997	0	
Indicator Definition:	1998	3	
	1999	5	
Comments:	2000	7	
	2001	9	

PART III. STATUS OF MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

As noted earlier, BHR/FFP has developed a new Strategic Plan, and thus a new management contract, for both of its Strategic Objectives, for the period 1997 - 2001. This Strategic Plan replaces the Plan developed the previous year. Although the SO2 Team is committed to its new strategy, as stated previously, if additional resources are not provided for FY 98 and beyond, the SO2 Team will need to make stark choices that could include reducing greatly the number of activities it supports, as well as the scope of its Strategic Plan.

PART IV. RESOURCE REQUEST

Food aid, and Title II resources in particular, represent USAID's most widely recognized international resource, and the one foreign assistance program with the greatest public recognition and support within the United States. Yet, while food aid accounts for approximately 45% of the Agency's program resources (about \$800 million out of \$1.8 billion), for years the direct hire staff, OE and DA resources available to manage food aid have been negligible. As a result USAID has been extremely vulnerable to criticism on the issue of P.L.480 management and the seriousness of these problems was highlighted in two GAO reports in 1993 and 1995 which criticized USAID's failure to ensure accountability for food aid resources and inability to demonstrate the impact of food aid on food security.

In the past two years, FFP's SO2 Team has strived to address these GAO concerns, by collaborating with its partners to develop guidelines and indicators for managing and demonstrating the results of its activities, as well as developing its own SO2 Strategic Plan and Results Framework. But these efforts will fail without the additional workforce, OE and DA resources necessary to see them through. The SO2 Team, with present resource levels, cannot simultaneously increase accountability, better demonstrate results, and continue to manage the current size and scope of its portfolio. Unless increased resources are provided, the SO2 Team will be faced with: (1) greatly reducing the size and scope of its activities (thereby addressing the food security needs of far fewer people) (2) being unable to fully operationalize its Strategic Plan; and/or (3) jeopardizing its ability to provide adequate oversight to activities to ensure accountability of resource use. Furthermore, if the requested monitoring and evaluation support is not provided, FFP will not have the resources to work with individual country activities and PVOs to activity- or country-specific indicators, but will be forced to mandate the use of generic indicators for all programs.

The sections below describe in more detail the Workforce, OE and DA resources that are needed to achieve Strategic Objective 2 and the associated Intermediate Results, and to avoid having to choose among the three unacceptable but increasingly likely alternatives listed above. A summary of P.L. 480 food aid and 202(e) resources needed by Title II PVOs and Missions to achieve their results is also provided, and a consolidated FFP budget is provided in Annex 6.

IV.A. Workforce Requirements

Currently, the SO2 Team has only four Country Backstop Officers supporting 53 activities in 24 countries, and administering over \$300 million in Title II resources (an average of about 13 activities, 6 countries and \$75 million per officer). And because P.L. 480 legislation now allows Title II PVOs to work in non-USAID presence countries, the level of SO2 Team management support, oversight and travel has intensified in order to assist REDSOs in supporting these activities and support PVOs working in these countries since there are no Missions to turn to for guidance. With the SO2 Team staff spread so thin, it is clearly impossible to provide the level of oversight, quality backstop support and

training to Title II PVOs and Missions required for high quality project design, implementation and monitoring, and to fully achieve the results of its Strategic Plan. This problem will be exacerbated as several countries transition from emergency to development programs in the near future (e.g., Angola, Rwanda), and as the Greater Horn of Africa (GHAI) Initiative becomes operationalized.

To adequately administer its Title II resources, and achieve the results in its Strategic Plan, as well as to effectively participate as virtual team members on Mission SO Teams and Agency task forces, the SO2 Team clearly needs an increase in resources in its direct hire workforce. Given the high level of resources for which FFP is responsible, and the recent cuts in Bureau FTEs, such an increase has been long overdue. Therefore, (as summarized in Budget Table 1) FFP is requesting four new project officers who would work full time (80%) on SO2, and one other direct hire who would split his/her time between the SO1 Team and SO2 Team (40% each). As currently envisioned, the four new full-time project officers needed are:

- (1) a Country Backstop Officer with technical expertise in agricultural productivity issues to assume responsibility for programs in approximately four countries, including the GHAI;
- (2) a Country Backstop Officer with technical expertise in health and nutrition issues to assume responsibility for programs in approximately four countries; and
- (3) a Country Backstop Officer (generalist) to assume responsibility for activities in new transition countries and non-presence countries (including Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chad and Mauritania) where higher levels of support are needed given the absence of a USAID Mission;
- (4) a Program Officer responsible for designing and managing the results monitoring and reporting system for the SO2 Strategic Plan activities, as well as handling special project- and policy-related issues. This person, who would have expertise in monitoring and evaluation is essential for continuing dialogue with the SO2 Team's partners on development of Title generic indicators and their measurement.

The new "half-time" officer (who would split time with SO1) needed is an Information/Public Liaison Officer responsible for maintaining and disseminating all program information related to Titles II and III programming, including handling public inquiries, distributing food aid reports and guidances, liaising with FAM and the FACG, and working closely with BHR/OFDA and the Office of Legislative and Public Affairs.

