



**Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project  
(*Proyecto de Prevención de la Violencia y del Crimen a Nivel Comunitario*)**

**Final Report**

**Version 3**

**April 2013**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by RTI International.

# **Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (*Proyecto de Prevención de la Violencia y del Crimen a Nivel Comunitario*)**

## **Final Report**

Cooperative Agreement No. 519-A-00-08-00010-00  
January 14, 2008–February 28, 2013

Prepared for  
Mr. Mauricio Herrera  
United States Agency for International Development/El Salvador

***Prepared by***  
RTI International  
3040 Cornwallis Road  
Post Office Box 12194  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194

RTI International is one of the world's leading research institutes, dedicated to improving the human condition by turning knowledge into practice. Our staff of more than 2,800 provides research and technical expertise to governments and businesses in more than 40 countries in the areas of health and pharmaceuticals, education and training, surveys and statistics, advanced technology, international development, economic and social policy, energy and the environment, and laboratory and chemistry services. For more information, visit [www.rti.org](http://www.rti.org).

RTI International is a trade name of Research Triangle Institute.

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
List of Tables.....	v
Abbreviations .....	vi
Resumen Ejecutivo .....	ix
Executive Summary .....	1
1 Context.....	1
2 Project Background .....	2
3 Conceptual Framework and Project Design .....	3
3.1 Phases 1 and 2.....	5
3.2 Phase 3.....	6
4 Objectives and Expected Results .....	6
4.1 Activity 1: Municipality-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention.....	6
4.1.1 Objective (sub-IR) 1: Community-based CVPs improved and expanded .....	6
4.2 Activity 2: National Leadership and Support for Crime and Violence Protection.....	7
4.2.1 Objective (sub-IR) 2: GOES’s capacity to plan, implement, and monitor CVP programs increased .....	7
5 Intervention Model.....	8
5.1 Key Elements of the CVPP Model .....	8
5.1.1 Municipal Organization.....	8
5.1.2 CVP Interventions in Communities.....	9
5.1.3 Focus on Youth.....	10
5.1.4 Small Grant Process .....	11
5.1.5 Municipal and Community Leadership Skills.....	11
5.1.6 Sites and Phasing .....	11
5.1.7 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Systems.....	13
6 Results .....	15
6.1 Activity 1: Key Results and Achievements by Selected Location.....	15

6.1.1	Review of Activities per Municipality .....	18
6.1.2	Selection of Municipalities and CMPVs' work .....	27
6.1.3	Competitive Small Grants Program.....	30
6.2	Activity 3: Key Results and Achievements by Selected Location.....	32
6.2.1	Review of Activities per Municipality .....	34
6.2.2	Target Municipalities and Communities and Consolidation of the Work of the CMPVs.....	38
6.2.3	Competitive Small Grants Program.....	40
6.3	Performance as Measured by the Indicators .....	47
6.4	Achievements Reflected in Products and Outcomes Not Covered by the Indicators .....	48
7	Before and After Evaluation Data .....	50
8	Voices of Participants .....	54
8.1	Strengths of CVPP.....	54
8.2	Observations and Recommendations.....	57
Annex A.	Monitoring and Evaluation Charts.....	59
Annex B.	Status of Progress toward Performance Indicator Targets .....	74
Annex C.	Financial Report.....	80
Annex D.	CVPP Projects and Grants Tracker .....	83
Annex E.	In-Kind and Cash Donation Tracker.....	103
Annex F.	References and List of CVPP Publications .....	104
Annex G.	CVPP Participant Communities per Phase, Municipality, and Activity ...	114

## List of Tables

Tabla A.	Línea de tiempo, lugares, y tipos Actividad: Pequeñas Donaciones y fortalecimiento de Consejos de prevención .....	xiii
Table 1.	Timeline, Locations, and Types of CVPP Activity: Small Grants and CMPV Strengthening.....	12
Table 2.	CVPP-supported Municipalities during Phases 1 and 2.....	28
Table 3.	CVPP-supported Municipalities during Phases 1–3.....	30
Table 4.	Change in Crime Reports and Citizen Perceptions Where Before-and-After Surveys Were Conducted .....	51
Table 5.	Factors that Enhanced or Limited Success.....	55
Table 6.	Factors That Enhanced or Limited Sustainability.....	57

## Abbreviations

ADESCO	community development association
AOR	agreement officer's representative
ASAPROSAR	Salvadoran Association for Rural Health ( <i>Asociación Salvadoreña Pro-Salud Rural</i> )
ASISTEDCOS	<i>Fundación de Asistencia Técnica para el Desarrollo Comunal Salvadoreño</i>
CARSI	Central American Regional Security Initiative
CASART	<i>Cámara Salvadoreña de Artesanos</i>
CBO	community-based organization
CECI	Centre for International Studies and Cooperation
CEII	<i>Comité Ejecutivo Inter-institucional del PNPS</i>
CIDEP	<i>Asociación Intersectoral para el Desarrollo Económico y el Progreso Social</i>
CMIPV	<i>Consejo Municipal Inter-Institucional de Prevención de Violencia</i>
CMPCS	<i>Comité Municipal por la Paz y Convivencia Social</i>
CMPV	Municipal Violence Prevention Committee
CNSP	National Council for Public Safety ( <i>Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Pública</i> )
COAMSS	Council of Mayors of the Greater Metropolitan Area of San Salvador ( <i>Consejo de Alcaldes del Área Metropolitana de San Salvador</i> )
COMDEPAST	<i>Consejo Municipal de Desarrollo y Participación Social de Tonacatepeque</i>
COMTEC	<i>Complejo Técnico San Francisco de Sales</i>
COMURES	<i>Corporación de Municipalidades de la República de El Salvador</i>
CONJUVE	National Youth Council ( <i>Consejo Nacional de Juventud</i> )
COPACIL	<i>Consejo de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana de Ilopango</i>
CPCCI	<i>Consejo de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana</i>
CSO	civil society organization
CVP	crime and violence prevention
CVPP	Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project in El Salvador (USAID/RTI/CECI)
EOI	expression of interest
EPV	National Strategy for the Social Prevention of Violence in Support of Municipalities ( <i>Estrategia de Prevención de la Violencia</i> )
ESCENICA	Cultural Association for Arts ( <i>Asociación Cultural para las Artes Escénicas</i> )
FBI	<i>Buro Federal de Investigaciones</i>
FEPADE	<i>Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo</i>
FIECA	<i>Fundación de Innovación Educativa Centroamericana</i>
FODA	<i>Fuerzas, Oportunidades, Debilidades, Amenazas</i>

FUNDI	<i>Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Integral</i>
FUMA	<i>Fundación Maquilishuat</i>
FUNDASAL	<i>Fundación Salvadoreña de Desarrollo y Vivienda Mínima</i>
FUNDASALVA	<i>Fundación Antidrogas de El Salvador</i>
FUNDAUNGO	<i>Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo</i>
FUNDEMOSPAZ	<i>Fundación para la Democracia, Seguridad y Paz</i>
FUNPRES	<i>Fundación para la Educación Especial</i>
FUNSALPRODESE	<i>Fundación Salvadoreña para la Promoción Social y el Desarrollo Económico</i>
FUSAL	<i>Fundación Salvadoreña para la Salud y el Desarrollo Humano</i>
FUSALMO	<i>Fundación Salvador del Mundo</i>
FY	fiscal year
GOES	Government of El Salvador
IDHUCA	<i>Instituto de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas (UCA)</i>
IIWG	Inter-institutional Work Group
ILC	<i>Industrias La Constancia</i>
INSAFORP	Salvadoran Institute for Professional Training ( <i>Instituto Salvadoreño de Formación Profesional</i> )
IR	intermediate result
ISD	<i>Iniciativa Social para la Democracia</i>
ISNA	<i>Instituto Salvadoreño de la Niñez y la Adolescencia</i>
KAPP	knowledge, attitudes, perceptions, and practices
LOC	letter of commitment
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MEPERSA	<i>Mesa de Prevención del Riesgo Social Armeniense</i>
MEPREDIZAL	<i>Mesa de Prevención y Desarrollo Integral de Izalco</i>
MINED	Ministry of Education
MIPVA	<i>Mesa Intersectorial de Prevención de la Violencia de Altavista</i>
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MSM	Salvadorian Women’s Movement ( <i>Movimiento Salvadoreño de Mujeres</i> )
MSPJ	<i>Ministerio de Seguridad Pública y Justicia</i>
NGO	nongovernmental organization
OCAVI	<i>Observatorio Centroamericano sobre Violencia</i>
ONG	<i>Organización No Gubernamental</i>
ORMUSA	<i>Organización de Mujeres Salvadoreñas por la Paz</i>
PNC	National Civilian Police ( <i>Policía Nacional Civil</i> )
PNPS	<i>Plan Nacional de Prevención y Paz Social</i>
PNUD	<i>Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo</i>
POA	<i>Plan Operativo Anual</i>
PREPAZ	Directorate for Violence Prevention and Culture of Peace ( <i>Dirección General de Prevención de la Violencia Social y Cultura de Paz</i> )

RNP	<i>Red Nacional de Pastores</i>
SIRAMA	<i>Centro de Capacitación Profesional Para la Mujer</i>
SDDTD	Sub-Secretariat for Territorial Development and Decentralization ( <i>Sub-Secretaría de Desarrollo Territorial y Descentralización</i> )
STTA	short-term technical assistance
SJ	Youth Secretariat ( <i>Secretaría de la Juventud</i> )
TOR	terms of reference
TRC	Technical Review Committee
UCA	<i>Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas</i>
US	United States
USG	United States Government
UEES	<i>Universidad Evangélica de El Salvador</i>
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization

# Resumen Ejecutivo

## Contexto

El aumento de la delincuencia y los índices de violencia en El Salvador han sido identificados como uno de los principales obstáculos en materia de seguridad ciudadana, el desarrollo económico y la gobernabilidad democrática. De hecho así lo manifiesta el Asocio para el Crecimiento entre el Gobierno de El Salvador y el de los Estados Unidos de Norteamérica. Uno de los más relevantes acuerdos de cooperación del país en los últimos años.<sup>1</sup>

No obstante que en el último año la tasa de homicidios por cada 100,000 habitantes ha pasado de aproximadamente 70 a 31, significando una reducción de 12 a 5.6 homicidios diarios, como resultado principalmente de la tregua entre pandillas<sup>2</sup>, El Salvador sigue pagando un precio muy alto en términos humanos y económicos debido al crimen y la violencia en sus diferentes manifestaciones en sus comunidades. Los jóvenes constituyen el mayor grupo de riesgo tanto como víctimas y como victimarios. La extorsión continúa afectando seriamente los negocios, y muchas personas no denuncian los delitos por miedo o desconfianza. La violencia contra las mujeres es alarmante así como los niveles de violencia doméstica contra niños y niñas, los delitos sexuales y el femicidio han subido de nivel.<sup>3</sup>

Sin embargo en los últimos 16 meses una serie de factores y acontecimientos han incidido positivamente en el cuadro de violencia y crimen que afecta a la comunidad salvadoreña, especialmente la que vive en barrios populares, urbanos y con mucha población. David Munguía Payés fue nombrado nuevo ministro de Justicia y Seguridad, en noviembre de 2011. Con él se reafirmó el compromiso del Ministerio de apoyar a los programas sociales y proyectos de prevención de la violencia y desde entonces se introdujeron cambios radicales dentro de la Policía Nacional Civil (PNC) y el Ministerio. En enero de 2012, un nuevo Viceministro fue designado con el mandato de implementar una estrategia de prevención de la violencia y el crimen que fuera eficaz, integral y coordinada. En marzo de ese mismo año, la Iglesia Católica inició un diálogo con los líderes de las pandillas encarcelados y negoció una tregua entre la Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) y la Mara Dieciocho (Pandilla de la Calle 18<sup>a</sup>), dos de las pandillas más violentas del país.

Se confirma el compromiso y el liderazgo del Ministerio de Justicia como contraparte en el apoyo a los programas sociales de prevención de la violencia y proyectos como el CVPP. El Vice ministerio continua con la revisión de la Estrategia Nacional para la Prevención de la Violencia que ya cuenta, gracias al apoyo del CVPP, con una versión nueva y actualizada y es parte integral de la política de Seguridad Nacional, una nueva ley de prevención fue presentada a consideración de la Presidencia de la República.

---

<sup>1</sup> Asocio para el Crecimiento: Plan de Acción 2011-2015. San Salvador Noviembre de 2011.

<sup>2</sup> *La Prensa Gráfica* de Enero 3, 2012 y *Diario Digital* La Página de Octubre 4, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> Según el informe Latinobarómetro 2011, El Salvador está en tercer lugar en cuanto a violencia intrafamiliar.

En este contexto, CVPP finalizó su quinto año de operaciones en Febrero de 2013 después de haber trabajado en su primera fase (2008-2009) en cinco localidades, en su segunda fase (2010-2011), con siete nuevos municipios, y en su tercera fase (2012) con tres municipios más, para un total de 16 localidades ubicadas en el centro y occidente de El Salvador. Sin embargo es necesario resaltar que este contexto favorable a la prevención al inicio del proyecto era diametralmente opuesto. De hecho la visión y estrategias prevalecientes en el 2008 eran las de “mano dura”. Con escasas excepciones, incluyendo en ellas los esfuerzos del CVPP, las iniciativas de prevención eran casi inexistentes, muy descoordinadas, unilaterales y sin ningún enfoque comunitario ni mucho menos participativo.

Dada la creciente conciencia en materia de prevención en círculos-sectores de GOES, los organismos internacionales como las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD), y los donantes bilaterales como la Agencia de Estados Unidos para el Desarrollo Internacional (USAID), se dio una invitación a presentar propuestas para la prevención de la delincuencia y la violencia por parte de USAID. RTI, en colaboración con el Centro de Estudios y Cooperación Internacional (CECI) y varios socios locales, respondieron con una propuesta en septiembre de 2007 y fue adjudicada con el acuerdo de cooperación en enero de 2008.

Cinco años después, es evidente que, el proyecto financiado por USAID e implementado por RTI cuyo enfoque ha sido la participación para la prevención social de la violencia y el delito ha tenido una influencia significativa en la forma en que el país está abordando el tema de la inseguridad ciudadana. Por ejemplo, este proyecto fue fundamental en la introducción de enfoques de la violencia de prevención primaria y secundaria de los municipios afectados y sus comunidades, así como a una serie de actores en los gobiernos locales y nacionales, la sociedad civil y el sector privado

## **Antecedentes**

El CVPP fue propuesto por RTI en septiembre de 2007, USAID otorgó el acuerdo a RTI el 10 de enero del 2008, con un fondo inicial de US\$2.298.951 y una fecha de finalización de Enero 30, 2010 (fase 1). En noviembre de 2009, RTI presentó un complemento a la propuesta que dio lugar a una extensión del plazo de ejecución hasta el mes Diciembre 31, 2011, aumentando la financiación a US\$7.743.350 millones (fase 2). Una tercera extensión fue otorgada hasta Diciembre 31, 2012, y aumentó el financiamiento total a US\$10.081.338 (fase 3). De 2008 a 2011, CECI acompañó como socio en la implementación del CVPP, finalizando en Diciembre del 2011.