If these workforce requirements cannot be met through increased direct-hire FTEs, it is strongly requested that additional personnel be made available through alternative means such as interns (e.g., IDIs, PMIs, AAAS Fellows), PSCs (and PSC hiring authority for development programs), or an expansion of FFP's current Institutional Support Contract, and adequate DA funds to support this.

Budget Table 1: Workforce Requirements

FFP/ Division	Position Description	% of Time for SO2 Team			Position is:	
		FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	Existing	New
FFP/D	Director	40%	40%	40%	X	
FFP/D	Deputy Director	40%	40%	40%	X	
FFP/D	Special Assistant	30%	30%	30%	X	
FFP/D	Grants Officer	45%	45%	45%	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	40%	40%	40%	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	40%	40%	40%	X	
FFP/DP	Chief	80%	80%	80%	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officers (4)	80%	80%	80%	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officer	70%	70%	70%	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officers (4)	80%	80%	80%		X
FFP/DP	Secretary	80%	80%	80%	X	
FFP/POD	Chief	15%	15%	15%	X	
FFP/POD	PA (Dev Coord)	80%	80%	80%	X	
FFP/POD	Budget Analyst	45%	45%	45%	X	
FFP/POD	PA (Info Officer)	---	45%	45%		X
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Specialist	80%	80%	80%	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Assistant	80%	80%	80%	X	
FFP/POD	Secretary	50%	50%	50%	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officer	20%	20%	20%	X	
FFP/ER	Chief	5%	5%	5%	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officers (3)	5%	5%	5%	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officers (3)	5%	5%	5%		X
BHR/PPE	Prog Analyst	25%	25%	25%	X	

IV.B. Operating Expense (Non-Personnel) Requirements

In addition to these workforce requirements, an increase is needed in the level of OE funds for travel and support services. Currently, the resources available for training, site visits, participation in international conferences and seminars, and consultations with implementing partners, international organizations and other donors are insufficient for achieving the SO2 Strategic Plan's objective and results. FFP has estimated that a total of \$548,700 is required for travel and support services in FY 99. This is only a 2% increase over previously *requested* funds for FY 97 and FY 98. It is important to note, however, that even with the increase, this total OE request represents *less than 0.2% of the total appropriated funds* for Title II development activities in FY 1997 for which the SO2 Team has management responsibility. A breakdown of the required travel and support services funding requirements is summarized in Budget Table 2 below:

Budget Table 2: Operating Expense Requirements

Operating Expense	(Thousands of Dollars)		
	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
Travel			
1. Training Travel	25.0	25.0	25.5
2. Site Visits	152.0	152.0	155.0
3. SO2 Team Retreats	50.0	50.0	50.0
4. Assessment Travel	10.0	10.0	10.2
Travel Subtotal:	237.0	237.0	240.7
Services			
5. Management & Professional Services	200.0	200.0	206.0
6. Other Miscellaneous Services	100.0	100.0	102.0
Services Subtotal:	300.0	300.0	308.0
TOTAL NON-PERSONNEL OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET:	537.0	537.0	548.7

Specifically, the line items in Budget Table 2 would be used for:

- (1) staff training, including four local joint reengineering workshops/retreats for FFP and institutional support contractors;
- (2) travel for site visits to provide technical assistance to Mission and PVO partners, including reviews of activity proposals and travel to "non-presence" countries to support REDSOs;
- (3) travel to international conferences and workshops for purposes of (1) increasing integration with other donors such as WFP and EU, and (2) partner strengthening through two food aid manager training conferences, one in Latin America and one in Africa;
- (4) field visits for carrying out assessments and evaluations of Title II development activities, which is critical for monitoring progress and quality in achieving and measuring the performance of Title II activities;
- (5) contractor support for carrying out conferences; and
- (6) support and maintenance services for computer hardware and software -- this is critical for maintaining FFP's information system for tracking P.L.480 commodities, since it is separate from the Agency's computer system and support, and not part of the New Management System (NMS).

As noted before, these OE funds must be used to backstop 53 separate activities in 24 different countries, as well as provide the training that is essential for making the transition to a managing-for-results system for Title II activities. Without an increase in OE funds, the SO2 Team will have to consider several of the following actions: (1) reducing participation of SO2 Team as virtual members in Mission SO Teams, which is a key part of the SO2 strategy of strengthening Missions and empowering them through redelegation of responsibilities; (2) reducing participation in Agency task forces, working groups and special initiatives; (3) reducing travel for providing field oversight and technical assistance to Title II development activities; (4) terminating its involvement in supporting preparations for U.S. delegation participation in WFP and EU food aid-related consultations; (5) terminating its micro-nutrient funds programming; (6) terminating training for our partners and FFP staff in managing for results in food aid programming; (7) terminating planned training for our partners in addressing environmental compliance requirements; and (8) eliminating involvement in GHAI and transition countries. Note that all of these choices would result in either reducing the number and scope of Title II activities, diminishing the ability to achieve the results in the SO2 Strategic Plan, and/or jeopardizing the ability to ensure accountability for Title II resources.