## **Marco Conceptual y de Operaciones**

El CVPP fue conceptualizado y diseñado para apoyar el mejoramiento de la seguridad ciudadana mediante la construcción de capacidades tanto del gobierno y como de la sociedad civil a nivel local y nacional para una mejor comprensión de los patrones del crimen y la violencia, planificar y ejecutar actividades de prevención, medir el impacto de las iniciativas, y reproducir las mejores prácticas en otros municipios interesados.

El enfoque está orientado a complementar los esfuerzos de los enfoques tradicionales de arriba hacia abajo y de combate a la violencia que llevan a cabo los cuerpos de seguridad pública. En tal sentido las acciones del CVPP se concentraron en abordar las causas subyacentes a la delincuencia y la violencia, incluyendo factores tales como la escasez de oportunidades de educación y empleo para los jóvenes y familias, la desintegración familiar y comunitaria y la falta de sistemas de apoyo social para los jóvenes marginados como alternativas a la integración a las pandillas.

Este tipo de enfoque es conocido como la prevención primaria, y está orientado a la población, jóvenes y familias que viven en zonas de alto riesgo a la violencia. La prevención secundaria, que se centra en los niños y adolescentes en riesgo de participación en pandillas, fue menos abordada, aunque los jóvenes en situación de riesgo siempre fueron sujetos de varias actividades.

A partir de enero de 2008, el CVPP presentó un enfoque de prevención liderado por la municipalidad pero en un marco amplio de participación comunitaria y ciudadana produciendo resultados efectivos y duraderos a nivel local. Efectivamente el CVPP promovió la conformación de mesas ciudadanas de prevención de la violencia, las cuales ahora son en su mayoría Comités Municipales de Prevención de la Violencia

Este enfoque fue construido sobre siete pilares:

1. Planificación participativa municipal, participación ciudadana, y la organización de la comunidad para el desarrollo local.
2. Generación de información más fiable e interpretable sobre la delincuencia y la violencia y de los esfuerzos de prevención
3. Cultivo de una cultura de paz y coexistencia pacífica
4. Rehabilitación de espacios comunitarios y cívicos
5. Mejorar las oportunidades de integración social y económica, especialmente para los jóvenes
6. Desarrollo de mejores vínculos entre las políticas, la planificación y el apoyo institucional
7. Comunicación estratégica para compartir la información de forma eficaz, tanto para la sistematización de las experiencias como para hacer que los resultados disponibles sean conocidos tanto a nivel local y nacional.

Ciertamente que la aplicación del enfoque participativo y de abajo hacia arriba en la prevención de la violencia, resultó ser un medio eficaz para generar procesos de desarrollo local vinculados a una mejoría de la seguridad ciudadana y a los esfuerzos municipales de planificación y presupuestación. Los cuales se vieron reforzados por las iniciativas de formación realizados a nivel nacional y el desarrollo de políticas.

Según el acuerdo de cooperación entre RTI y USAID el CVPP tiene dos objetivos fundamentales:

1. Inducir y apoyar los procesos municipales participativos para organizar la respuesta a las prioridades locales de prevención de la violencia;

2. Desarrollo de capacidades y de políticas a nivel nacional para sostener y replicar las experiencias locales, al tiempo que se apoyaba a las instancias nacionales en acciones de prevención más integrales.

Estos objetivos corresponden a las Actividades 1 y 2 en el acuerdo de cooperación. Una tercera actividad se añade en la segunda fase para abordar las demandas originadas con la Iniciativa Regional Centroamericana de Seguridad (CARSI). Es de hacer notar que las Actividades 1 y 3 son muy similares en todos los aspectos básicos.

### **Actividad 1, "Prevención de la violencia a nivel comunitario liderada por el municipio".**

En esta actividad se desarrollaron dos tipos de acciones:

1. Facilitar y proporcionar asistencia técnica para establecer y dirigir los Consejos de Prevención Municipales
2. Facilitar a estos Consejos pequeñas donaciones para la implementación de proyectos comunitarios de prevención de la violencia.

El CVPP trabajó estrechamente con los representantes de las municipalidades, las comunidades, de gobierno nacional y sociedad civil en la organización e impulso de procesos participativos y colegiados de tomas de decisión por medio de los cuales cada Consejo de prevención participaron en la elaboración de diagnósticos de violencia y en la elaboración de planes estratégicos y anuales para abordar la problemática a nivel comunitario y municipal. Para ello estos espacios de prevención seleccionaron participativamente a las comunidades participantes; 86 comunidades ubicadas en 15 municipios fueron seleccionadas de esta forma y recibieron los fondos de las pequeñas donaciones para la implementación de los proyectos.

### **Actividad 2, "Liderazgo Nacional y apoyo a la prevención del crimen y la violencia".**

En el marco de esta actividad se proporcionó asistencia técnica a las contrapartes de CVPP a nivel nacional en el desarrollo de las capacidades en materia de prevención de la violencia, tanto a nivel nacional (desarrollo de estrategias y políticas) como en apoyo a los municipios. En ello se incluyen la capacitación de los funcionarios; proporcionar apoyo a las iniciativas de nuevas políticas; y desarrollar mejores sistemas para recopilar, gestionar, y utilizar los datos sobre la delincuencia y la violencia.

### **Actividad 3 se añadió en el inicio de la Fase 2.**

Dentro de esta actividad, muy similar a la Actividad 1 en cuanto a objetivos y resultados esperados solo que con recursos de CARSI, se proporcionó asistencia técnica y financiera a siete municipios seleccionados después de evaluar las manifestaciones de interés presentadas<sup>4</sup>. Esta selección incluyó criterios relacionados con la voluntad de dedicar recursos para el proceso y para su continuación. El proceso participativo utilizado en los municipios para establecer y fortalecer los Consejos de Prevención Municipales, así como la selección de las comunidades y la elaboración de los Planes de Prevención e implementación fue la misma que en la Actividad 1.

---

<sup>4</sup> Los siete municipios fueron Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, San Juan Opico, Zaragoza, Nejapa, San Antonio del Monte, y Soyapango.

CVPP ha trabajado en un total de 18 municipios (Tabla A) más el sitio Altavista; un gran desarrollo urbanístico de vivienda urbana que abarca partes de San Martín, Ilopango, y Tonacatepeque, donde cada uno de estos municipios también participaron por separado en el Proyecto. En todos estas localidades el CVPP se concentro en la promoción y desarrollo de comités municipales de prevención de la violencia (excluyendo los seleccionados con PREPAZ y Santa Tecla). 15 municipios recibieron tanto pequeñas donaciones (Tabla A, en dorado) y el apoyo en el apoyo al fortalecimiento de los consejos de prevención (Tabla A, en verde). Como Santa Tecla ya había establecido exitosamente un consejo de prevención el apoyo del Proyecto se oriento al fortalecimiento de instancia y del observatorio de violencia. Los tres municipios de Ayutuxtepeque, Mejicanos, y Cuscatancingo (Tabla A, en azul ) contaron con el apoyo indirecto a través PREPAZ, la agencia encargada de continuar con esta labor en el futuro, lo cual fue una experiencia piloto en la construcción de la capacidad para PREPAZ en la construcción de este tipo de iniciativas de prevención

La implementación del CVPP tuvo lugar en tres fases. En la Fase 1 (2008- 2009), el CVPP comenzó a trabajar en Izalco, Altavista, Armenia, Ahuachapán, y la Chacra (San Salvador Distrito 6), continuando durante un período de dos a tres años en cada municipio. También en esta fase se apoyo al Observatorio de Santa Tecla. En la Fase 2 (2010- 2011), CVPP apoyo a Ahuachapán, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, San Juan Opico, Zaragoza y San Martín (donde algunos subsidios se habían dado en la Fase 1 dentro del trabajo con Altavista). En la Fase 3 (2012), se sumaron al proyecto los municipios de Ilopango, Tonacatepeque, Soyapango, Nejapa, y San Antonio del Monte, así como Ayutuxtepeque, Mejicanos, Cuscatancingo mediante una trabajo conjunto con PREPAZ.

**Tabla A. Línea de tiempo, lugares, y tipos Actividad: Pequeñas Donaciones y fortalecimiento de Consejos de prevención**

<b>Años</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Las fases</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>3</b>
Izalco	X	X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	
Altavista	X	X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	
Armenia		X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	
La Chacra, San Salvador Distr. 6		X	X	X	
	X	X	X		
Santa Tecla		X	X	X	
Ahuachapán			X	X	
			X	X	
Ciudad Arce			X	X	X
			X	X	
Nahuizalco			X	X	X
			X	X	X

Años	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Las fases	1		2		3
San Juan Opico			X	X	
			X	X	X
Zaragoza			X	X	
			X	X	X
San Martín			X	X	
			X	X	X
Ilopango				X	
					X
Tonacatepeque		X	X	X	
					X
Soyapango					X
					X
Nejapa					X
					X
San Antonio del Monte					X
					X
Ayutuxtepeque					
Mejicanos					
Cuscatancingo					

Pequeñas donaciones a socios implementadores
Fortalecimiento de Consejos de prevención , memorandos de entendimiento con municipio
Facilitación CMPV a través de PREPAZ

En cada uno de los 15 municipios, el CVPP junto con los consejos de prevención identificaron y seleccionaron de 4 a comunidades de alto riesgo, sobre la base de estudios de diagnóstico y de mapas de riesgo, los criterios para la selección de estas comunidades fueron establecidos por conjuntamente como parte de sus procesos de participación.. En algunos casos, se incluyeron nuevas comunidades en el transcurso del Proyecto. Un total de 86 comunidades participaron como socias del CVPP.

## Seguimiento y Evaluación

Con el CVPP se realizaron 14 estudios de líneas de base. Estas líneas de base utilizados datos de diversas fuentes se centraron en cuatro áreas:

1. Información general geográfica de los municipios y las comunidades (los datos de población, servicios públicos, infraestructura, etc.).
2. Estadísticas de la policía nacional sobre la delincuencia.
3. Mapas de Riesgo desarrollados por los consejos de prevención basado en las observaciones de los residentes y los funcionarios participantes, mostrando números y

ubicaciones de los factores de riesgo (p. ej., los sitios de atracos, bares y salones de baile, casas de drogas, pandillas, etc.) y de factores favorables para la prevención de la violencia (por ejemplo, las escuelas, iglesias, instalaciones deportivas, centros de formación, puestos de policía, etc.).

4. Encuestas de hogares que incluyen preguntas sobre experiencias con el crimen y la violencia, la historia de denuncia de los delitos, el conocimiento y las opiniones sobre las pandillas, la comunidad barrio y sobre las medidas personales de seguridad adoptadas, incluyendo mejoras realizadas en el hogar con tales propósitos.
5. Cuatro evaluaciones intermedias en: Altavista, Armenia, Izalco y La Chacra en el Distrito 6 de San Salvador.
6. Autoevaluaciones anuales del los consejos de prevención.

## **Elementos Claves**

Durante los cinco años que duro la implementación del Proyecto, este se caracterizó por la aplicación en la práctica de los siguientes aspectos fundamentales:

1. El municipio como el centro de coordinación de todas las actividades de prevención.
2. Una comunidad organizada y con capacidad propuesta y respuesta a los problemas de violencia.
3. Priorización de la juventud y niñez en las agendas de prevención locales
4. Facilitar el financiamiento necesario a través de pequeñas donaciones para la ejecución de proyectos comunitarios de prevención
5. Desarrollo de las capacidades de liderazgo municipales y comunitarias
6. Involucramiento de las socios nacionales y locales en los procesos de prevención

## **Principales Resultados**

Quizás el logro más importante del CVPP ha sido la puesta en marcha de nuevo enfoque para abordar la prevención de la delincuencia y la violencia en El Salvador. Complementando en buena medida y eficazmente las medidas represivas, las cuales eran vistas como la única solución. Mediante el trabajo del CVPP ha sido posible mostrar avances significativos en la reducción de la violencia a través de acciones integrales, comunitarias y altamente participativas, las cuales han tenido alta incidencia en el desarrollo de nuevas estrategias y políticas nacionales en prevención de la violencia.

Otros logros son:

- i. Un incremento en la participación ciudadana en prevención de la violencia así como el avance en el fortalecimiento de la capacidad municipal y comunitaria en organizar, planificar e implementar considerable trabajo en prevención en 80 comunidades distribuidas en 14 municipalidades.

- ii. Comités municipales de prevención con capacidades para trabajar conjuntamente con organizaciones de la sociedad civil, para hacer planes de prevención y ejecutar proyectos comunitarios en esta área.
- iii. Los cuatro Consejos de Prevención con los que el CVPP inició en el 2008 siguen activos y desarrollando actividades mediante su propia autogestión
- iv. Estrategias y políticas nacionales de prevención mejor formuladas y puestas en práctica, tomando en cuenta el modelo de prevención definido por el CVPP.
- v. USAID en EL Salvador ha adjudicado el CVPP2 que continúa con una línea muy similar a su enfoque, solo que con una cobertura ampliada, a la que se desarrolló en CVPP1.
- vi. Modelo Municipal de Prevención de Santa Tecla fue apoyado integrando al Observatorio de la Violencia.
- vii. Ninguno de los procesos de los Consejos de Prevención se vieron afectados por las elecciones municipales de Marzo del 2012. Ello deja constancia de que la apoliticidad de RTI ha sido de alta incidencia.
- viii. 71 proyectos en diferentes áreas de la prevención social de la violencia fueron implementados a través de los mecanismos de procesos competitivos de pequeñas donaciones.
- ix. Más de 60 proyectos de pequeña infraestructura fueron ejecutados con una alta participación de los Consejos de prevención y las comunidades, mejorando así la utilización de jóvenes y familias. Entre estos pequeños proyectos se pueden mencionar: canchas deportivas, centros comunitarios e iluminación de espacios públicos.
- x. Más de 8,000 jóvenes fueron capacitados en habilidades para la vida, formación vocacional y emprendedurismo.
- xi. Se desarrollaron programas innovativos como la resolución de conflictos y el de atención y orientación en prácticas de crianza y atención psicológica a más de 7,000 niños, jóvenes y adultos.
- xii. Más de 500 familias recibieron atención psicosocial mediante el desarrollo del proyecto de Familias Fuertes, en el Distrito 6 de San Salvador
- xiii. Mecanismos sostenibles de financiamiento de los procesos locales de prevención de la violencia se han puesto en práctica. Industrias la Constancia está apoyando estos procesos como iniciativa propia. Nejapa, Soyapango y el Distrito 6 de San Salvador está recibiendo fondos de ILC para tales propósitos.
- xiv. El CVPP incidió significativamente en la elaboración de las dos versiones de la EPV, tanto en el 2009 como en el 2012.
- xv. El CVPP desarrolló técnicas y metodologías propias para la formación de PREPAZ en materia de prevención social de la violencia, la EPV en sus dos versiones.
- xvi. 208 personas del GOES recibieron capacitación en materia de prevención social de la violencia.