IV.C. Development Assistance (DA) Resource Requirements

DA funding increases are also critical for the SO2 Team to carry out the institutional

strengthening and integration activities outlined in its Strategic Plan. DA requirements include funding for: (1) technical support to the SO2 Team; (2) institutional support grants for strengthening PVO technical and managerial capacities; (3) performance monitoring and evaluation, including refinement and analytical review of performance indicators; (4) food security analysis and planning, particularly on issues related to Bellmon Amendment, storage and producer disincentives, design and implementation of the GHAI, strategy development with the EU and WFP, and linking relief with development; and (5) environmental impact compliance (possibly through a buy-in to the Global Bureau, a transfer to PVOs, or both), including guidance and training for FFP, Missions and PVOs. A summary of funding requirements for each of these categories is provided in Budget Table 3, and the rationale for each of these line items, and the consequences of not receiving funding for each item, are provided below. In addition to the overall level of DA resources, the breakdown of the resources in spending categories is also important. In particular, it is critical that the percentage of Child Survival funds for FY 1998 not exceed 42%, which was the percentage established in FY 1997.

Budget Table 3: Development Assistance Requirements

Development Assistance Type	(Thousands of Dollars)		
	Request FY 1997	Request FY 1998	Request FY 1999
1. FFP Institutional Support Contract	627.95	649.15	728.41
2. Institutional Support Grants	5700.00	7000.00	7000.00
3. Monitoring Performance & Evaluation	600.00	500.00	500.00
4. Food Security Analysis & Planning	750.00	875.00	875.00
5. Environmental Impact Compliance (Buy-in)	250.00	250.00	250.00
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	7927.95	9274.15	9353.41

(1) **FFP Institutional Support Contract**

Rationale: Technical support to the SO2 Team, which is currently provided through a contract with Mendez England & Associates, is critically needed for assistance in a number of administrative and information services, including commodity and logistics tracking, information system management, assistance in administering grant programs, and organization of conferences and training workshops such as the Food Aid Managers Course offered annually for Washington and field staff.

Consequences of not receiving funding: If the level of resources requested is not provided, many of these critical activities supported by Mendez England & Associates would have to be cut which would seriously impede the SO2 Team's ability to maintain its automated information systems, program commodities, organize proposal reviews,

and train food aid managers and Title II PVO personnel.

(2) **Institutional Support Grants**

Rationale: Institutional Support Grants (ISGs) are a key resource for providing our implementing partners with the necessary dollar resources to: (1) better design, target and manage food aid activities; (2) refine country strategies for achieving food security through better identification of project purpose, key constraints and host country capabilities; (3) continue forward momentum on common, generic food aid performance indicators and mutually acceptable methodologies that cooperating sponsors and USAID can use in measuring the impact of food aid; (4) establish sound monitoring and evaluation systems; (5) meet new BHR requirements for environmental reviews; and (6) increase PVO participation in Mission and FFP strategic Planning and re-engineering efforts. In these ways, the ISGs greatly strengthen the abilities of our Title II PVOs to achieve sustained improvements in household nutrition and agricultural productivity for vulnerable groups.

It is clear that adequate DA resources for ISG grants are absolutely critical for enabling the SO2 Team to achieve its strategic objective. Based on both past and anticipated demand for ISG resources and the SO2 Team's desire to continue to support the impressive progress made by Title II PVOs in strengthening and improving their programs with these resources, the SO2 Team emphasizes the importance of allocating no less than \$7 million annually in DA-funded ISG grants for development food aid activity purposes.

Consequences of not receiving funding: If DA resources are insufficient, PVOs would not have the needed resources for development of country strategies and high-quality activity designs; development of M&E systems (including baseline data); incorporation of environmental planning in activity design; and maintenance of strong headquarters operations (which are critical for effective backstopping of field programs, training of field staff, and cross-fertilization of ideas across countries). This would greatly impair the ability of Title II activities to achieve and demonstrate impact, and prevent the SO2 Team from achieving the results in its Strategic Plan.

(3) **Monitoring Performance & Evaluation**

Rationale: In addition to increased staffing requirements, technical expertise is also needed to support FFP, Missions and Title II PVOs in continuing efforts to develop and operationalize monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems as part of their results reporting requirements, including development and review of the relevance and application of indicators, reporting systems and guidelines for the evaluation of activities. The SO2 Team has been accessing technical expertise on M&E issues through a buy-in to the Global Bureau IMPACT Project. It is critical that the Team continue to be able to access this expertise through Global's planned follow-on project.

Consequences of not receiving funding: If these funds are not provided, the SO2 Team's ability to strengthen field M&E activities, and to consolidate results of Title food aid activities for external reporting purposes would be greatly limited, and may necessarily result in a shift back from reporting food aid impacts on food security, to merely reporting outputs.

(4) **Food Security Analysis & Planning**

Rationale: The transition to a more development-oriented and integrated approach to Title II programming has been hampered by a lack of resources for food security analysis and planning, both for FFP and its partners. In particular, funds are needed for addressing critical food security issues. This includes support for: (1) analyses regarding food supply/demand conditions, the effects of monetization and other Bellmon Amendment concerns; (2) improving linkages between relief and development; (3) the development of long-term strategies (internally and with other donors) for food security and the role of food aid in critical regions, such as the Greater Horn of Africa and the Sahel; and (4) conducting analyses of agricultural cycles, trading patterns, production trends, and donor and host country policies and programs. Food security strengthening can also be addressed through buy-ins to Global Bureau projects to provide staff and partners with critical training in food security analyses, food aid activity design, and development of Bellmon and monetization plans. Issues (1) and (2) above would be of first priority, and issues (3) and (4) would be addressed only if full funding is provided.