- xvii. Cinco centros de alcance fueron establecidos por el CVPP apoyando a más de 5,000 familias. Estos centros fueron : 2 en San Antonio del Monte; dos en Nejapa y uno en Ilopango.



## Executive Summary

### 1 Context

Increasing crime and violence rates in El Salvador have been identified as the leading constraints on citizen safety, economic development, and democratic processes. As one of the most violent countries in the world, El Salvador's homicide rates have been among the world's highest, approaching 70 per 100,000 in 2011—seven times the rate considered epidemic by the World Health Organization (WHO; Krug et al., 2002) and 14 times the U.S. rate for 2010.<sup>5</sup> Since mid-2012, however, El Salvador's rate has been reduced by half mainly as a result of a truce between Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) and Mara Dieciocho (18th Street Gang), two of the nation's most violent gangs. This truce was facilitated in part by a recent shift in the Government of El Salvador's (GOES's) policy from almost exclusively relying on enforcement to supporting violence prevention.

Nonetheless, El Salvador continues to pay a very high price in both human and economic terms for the crime and violence in its communities. Youth constitute the most at-risk group, as both offenders and victims. Extortion continues to seriously affect businesses, and many people do not report crimes out of fear or mistrust. Violence against women is alarmingly high: through domestic violence, sex crimes, and homicides. Economic losses are estimated at about 10% of the gross domestic product.<sup>6</sup> Public insecurity resulting from crime and violence is a leading source of political debate, attracting rhetoric, resources, and responses at local as well as national and regional levels.

Many underlying causes have been adduced. They include pervasive poverty; scarcity of educational and economic opportunity, particularly for youth; and high levels of income disparity. The heritage of violence and disruption from the civil war (1979–1992) and its devastating economic and social impact has been another influence. These factors have contributed to continuing high emigration, mostly to the United States, with remittances to family members now comprising a significant part of family and national income (World Bank, 2010).

The introduction of many emigrant youth to gangs in Los Angeles and elsewhere, away from the influence of traditional extended families and community support, and the subsequent deportation to El Salvador of thousands of gang members, led to the establishment and growth of Salvadoran gangs with links to those in the U.S. At the same time, its geographic proximity

---

<sup>5</sup> Organization of American States Observatory on Citizen Security ([www.oas.org/dsp/Observatorio/database/countriesdetails.aspx?lang=en&country=USA](http://www.oas.org/dsp/Observatorio/database/countriesdetails.aspx?lang=en&country=USA)).

<sup>6</sup> United States Department of State. *Partnership for Growth: El Salvador–United States Joint Country Action Plan 2011–2015*. Issued November 2011. Available at [http://photos.state.gov/libraries/elsavador/92891/octubre2011/Joint\\_Country\\_Action\\_Plan.pdf](http://photos.state.gov/libraries/elsavador/92891/octubre2011/Joint_Country_Action_Plan.pdf).

between lucrative U.S. drug markets and the main cocaine production areas in South America has made El Salvador an increasingly important drug trafficking route.

These patterns have both contributed to and been reinforced by the separation and disintegration of families, widespread intra-family violence, and breakdown of social support networks. The population has a high proportion of youth, many of whom have not been well integrated into families, school, and social structures. In fact, social status and class-related stigma undermine inclusivity and solidarity and widen expectation gaps. The increase in gang affiliation among disaffected, marginalized youth is a response (World Bank, 2010).

The level of violence and crime in El Salvador is routinely attributed to this proximate factor: the rise of gangs in the country in the past two decades. In fact, the government, media, and public have largely responded by blaming gangs and youth as the source of the problem and supporting iron fist (“*mano dura*”) solutions. Since the 1990s, successive governments have introduced security policies to reinforce police capacity to repress gangs and control their territories, and increasingly to involve the military. Crime and violence prevention (CVP) was not prioritized, although some pilot experiences existed and crime and violence programs scaled up strongly. Repression proved to be a less than fully effective response.

Growing awareness of this in some circles—sectors of GOES, international agencies like United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and bilateral donors like the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)—led to a call for proposals for a crime and violence prevention program in USAID RFA No. 519-07-A-003. RTI, in partnership with Centre for International Studies and Cooperation (CECI) and several local partners, responded with a proposal in September 2007 and was awarded the cooperative agreement in January 2008.

Five years later, it is clear that RTI’s USAID-funded Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (CVPP) has had a significant influence in the way El Salvador addresses the growing challenge of crime and violence. For example, this project was instrumental in introducing primary and secondary violence prevention approaches to the affected municipalities and their communities, as well as to a range of actors in local and national governments, civil society, and the private sector.

This Final Report summarizes the main accomplishments, including additional contributions that had not been anticipated. In doing so, we review how the project functioned and examine factors contributing to project successes as well as implementation challenges. We also highlight lessons learned, including some missed or emerging opportunities, to inform and improve future USAID/El Salvador programming efforts.

## **2 Project Background**

CVPP was proposed by RTI in September 2007 in response to USAID/El Salvador RFA No. 519-07-A-003. USAID awarded the agreement to RTI on January 10, 2008, with initial funding of US\$2,298,951 and a completion date of January 30, 2010 (Phase 1). In November 2009, RTI submitted an add-on proposal that resulted in an extension of the period of performance through

December 31, 2011, increasing the funding to US\$7,743,350 million (Phase 2). A second add-on award extended the period of performance until December 31, 2012, and increased the total estimated funding to US\$10,081,338 (Phase 3). From 2008 to 2011, CECI served as RTI's implementing partner; however, per USAID's guidance, the partnership formally ended in December 2011.

In 2010, the GOES developed a justice and security policy<sup>7</sup> to combat crime and violence based on five pillars, including the National Strategy for the Social Prevention of Violence in Support of Municipalities (*Estrategia de Prevención de la Violencia* [EPV]). CVPP provided substantial input on the design of the EPV and its policy framework, including field methods, manuals, and policy liaising from 2008 to 2010. Since 2008, the CVPP team has worked closely with national agencies and local governments, civil society organizations (CSOs), high-risk communities, and the private sector to develop models for municipality-led, community-based CVP. CVPP's policy analyses and recommendations advocating citizen safety continued to be made at the national and local levels.

### **3 Conceptual Framework and Project Design**

CVPP aimed to improve citizen safety by building on the government's and civil society's capacities at the local and national levels to better understand crime and violence patterns, plan and implement prevention activities, measure the initiatives' impact, and replicate best practices across municipalities.

Our approach aimed to complement and improve on the results of the more traditional, top-down antiviolence actions being carried out by the police and the judicial system. As such, CVPP focused on addressing the underlying causes of crime and violence, including factors such as scarcity of education and employment opportunities for youth, family and social disintegration; and the lack of social support systems for marginalized youth that provide alternatives to gangs. Moreover, CVPP focused on creating mechanisms to engage the citizenry in family, community, and municipal settings by engaging municipal governments and local representatives of national agencies.

This kind of approach is known as primary prevention, which focuses on the general population of youth and families living in high-risk areas. Secondary prevention, which focuses on children and adolescents at risk for gang involvement, was less directly addressed, though at-risk youth were targeted by several activities. Tertiary prevention, dealing with gang members (e.g., gang leaders and serious offenders) remained the purview of the police; in many municipalities, less-hardened gang members who expressed an interest in CVPP-supported programs were allowed to participate in training and recreational activities.

---

<sup>7</sup> National Policy on Justice, Security, and Citizen Coexistence.