Consequences of not receiving funding: Without this funding, FFP, and thus USAID, will not be able to focus on long-range food security analysis and planning, and Title II development activities will continue to be designed, approved and implemented with limited long-term strategic thinking. Efforts to improve coordination with other donors would also be constrained.

(5) **Environmental Impact Compliance**

Rationale: Environmental impact analyses are a new requirement for Title II food aid activities, as a result of a recent determination by the Agency Environmental Officer that FFP activities were not in compliance with Regulation 216. DA resources are therefore needed for supporting PVOs' efforts to comply with this requirement. Funds would support training and technical assistance for PVOs in carrying out Initial Environmental Examination (IEEs), which are required for all activities funded in FY 98, and incorporating environmentally sound interventions in activity designs.

Consequences of not receiving funding: Without resources to train Title II PVOs (and possibly allow them to hire staff with environmental expertise), many will be unable to adequately carry out IEEs, thus calling into question the ability of activities to be in compliance with Regulation 216. This is particularly true for those activities related to agricultural productivity, water and sanitation, natural resource management and roads and infrastructure.

IV.D. Food Aid Commodity Requirements

Title II Food Aid Requirements

FFP expects in the future that P.L. 480 Title II resources will not be included in FFP R4s, and instead will be part of the Agency's reinvented programming process. This is consistent with USAID reengineering principles, as well the SO2 Strategic Plan's approach that the SO2 Team's role is to increase the effectiveness of its PVO and Mission partners in achieving people-level impact targets that *they* set. Based on this approach, P.L. 480 (and dollar) resources are used by Missions and PVOs for achieving their field-level results targets, and other OE and DA resources are required by the SO2 Team to increase the effectiveness of the Missions and PVOs. Presumably the levels of Title II resources available to PVOs and Missions would be commensurate with levels of support needed for meeting their objectives.

Estimates of required Title II development resources are derived annually through a formal collaborative process with Missions, and these estimates are included in the Congressional Presentation (CP). This process has not yet taken place, however, for FY 99. Consequently, an estimate of expected P.L. 480 resources required for FY 99 is derived here based on an assumption of a 10% increase over the previous year. This estimate accounts the mortgage for the continuation of previously approved activities, expected new DAPs, food availability trends, and expansion into countries anticipated to transition from emergency to development activities. The FY 98 CP allocation of Title II resources for development activities implemented through PVOs (i.e. excluding the WFP pledge and emergency allocations) was approximately \$410 million. Based on this, the expected Title II development requirements for PVO-implemented activities for FY 99 in dollar terms is \$450 million.

Title III Food Aid Requirements

Title III food aid is an important government-to-government grant program that gives USAID Missions a flexible tool for promoting activities that support policy changes to improve food security. In this regard, Title III has been one of the most effective USAID programs for assisting host country governments to focus on economic development activities, promotion of policy reforms in the agricultural sector, and the promotion of free and open markets. Major accomplishments of the Title III program in recipient countries have included: adoption of more open and competitive market and trade policies; privatization and increased efficiency of agricultural extension services; improved land tenure policies and increased investments in land; more efficient and accessible rural financial services; and more sustainable forest management and land use policies that enhance agricultural productivity and economic growth. Title III commodities have also been used effectively to promote food security through direct feeding programs or the development of emergency food reserves.

Priority in allocating Title III resources is given to countries that demonstrate the greatest need for food, the capacity to use the food assistance effectively, a commitment to policies which promote food security, and a long-term plan for development. Title III is also an especially appropriate tool for promoting food security in transition countries. Although Title III resources have diminished considerably in recent years, a number of Missions appreciate the usefulness and unique focus of this resource, and have expressed their desire for continued Title III food aid. The SO2 Team has also attempted to compile all Mission Title III requests from the Mission R4s, and based on this review, estimates that approximately \$50 million in Title III is needed for FY 99.

IV.E. Prioritization of Objectives

The SO2 Team believes that the best chance for achieving great and sustainable impacts from Title II activities in eliminating food insecurity lies in the integration of Title II with development assistance resources. Therefore, in prioritizing resources allocated to its partners, integrated approaches will receive priority over "stand alone" activities.

With respect to the OE and DA resources available to the SO2 Team for increasing the effectiveness of its partners, if additional resources are not provided, the Team will face stark choices among three alternatives: (1) greatly reducing the size and scope of its activities, thereby addressing the food security needs of far fewer people; (2) reducing its efforts to achieve the objective and results in its Strategic Plan; and/or (3) jeopardizing its ability to provide adequate oversight to activities to ensure the accountability of resource use. If food aid activities are cut back, decisions will be based on the technical merits of programs, using criteria established in FFP's DAP guidance. Furthermore, if additional DA resources are not provided, the SO2 Team's first commitment would be to its institutional support contract and ISG grants, necessitating cut backs or elimination of monitoring and evaluation, food security analysis and environmental compliance training.

IV.F. Performance Weights and Measures

Just as the Agency is seeking to improve the process of DA allocation to better link resources to results and priorities, FFP is also seeking to improve the process by which it allocates Title II resources through more rigorous reviews of DAPs and PAAs. Consequently, this year, for the first time, the DAP/PAA guidance included explicit criteria by which proposals will be approved and resources allocated. These review criteria act as "weights and measures" linking Title II allocation with results and USAID priorities.

As part of the DAP/PAA review process, performance targets are established by PVOs and are a basis for continued food aid assistance. This review process functions similarly to the Agency weights and measures in that proposals are judged by: (1) the performance of activities against planned targets; (2) the extent to which they support the Farm Bill's development goal of improved food security; and (3) the links between activities and development initiatives of host country institutions, USAID Missions, other PVOs and other donors.

The SO2 Team's present system for allocating Title II resources thus places strong emphasis on weighing the many factors important to food aid and food security results. It is different from the DA approach, however, because the underlying legislation is different and its partnership with its PVO Cooperating Sponsors is key. The SO2 Team has also strived to improve its process of allocating resources by results and priorities as evidenced in its new Strategic Plan and DAP/PAA guidance. In particular, the Strategic Plan has emphasized promoting links between Title II resources and host country and USAID priorities. A continuing challenge will be to more strongly integrate the allocation process of Mission DA resources and the allocation process for Title II PVOs.

IV.G. Environmental Compliance

PVOs implementing Title II development activities in FY 98 are required to conduct an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE), in accordance with USAID environmental review procedures, within the first year of activity implementation. For those activities determined, based on the IEE, to have potentially significant impacts on the environment, a more detailed Environmental Assessment is required. FFP is monitoring compliance with these regulations. USAID's BHR Environmental Officer has reviewed FY 1997 DAPs to determine which ongoing activities need to undergo an environmental review, and PVOs are being advised where further action is needed.

BHR/FFP is in the midst of developing guidance for Title II PVOs to use in carrying out IEEs (which will ultimately be submitted with DAPs beginning in FY 99); and designing training activities to assist our partners in carrying out environmental assessments, and ensuring that their projects have no negative environmental consequences. In addition to these procedures for avoiding any negative environmental impacts, many Title II activities have natural resource management components which include positive interventions designed to improve the management and sustainability of environmental resources, as well as prevent disasters.

45

ANNEX 1: Criteria for Adequate DAP/PAA Indicators

(A summary of this section has been included in FY 98 DAP/PAA guidance).

To allow for consistent, reliable measurement of the performance and impacts of Title II field programs, adequate indicators need to be articulated in DAPs/PAA. To aid in determining whether indicators are adequate, the following criteria are provided:

1. They must be **objectively measurable**. That is, they should not be dependent on subjective judgment. Subjective terms like "improved", "strengthened", "better" and "adequate" should be avoided. For instance, one FY 96 DAP had as an indicator, the number of women who *"improve their knowledge and practice of preventive health..."* As an example, a more objectively measurable alternative would be the number of women who *perform (list of desired health practices) on a daily basis....*

Additional examples from FY 96 DAPs of indicators that are NOT objectively measurable include (non-objectively measurable terms are in *italics*):

- "Popular pharmacies with *sufficient* medicines"
- "*Improvement* in primary health knowledge"
- "70 community members are *effectively* managing community resources"
- "*Better* utilization and consumption of food by project beneficiaries than others"
- "*Changes in knowledge* of parents on specific health and nutrition topics"
- "Percent *success* in project implementation"
- "Number of families *implementing training*"
- "Number and *content* of community monitoring assessment bulletins produced"
- "*Improved* soil conditions"

2. They must include **specific measurement units**. For instance, unspecific terms such as "health practices", "eating habits", and "implementing training" should be avoided. An example from an FY 96 DAP of an indicator without a specific measurement unit would be: "*Increased local market activity*". A more measurable alternative, perhaps, would be: "*Increased number of vehicles travelling into and out of market centers*".

Additional examples in FY 96 DAPs lacking specific measurement units include:

- "Continuing 'development' activities after FY 1997"
- "Availability of 'development inputs' on local market"
- "Decreased erosion damage and gully formation"
- "Malnutrition reduced"
- "Technologies applied in agriculture"
- "Increased access, availability, and utilization of food"
- "Change in traditional system of agriculture"
- "Topics covered in bimonthly Mothers' Club training session"

3. They must be **program-linked**. Full and direct attribution of changes in people's food security status to specific program activities is rarely possible, due to the myriad of factors that affect food security outcomes. However, indicators (and the way they are measured) need to be linked to program activities as strongly as possible, so that

changes in values of indicators can be "reasonably" attributed to these activities. For instance, changes in national unemployment rates would not (generally) be an "attributable" indicator for development programs. Nor can changes in agricultural productivity be assumed to be attributable to program activities in cases, for instance, where rainfall has varied dramatically between years, unless the change in rainfall is somehow accounted for.

Examples of "non program linked" indicators cannot necessarily be expressed as simple phrases, because it is not simply the nature of the indicator that matters, but rather how it relates to the particular program. To cite one example, an FY 97 DAP had as a target that the extension service it was working with would "... ultimately transition into a service provided by commercial suppliers...." But the DAP gave no indication of how the program activities would support such a transition.

4. They must be **effect- or impact-oriented**, as opposed to only input- or output-oriented. USAID's results-oriented operations system requires that results be reported in terms of ultimate effects or impacts rather than simply the inputs or outputs which may contribute to the ultimate effects. Thus, input-oriented indicators such as "amounts of food distributed" and "numbers of training workshops held" should be avoided. Likewise, output-oriented indicators such as "numbers of persons trained" and "miles of roads built".