Starting in January 2008, CVPP introduced a municipality-led, community-based approach to CVP that produced tangible results in previous work. We developed municipal citizen safety roundtables, now known as Municipal Violence Prevention Committees (CMPVs).<sup>8</sup> This approach was built on seven pillars:

- (1) Participatory municipal planning, citizen engagement, and community organization for local development
- (2) Improved, more reliable, and easily interpretable information on crime and violence and on prevention efforts
- (3) Cultivation of a culture of peace and peaceful coexistence
- (4) Rehabilitation of community spaces and civic empowerment
- (5) Improved opportunities for social and economic integration, especially for youth
- (6) Development of improved policy links, planning, and institutional support
- (7) Communication strategies to share information effectively, systematize it, and make results readily available both locally and nationally.

Applying participatory, bottom-up methods proved to be an effective way to generate local development processes that improved citizen safety and to link them to municipal planning and budgeting processes. National-level efforts in training and policy development laid the foundation and social environment to sustain these efforts and to replicate them via GOES's agencies in other municipalities.

Per the cooperative agreement, CVPP interventions had two basic objectives (intermediate results [IRs]): (1) inducing and supporting participatory municipal processes to organize a response to local violence prevention priorities; and (2) developing skills and policies at the national level to sustain and replicate the municipal-level work while addressing national CVP needs more integrally. These objectives correspond to Activities 1 and 2 in the cooperative agreement. A third activity, added in Phase 2, focused on addressing the requirements of a particular funding stream within USAID, the Central American Regional Security Initiative (CARSI). However, Activities 1 and 3 are very similar in all essential respects (82% of Activity 1 indicators are identical to those in Activity 3). Thus, where the field processes were the same, results for Activities 1 and 3 are reported together.

**Activity 1**, “Municipality-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention,” supported the approach to CVP outlined above, via two kinds of interventions: (1) facilitating and providing technical assistance to establish and run the CMPVs and (2) providing small grant support to plan and implement the CMPVs’ prioritized activities.

CVPP facilitators worked closely with the municipal council, local institutions, and community groups to organize a participatory process to structure a CMPV in which the local government; the national police; representatives from other national institutions who were active in the

---

<sup>8</sup> Previously known also as Inter-Institutional Working Groups (IIWGs), Violence Prevention Commissions, Peace and Security Roundtables (*Mesas*), etc.; for this report, we have adopted GOES’s CMPV terminology.

municipality; community councils; and civil society and private sector actors were represented in a balanced fashion.

Each CMPV underwent a participatory planning process to diagnose the condition, identify and prioritize its needs, and produce a CVP plan<sup>9</sup> for the locality. Four to seven high-risk communities were selected as pilot sites in each municipality to receive intensive CVP interventions. During implementation, the municipal CVP plan provided the basis for calls for proposals by sources of technical assistance to carry out CVP programs in the targeted communities. Based on proposals from local or national CSOs, reviewed and selected by the CMPVs, we awarded small grants to the selected CSOs. In addition, CVPP provided technical assistance to CMPVs to monitor each grantee's performance and approve payments. Please see Annex G, CVPP Participant Communities, for more details.

**Activity 2**, "National Leadership and Support for Crime and Violence Prevention," provided technical assistance to strengthen GOES's capacity to prevent crime and violence. This included training officials; providing support for policy initiatives; and developing improved systems to collect, manage, and use data on crime and violence. Examples of the initiatives proposed are listed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

### **3.1 Phases 1 and 2**

- Providing technical assistance to an Inter-Institutional Executive Committee (later re-structured) to coordinate CVP efforts at the national level
- Advising on the development of a set of standardized CVP indicators, training GOES staff on data collection and analysis, and encouraging partner institutions to adopt them
- Training national-level GOES staff on the use of CVPP modules and activities to extend the community-based CVP process to additional municipalities
- Facilitating case studies on CVP processes via grants to universities
- Engaging the private sector to support CVP initiatives at both the national and local levels
- Conducting studies on El Salvador's crime and prevention policy and proposing pertinent recommendations (Phase 2 only)
- Encouraging financial or in-kind contributions to CVPP projects by GOES agencies (Phase 2 only)

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that previous CVPP reports have used the term "action plan," but we have used CVP plan in this report to be consistent with GOES's terminology.

## 3.2 Phase 3

- Providing consulting support to the Directorate for Violence Prevention and Culture of Peace (*Dirección General de Prevención de la Violencia Social y Cultura de Paz* [PREPAZ]) officials to establish, in a participatory manner, a comprehensive set of indicators that will be the basis of a national tracking and mapping system for prevention interventions carried out in high-risk municipalities
- Designing and executing an CVP plan to implement the EPV in at least three municipalities
- Developing with GOES counterparts a national tracking and mapping system on CVP interventions to help design new activities, monitor progress, and adjust strategies and policies in at-risk municipalities. (In accordance with USAID's request, this result was omitted because it was integrated within other GOES activities.)
- Training at least 25 government officials on CVPP's approach to community-based CVP processes.

**Activity 3** was added at the beginning of Phase 2. We provided technical and financial assistance to seven municipalities.<sup>10</sup> CVPP selected municipalities after evaluating competitive proposals submitted by interested municipalities; the selection criteria included willingness to commit resources to the process and to make it sustainable. The participatory process used in those municipalities to establish and strengthen the CMPVs, select high-risk target communities, make a CVP Plan, and carry out the interventions was the same as in Activity 1.

## 4 Objectives and Expected Results

### 4.1 Activity 1: Municipality-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention

#### 4.1.1 Objective (sub-IR) 1: Community-based CVPs improved and expanded

##### *Expected Results for Activity 1*

- A. Crime and gang activity reduced in targeted communities of selected municipalities
  - i. Increase in perceived citizen safety in targeted communities/municipalities and satisfaction with local authorities (reflected via annual surveys conducted at the local level).
  - ii. Lower indices of specific crimes and gang activity (e.g., homicides, robberies, and domestic violence; from a standardized list to be developed under Activity 2).
- B. Increased capacity to implement participatory approaches to CVP
  - i. Municipalities with approved CVP policies and CVP plans
  - ii. Municipal CVP programs staffed and funded with local resources

---

<sup>10</sup> The seven municipalities were Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, San Juan Opico, Zaragoza, Nejapa, San Antonio del Monte, and Soyapango.

- iii. Municipalities conducting local monitoring and analysis of crime and violence (and linked to observatories on violence)
- C. Small grants program supporting community-based CVP projects prioritized by municipalities in at least 10 communities
  - i. Counterpart contributions are leveraged more than 33% at the local level
  - ii. Grant volume increased by 50 percent through national private sector support
  - iv. Success stories circulated from funded projects
- D. Successful approaches to municipal-led, community-based CVP systematized, disseminated, and replicated
  - i. Self-directed training materials developed and validated
  - ii. CVP program replicated in additional (non-targeted) communities and municipalities
  - iii. Communications materials created and disseminated
  - iv. Municipalities pursuing strategies to promote a culture of peace in communities
- E. Partnerships established between community-based CVP programs, national institutions (e.g., National Civilian Police/*Policía Nacional Civil* [PNC], Youth Secretariat/*Secretaría de la Juventud* [SJ], and Council of Salvadoran Municipalities/*Corporación de Municipalidades de la República de El Salvador*), and the private sector
  - i. National institutions sharing crime-related information at the local level (at least the PNC)
  - ii. Private sector contributing to municipal CVP programs