The following are examples from FY 96 DAPs of indicators and targets which are NOT effect- or impact-oriented:

- "Number of persons trained in nutrition education"
- "Number of health posts supplied"
- "Provide 403,200 calories to each participating child over LOP"
- "Numbers of farmers trained... in natural resource management techniques...."
- "Numbers of wells constructed"

5. Where possible, they are **standardized** to promote consistency and comparability of impacts across countries and programs, and over time. Specifically, as far as possible, indicators should be chosen from the generic list of indicators provided in the *"List and Description of P.L. 480 Title II Generic Performance Indicators for Development Activities"* which has been distributed by FFP and was jointly drafted with Title II PVOs.

ANNEX 2: Title II Generic Performance Indicators for Development Activities

Having PVOs and Missions measure and report on standardized indicators is critical for successfully implementing the SO2 Strategic Plan. Therefore, PVOs using Title II food aid for development activities will be expected to carefully measure and report impacts, using, as far as possible, appropriate indicators from the list of Title II Generic Indicators. The use of these indicators will allow USAID and its partners to measure the impact of similar interventions in a standardized way and to better judge which interventions are more effective in improving household food security. Use of these indicators will also enable FFP and the cooperating sponsors to consolidate data, and thus more effectively meet Agency and Congressional requirements to demonstrate the impacts of Title II activities on food security objectives.

The core generic indicators are focused on the major categories of Title II activities and are divided into two types: (1) *impact indicators*, which will be carefully measured at the midpoint and at the end of activities; and (2) *annual monitoring indicators*, which will be measured using routine records or with brief surveys. All will be measured against data collected in baseline surveys that will be carried out at the start of all Title II activities.

(1) Impact Indicators - The measurement of impact indicators will require cooperating sponsors to carry out high quality baseline, midterm (where possible), and end-of-activity surveys. This will require use of appropriate sampling techniques and, where possible, include measurement of control groups in non-intervention areas. Due to the relatively high cost of their measurement, FFP will not require that these indicators be measured every year. However, FFP will support selected Operations Research Cases designed to better answer some generic impact questions. In these cases, PVOs may be asked to carry out more extensive measurements at the midpoint of a five-year activity. In addition, USAID Missions and relevant offices in the Global Bureau will be encouraged to invest resources to demonstrate the impact of food-aid-supported interventions.

(2) Annual Monitoring Indicators - In years in which impact data are not collected, annual results reporting will consist of monitoring intermediate results and selected impact measures that can be routinely collected. In addition, qualitative methods such as focus group discussions and key informant interviews may be used to capture process and contextual data. This annual data may indicate trends, constraints, and external factors influencing activity performance. For example, in the case of agricultural activities, annual yield data needs to be collected over the life of the activity to help distinguish effects of climatic variability from effects of the food-supported interventions.

The table below provides a summary of the Title II generic indicators. As much as possible, PVOs will be encouraged to choose indicators from this list which are relevant to their programs.

Summary of Title II Generic Indicators

Category	Level	Indicator
Health,	Impact	% stunted children (height/age z-score)
		% underweight children (weight/age z-score)
		% infants breastfed w/in 8 hours of birth
		% infants under 6 months breastfed only
		% infants 6-10 months fed complementary foods
		% infants continuously fed during diarrhea
		% infants fed extra food for 2 weeks after diarrhea
	Annual	% eligible children in growth monitoring/promotion
		% children immunized for measles at 12 months
		% of communities with community health organization
% children in growth promotion program gaining weight in past 3 months (gender		
Water and	Impact	% infants with diarrhea in last two weeks
		liters of household water use per person
		% population with proper hand washing behavior
		% households with access to adequate sanitation (also annual monitoring)
	Annual	% households with year-round access to safe water
		% water/sanitation facilities maintained by community
Household food	Impact	% households consuming minimum daily food requirements
		number of meals/snacks eaten per day
		number of different food/food groups eaten
Agricultural	Impact	annual yield of targeted crops
		yield gaps (actual vs. potential)
		yield variability under varying conditions
		value of agricultural production per vulnerable household
		months of household grain provisions
		% of crops lost to pests or environment
	Annual	annual yield of targeted crops
		number of hectares in which improved practices adopted
		number of storage facilities built and used
Natural	Impact	imputed soil erosion
		imputed soil fertility
		yields or yield variability (also annual monitoring)
	Annual	number of hectares in which NRM practices used
		seedling/sapling survival rate
FFW/CFW	Impact	agriculture input price margins between areas
		availability of key agriculture inputs
		staple food transport costs by seasons
		volume of agriculture produce transported by households to markets

	volume of vehicle traffic by vehicle type
Annual	kilometers of farm to market roads rehabilitated
	selected annual measurements of the impact indicators

ANNEX 3: DAP Review Scoring System

Country/PVO _____ Reviewer _____
 Date _____

For the following statements, provide written comments and rate according to the following scale:

- 1 = Not True of this DAP;
- 2 = True to some extent;
- 3 = True to a great extent with a few exceptions; and
- 4 = True without exception or qualification.

Note: The scores are a tool for tracking and improving the quality of DAP submissions and will NOT be used as the basis for accepting or rejecting proposals. Leave blank any statements which you are not able to comment on.

1. The DAP provided a convincing rationale for the country and the target population chosen, including an assessment of their relative food security needs.

					SCORES
country:	1	2	3	4	_____
target group:	1	2	3	4	_____

2. The DAP provided specific objectives and intermediate results consistent with food security.

					SCORES
specific objectives and IRs:	1	2	3	4	_____
consistent with food security:	1	2	3	4	_____

3. The DAP identified performance indicators and targets that (as defined in attached guidance): are objectively measurable, include specific measurement units, address people-level effects and impacts in addition to monitoring indicators, have clear links to program activities, and include FFP Title II Generic Indicators where possible.

					SCORES
objectively measurable:	1	2	3	4	_____
specific measurement units:	1	2	3	4	_____
effect and impact indicators:	1	2	3	4	_____
monitoring indicators:	1	2	3	4	_____
linked to program activities:	1	2	3	4	_____
generic indicators if appropriate:	1	2	3	4	N/A _____

4. The program interventions are described in sufficient detail to assess technical feasibility, and have a clear relationship to the program objectives; and a convincing case is made that these interventions, and the level of resources devoted to them, are likely to achieve the proposed impact targets.

					SCORES
sufficient detail:	1	2	3	4	_____
tied to objectives:	1	2	3	4	_____
likely to achieve targets:	1	2	3	4	_____

5. The DAP provides a convincing rationale for the proposed ration size and composition (non-monetized programs only)

SCORES

ration size:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
ration composition:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____

6. The DAP demonstrates the likelihood that intended benefits will be sustainable, including measures of cost recovery, financial commitment of partners, and capacity of gov't/NGO partners for continued management/maintenance.

SCORES

cost recovery:	1	2	3	4		_____
financial commitment:	1	2	3	4		_____
partner capacity:	1	2	3	4		_____

7. The DAP described clearly how the proposed activities are integrated with each other, with food security-related activities of other PVOs/donors/host government, with food security objectives of Missions, and with non-food resources, where applicable.

SCORES

with each other:	1	2	3	4		_____
with other PVOs:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
with other donors:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
with host country:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
with Mission:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
with non-food resources:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____

8. The DAP provided a realistic logistics plan with sufficient information on port, storage and inland transport facilities, including logistical problem areas and steps to address them.

SCORES

port and storage:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
inland transport:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____
problems addressed:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____

9. The DAP described specific plans for monitoring and evaluation, including the collection of baseline data, and including monitoring of Title II Generic Indicators, where relevant.

SCORES

M&E plans:	1	2	3	4		_____
baseline data:	1	2	3	4		_____
Title II generic indicators:	1	2	3	4	N/A	_____

10. The DAP included a complete, documented analysis of the impact of commodities on local production to satisfy the Bellmon Amendment.

SCORE

Bellmon analysis:	1	2	3	4		_____
-------------------	---	---	---	---	--	-------

11. Overall, the DAP was sufficiently clear and concise.

SCORES

clear:	1	2	3	4		_____
concise:	1	2	3	4		_____

ANNEX 4: DAP Guidance Quality Survey

(Below is a survey to be distributed annually to PVOs to solicit their assessment of the quality of FFP DAP/PAA guidance and to track their assessments over time. As a baseline, this survey, in a modified form, was sent to PVOs to assess the FY 97 DAP/PAA.)

To assist PVOs in designing high-quality DAPs and PAAs, which satisfy Title II program design requirements, and avoid the need for substantial revisions, FFP intends to make its DAP/PAA guidance for FY __ as clear and as helpful to PVOs as possible. To this end, FFP would appreciate your providing feedback on the quality of this year's (FY __) guidance, and areas where improvements are needed, by answering the following brief survey.

1. Did the FY 97 DAP/PAA guidance provide sufficient clarity and detail regarding what is expected in each section of the DAP/PAA? If not, which sections were inadequate and why?

_____ 1 = No.
_____ 2 = Somewhat.
_____ 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions)
_____ 4 = Yes

2. Were the criteria for accepting or rejecting proposals sufficiently clear? If not, why not?

_____ 1 = No.
_____ 2 = Somewhat.
_____ 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions)
_____ 4 = Yes

3. Was the DAP/PAA guidance issued in a timely manner to allow sufficient time to develop DAPs/PAAs?

_____ 1 = No.
_____ 2 = Somewhat.
_____ 3 = Generally yes (yes with exceptions)
_____ 4 = Yes

4. On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the FY 97 DAP guidance in terms of the level of clarity and detail it provides in describing what is expected in DAP submissions and the criteria for approval or rejection? (Mark with an X)

_____ 1 = Poor (mostly unclear and lacking detail)
_____ 2 = Mediocre (somewhat unclear and lacking detail)
_____ 3 = Good (mostly clear and well-detailed)
_____ 4 = Excellent (very clear and detailed)

5. What changes in the guidance would you recommend to increase its helpfulness to you in designing DAPs/PAAs?

ANNEX 5: FFP Support Quality Survey

(Below is a survey to be distributed annually to PVOs and Missions to solicit their assessment of the quality of FFP support to them and to track their assessments over time. As a baseline, this survey was sent to PVOs in April, 1997.)