## **4.2 Activity 2: National Leadership and Support for Crime and Violence Protection**

### **4.2.1 Objective (sub-IR) 2: GOES's capacity to plan, implement, and monitor CVP programs increased**

#### *Expected Results for Activity 2*

- A. Comprehensive, National Crime Prevention Plan and policy developed
  - i. PNP initiatives being implemented, with participation of national institutions
  - ii. National CVP policy drafted and under consideration
- B. Enhanced GOES capability to promote citizen safety through municipal-led, community-based crime prevention
  - i. Improved local–national coordination mechanisms in place
  - ii. Self-directed training materials adopted, available online, and in use for replication
  - iii. Replication of successful municipal CVP programs being facilitated by GOES
- C. Working relationships between GOES entities, private sector, and civil society strengthened
  - i. National PNP pilot project (US\$300K) identified, designed, approved, and implemented
  - ii. Participation of the National Inter-Institutional Executive Committee representatives in projects implemented by municipalities under Objective 1
  - iii. Private sector participation and support (cash and in-kind contributions of more than 35 percent)

- D. National capabilities for monitoring, evaluation, systematization enhanced and in use
- i. Key indicators selected for national and municipal use (e.g., homicides, etc.)
  - ii. Methodology to conduct baseline studies at the national and local levels developed
  - iii. Case studies, best practices systematized, published, and disseminated

## 5 Intervention Model

### 5.1 Key Elements of the CVPP Model

Below, we discuss several factors that make the CVPP model effective. These factors were identified from feedback obtained from CMPV participants, government agencies, CSO partners, and CVPP technical staff.

#### 5.1.1 *Municipal Organization*

Providing support for municipality-led processes within the context of recent decentralization efforts and the encouragement of participatory local planning was CVPP's main strategy. The facilitation process has been described in CVPP-produced training manuals (RTI and CECI, 2009a, 2010) and in subsequent manuals and systematizations (IDHUCA, 2011a).

- **Municipalities as hubs.** A key aspect of CVPP's interventions was the focus on working at the municipal level as a framework to organize community-level CVP actions. Both communities and national agencies were linked to the local governments to plan and operationalize violence prevention measures. Citizen safety was within the mandate of the decentralized municipalities; and the political process motivated local leaders to address the highly visible problem of crime and violence. With their convening power and access to resources, municipalities can support and sustain the CVP processes and extend them to additional communities.
- **Clear expression of interest** on the part of municipal authorities and the municipal council. A key success factor lies in working with municipalities where the local authorities favored the CVPP process and were willing to explore our methodology.
- **Participatory approaches/proponents.** CVPP engaged citizens and government counterparts at each level and encouraged them to express their concerns and to participate in developing solutions. Training in induction and facilitation of participatory processes may be needed (depending on previous experience and skill levels). However, participation was structured, as discussed in the next two bullets.
- **Selection of participants/representatives.** The participants in CMPVs and other working groups represented their communities or institutions. Representatives were designated by election or by their position within the institution (e.g., a community development association [ADESCO] may elect a representative, whereas the local functionary of the Interior Ministry may be designated ex officio).

- **Structured inclusivity/balance.** CVPP emphasized the importance of a balanced representation of all relevant entities active in a municipality to ensure well-rounded discussion of the needs and priorities of all sectors. In addition to representatives from local government and the communities, we included representatives from central government agencies like health officials, police, schools, and others, as well as faith-based, civil society, and private sector organizations.
- **Evidence-based approaches.** Participatory diagnostic processes to verify the conditions and create a shared factual basis for proposing actions and setting priorities were essential approaches to determine real needs and avoid the appearance of bias or arbitrary procedures. The resulting Municipal CVP Plan guided the development of programs and actions, focusing first on communities prioritized because of their high-risk characteristics and the feasibility of achieving results.

### 5.1.2 *CVP Interventions in Communities*

The central theme of CVPP was using community-based action to address violence. We did so on a range of fronts, in combinations that were tailored by each community to meet its situation and needs. Communities were represented by their ADESCOs or leaders of similar community-based organizations (CBOs). Facilitation methods have been documented in the previously published CVPP Training Manuals (RTI and CECI 2009a, 2010). Below, is a summary of the approaches we used to facilitate community-level CVP interventions. Many of these community-level interventions were supported by broader campaigns in the municipalities.

- **Raising awareness of the impact of violence, crime, and related issues.** CVPP raised awareness by providing improved public information on local conditions, CVP planning and progress, etc. (e.g., via announcements, posters, community radio, and local churches). We also improved collection of data on crime, violence, and prevention measures; and communication on CMPV plans and activities by involving the public in participatory diagnosis and planning as well as the activities listed below.
- **Creating safer spaces.** Reducing risks in the physical environment by improving lighting, fencing, or policing, ultimately promoted the community's use of public spaces, increased citizen safety, and eliminated sites for gang members to gather.
- **Engaging youth in meaningful activity.** Providing extracurricular activities for students and the many out-of-school youth served as a vital link to build self-esteem and skills and provide an alternative to joining a gang. CVPP facilitated the following activities:
  - Weekend or evening classes to improve academic performance
  - Sports schools and programs (e.g., soccer, karate, basketball, etc.).
  - Performance art and artisanal classes (e.g., theater, dance, puppets, music groups, drum corps, drawing and painting, ceramics, silk screening, etc.).
  - Community service programs and projects
  - Youth groups (e.g., church sponsored, scouts, etc.)
  - Events for youth (e.g., exhibitions of their handiwork, concerts, fairs, excursions, etc.)

- Job-skills training (e.g., carpentry, masonry, cooking, baking, metal working, cosmetology, sewing, etc.), which was often accompanied by entrepreneurship training
- Life skills and values training, often integrated with one or more of the preceding activities
- **Increasing economic and educational opportunities for youth.** CVPP-funded activities provided internship and job opportunities, placement programs, training in resume preparation and interviewing techniques, negotiation of full or partial academic scholarships, summer job placement, etc. CVPP also formed links with employment programs in the GOES and in job creation projects supported by USAID and other agencies.
- **Promoting a culture of peace.** In addition to sponsoring public events and conducting publicity campaigns to promote the concept, CVPP funded conflict resolution training for targeted groups: families, women, and at-risk youth (see the next two bullets for more details).
- **Reducing domestic violence.** A CSO partner, *Fe y Alegría*, developed a very effective Strong Families program, adapted from methods developed in the Ministry of Education (MINED) and carried out as a pilot project in San Salvador District 6 and Zaragoza. Credited by participants with improving inter- and intra-family relations and reducing use of violence to resolve conflict, it taught nonviolent methods and helped parents and children apply those skills to their lives (Fe y Alegría, 2011). Training modules (37 weekly sessions) covered parenting, positive discipline, stress management, problem solving, and communication skills.
- **Providing psychological support/mental health services.** Family and youth services offered by *Fundación para la Educación Especial* (FUNPRES), Ministry of Health community mental health programs, *Fe y Alegría*, and others were reported to be effective by participants. These programs and services helped youth and older generations deal with the difficult situations underlain by broken or dysfunctional families, poverty and lack of economic opportunities, and social marginalization. CVPP-funded grantees provided alternatives to violence as a means of conflict resolution.

### 5.1.3 Focus on Youth

This was a main axis of CVP plans. Traditionally marginalized, youth were considered to be the principal victims of violence in the family and the community and among the main perpetrators of crime. CVPP therefore focused on raising awareness of economic and social disenfranchisement of youth and developed specific programs and activities to engage youth.

#### **5.1.4 Small Grant Process**

The development of an effective small grant mechanism to supply high-caliber services while strengthening both the municipal prevention committees and the partner CSOs was an important contribution of this project. CVPP produced a training manual (RTI, 2012d) that documents the methodology of our small grants process.