BHR/FFP is committed to assisting our PVO and Mission partners to increase the effectiveness of Title II food aid development activities, and their ability to demonstrate significant measurable results. To this end, we would like feedback on the adequacy of our support to you in various areas, and areas where more support is needed. Therefore, we would appreciate if you could provide us with scored and written responses for the following questions:

1. How well has FFP supported the **design and implementation** of Title II development activities through the provision of guidance and technical expertise in critical technical areas -- (e.g., health and nutrition, agricultural productivity, water and sanitation, etc.)?

_____ 4 = FFP support has been excellent.
_____ 3 = FFP support has been generally adequate.
_____ 2 = FFP support has been inadequate in some areas.
_____ 1 = FFP support has been very inadequate.

Additional comments, if any:

2. How well has FFP supported the **food aid management and logistics** of Title II development activities through guidance and expertise in critical areas (e.g., Bellmon Amendments, monetization, and commodity selection and distribution)?

_____ 4 = FFP support has been excellent.
_____ 3 = FFP support has been generally adequate.
_____ 2 = FFP support has been inadequate in some areas.
_____ 1 = FFP support has been very inadequate.

Additional comments, if any:

3. How well has FFP supported the **monitoring and evaluation** of Title II activities through the provision of guidance and technical expertise on the development of M&E systems, including the integration of PVO M&E activities into USAID results reporting systems?

_____ 4 = FFP support has been excellent.
_____ 3 = FFP support has been generally adequate.
_____ 2 = FFP support has been inadequate in some areas.
_____ 1 = FFP support has been very inadequate.

Additional comments, if any:

4. Has FFP supported the **efficiency and timeliness** of Title II activities through streamlined procedures and timely responses for key program actions such as proposal reviews and call forwards, recognizing the need for FFP to also ensure quality and accountability in these actions?

- _____ 4 = FFP support has been excellent.
- _____ 3 = FFP support has been generally adequate.
- _____ 2 = FFP support has been inadequate in some areas.
- _____ 1 = FFP support has been very inadequate.

Additional comments, if any:

5. Among the areas in which you have assessed FFP support to have been inadequate, please identify which areas are most important to you, and thus areas which are of greatest priority for FFP to address?

6. Can you identify areas in which you think FFP should provide additional training to Missions and PVOs?

7. Do you have any other comments on how FFP can better support PVO and Mission needs?

SS

ANNEX 6: Consolidated FFP Budget Tables

Consolidated Budget Table 1: FY 1999 FFP Workforce Requirements

FFP/ Division	Position Description	% Allocation of Time			Position is:	
		SO1 Team	SO2 Team	Other	Existing	New
FFP/D	Director	40%	40%	20%	X	
FFP/D	Deputy Director	40%	40%	20%	X	
FFP/D	Special Assistant	30%	30%	40%	X	
FFP/D	Grants Officer	45%	45%	10%	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	40%	40%	20%	X	
FFP/D	Secretary	40%	40%	20%	X	
FFP/DP	Chief	10%	80%	10%	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officer (4)	5%	80%	15%	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officer	20%	70%	10%	X	
FFP/DP	FFP Officer (4)	5%	80%	15%		X
FFP/DP	Secretary	5%	80%	15%	X	
FFP/ER	Chief	90%	5%	5%	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officer (3)	90%	5%	5%	X	
FFP/ER	FFP Officer (3)	90%	5%	5%		X
FFP/ER	FFP Officer	70%	20%	10%	X	
FFP/ER	Secretary	90%	5%	5%	X	
FFP/POD	Chief	15%	15%	70%	X	
FFP/POD	Budget Analyst	45%	45%	10%	X	
FFP/POD	PA (Dev. Coord.)	5%	80%	15%	X	
FFP/POD	PA (Emer. Coord.)	80%	5%	15%		X
FFP/POD	PA (Info Officer)	45%	45%	10%		X
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Specialist	10%	80%	10%	X	
FFP/POD	Prog Ops Assistant	10%	80%	10%	X	
FFP/POD	Secretary	10%	50%	40%	X	
BHR/PPE	Program Analyst	25%	25%	50%	X	

Consolidated Budget Table 2: FY 1999 FFP (Non-personnel Operating Expense Budget

Operating Expense	(Thousands of Dollars)		
	SO1	SO2	TOTAL
Travel			
1. Training Travel	25.5	25.5	51.0
2. Site Visits	206.0	155.0	361.0
3. Conferences/Seminars/Retreats	25.0	50.0	75.0
4. Assessment Travel	30.0	10.2	40.2
5. Disaster Travel (in response to specific disasters)	25.0	0.0	25.0
Travel Subtotal:	311.5	240.7	552.2
Services			
6. Management & Professional Services	102.0	206.0	308.0
7. Other Miscellaneous Services	102.0	102.0	204.0
Services Subtotal:	204.0	308.0	512.0
TOTAL NON-PERSONNEL OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET:	515.5	548.7	1064.2

Consolidated Budget Table 3: FY 1999 FFP Development Assistance Requirements

Development Assistance Type	(Thousands of Dollars)		
	SO1	SO2	TOTAL
1. FFP Institutional Support Contract	1028.00	728.41	1756.41
2. Institutional Support Grants	2000.00	7000.00	9000.00
3. Monitoring Performance & Evaluation	500.00	500.00	1000.00
4. Food Security Analysis & Planning	250.00	875.00	1125.00
5. Environmental Impact Compliance (Buy-in)	100.00	250.00	350.00
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	3878.00	9353.41	13,231.41