#### **5.1.5 Municipal and Community Leadership Skills**

By providing training and technical assistance, CVPP built capacity in facilitating democratic processes, effectively communicating with constituencies, resource mobilization and stewardship, and monitoring progress and evaluating results.

#### **5.1.6 Sites and Phasing**

CVPP has worked with different modalities in a total of 18 municipalities (Table 1) plus the Altavista site, a large urban housing development that spans parts of San Martín, Ilopango, and Tonacatepeque—each of which was also targeted separately. CVPP focused on developing effective, sustainable municipal violence prevention committees (CMPVs) in 15 municipalities (excluding Santa Tecla and PREPAZ-managed municipalities). Altavista received similar focused intervention even before CVPP began under GOES funding for community policing. All 15 municipalities received both small grants (Table 1, gold shading) and CMPV facilitation to strengthen them (Table 1, green shading). Because Santa Tecla already had an established, successful CMPV, CVPP provided grant support to strengthen its model Municipal Crime and Violence Observatory. The three municipalities of Ayutuxtepeque, Mejicanos, and Cuscatancingo (Table 1, blue shading) were supported indirectly via PREPAZ, the agency charged with continuing this work in the future. This was a pilot experience in building capacity for PREPAZ personnel; we trained a cadre of PREPAZ staff to serve as facilitators in those three municipalities.

CVPP implementation occurred in three phases corresponding to the period of performance in the original cooperative agreement and its two extensions. In Phase 1 (2008–2009), CVPP began working in Izalco, Altavista, Armenia, Ahuachapán, and La Chacra (San Salvador District 6), continuing for two to three years in each municipality. Support for the Santa Tecla Observatory also began during Phase 1. In Phase 2 (2010–2011), CVPP supported Ahuachapán, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, San Juan Opico, Zaragoza, and San Martín (where some grants had been given in Phase 1 in conjunction with the work in Altavista). Phase 3 (2012) addressed Ilopango, Tonacatepeque, Soyapango, Nejapa, and San Antonio del Monte, as well as Ayutuxtepeque, Mejicanos, and Cuscatancingo via PREPAZ. In some municipalities, CVPP support continued seamlessly from one phase into the next, as reflected in Table 1.

**Table 1. Timeline, Locations, and Types of CVPP Activity: Small Grants and CMPV Strengthening**

Years	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Phases	1		2		3
Izalco	X	X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	
Altavista	X	X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	
Armenia		X	X	X	
	X	X	X	X	
La Chacra, San Salvador Distr. 6		X	X	X	
	X	X	X		
Santa Tecla		X	X	X	
Ahuachapán			X	X	
			X	X	
Ciudad Arce			X	X	
			X	X	X
Nahuizalco			X	X	
			X	X	X
San Juan Opico			X	X	
			X	X	X
Zaragoza			X	X	
			X	X	X
San Martín			X	X	
			X	X	X
Ilopango				X	
					X
Tonacatepeque		X	X	X	
					X
Soyapango					X
					X
Nejapa					X
					X
San Antonio del Monte					X
					X
Ayutuxtepeque					
Mejicanos					
Cuscatancingo					

Grants disbursed to partners
CMPV strengthening -- MOUs with municipality
CMPV facilitation via PREPAZ

In each of the 15 core municipalities, the CMPV developed a CVP plan that prioritized four to nine high-risk communities, based on diagnostic studies and risk mapping. Criteria for selection of these focus communities were set by the CMPVs as part of their participatory processes, with project advice and input from the PNC. In some cases, new communities were included during the course of the project. A total of about 86 communities benefitted from CVPP's support.

### **5.1.7 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Systems**

USAID approved the M&E Plan in April 2008. It covered Phase 1 and was updated for Phases 2 and 3 to address the modifications of the cooperative agreement in 2010 and 2012. The M&E Plan delineated regular, uniform data collection, analysis, reporting, and information sharing. M&E information was used to inform project management; identify and correct problems; show approaches and activities that worked well; and make evidence-based decisions throughout the project. It also fostered communication about project performance to the project team, national and local partners, USAID, and GOES. Indicators were designed to measure progress toward results expected from project activities, which were included in quarterly, semiannual, and annual reports.

**The indicators** adopted are shown in Annex B, including those added for Phases 2 and 3. As aforementioned, we have combined results for indicators for Activities 1 and 3 because they are similar; however, the differences are also reflected, as are the achievements attributed to each. Nonetheless, the indicators are essentially process indicators and do not reflect the effects or impacts of the interventions carried out.

**Other instruments for tracking and assessing** were also developed during implementation. Some addressed the need to assess effects and impact at least partially.

- CVPP conducted 14 baseline studies in as many municipalities. Despite the term “baseline,” some of these studies were conducted months or even more than a year after project activities began. This delay was at least in part due to the time it took to establish good relationships with communities and train local youth to conduct interviews (i.e., we used this method to improve local buy in and decrease the communities’ suspicions of having “outsiders” conducting the survey). Using data from a variety of sources, including knowledge, attitudes, perceptions, and practices (KAPP) surveys, they focused on four areas:
  - (1) General geographic information on targeted municipalities and communities (data on population, public services, relevant infrastructure, etc.)
  - (2) Crime report statistics on patterns of reporting and different crimes committed, from national police data
  - (3) Risk maps developed by the CMPVs and based on observations of participating residents and officials, showing numbers and locations of risk factors (e.g., sites of muggings, bars and dance halls, drug houses, gang hangouts, etc.) and of factors favorable to violence prevention (e.g., schools, churches, sports facilities, training centers, police posts, etc.).
  - (4) Household surveys included questions about experiences with crime and violence, history of reporting crimes, awareness and opinions of gang activity, neighborhood and personal security measures taken, and improvements made to the home. In addition, opinions were solicited on a variety of topics, including the risk of becoming a crime victim in the next months, how the security conditions and the gang problem are evolving; how effective the work of police, local authorities, and

private security firms has been and how it is changing; and awareness of local CVP organizations and activities.

The baseline data informed the development of the local CVP plans and were used to compare data from intermediate/follow-up evaluations using the same framework. The household survey questions were designed to facilitate before-and-after comparisons that measured change in perceptions, practices, and attitudes relevant to assessing effects and impacts.

- Four Intermediate Evaluations. The potential to make comparisons between the baselines and later surveys was realized in the four municipalities targeted in Phase 1: Altavista, Armenia, Izalco, and San Salvador District 6. We conducted intermediate evaluations after an interval of 14 to 22 months to measure the change that had occurred in perceptions, attitudes, and the current conditions while the CVPP interventions took place.

Unfortunately, no subsequent survey evaluations were conducted in these municipalities or the 10 other sites with baseline studies. Therefore no longer-term comparisons can be made. Although the results of these four intermediate evaluations were promising, as noted below, it is clear that the municipal CVP processes continued to mature, and it is likely that future studies would have shown more substantial improvements. If data had been collected in 2012, it might have been able to address aspects of sustainability as well, since these four sites had graduated during or at the end of Phase 2.

- Annual self-evaluations by the CMPVs. At the municipal level, annual self-evaluations were conducted to measure the progress in relation to plans and the current overall situation of violence and crime in the municipality. Initially led by CVPP facilitators, we built capacity in CMPVs and turned over leadership to them to manage. These evaluations were based on criteria defined by the municipalities following CVPP guidelines.
- Systematizations of components. Systematizations of processes carried out, as well as handbooks, training manuals or implementation guides, have been documented on a range of topics (see Section 6, Results).
- USAID contracted Vanderbilt University to conduct impact studies on two of the CVPP-targeted municipalities—Zaragoza and San Juan Opico. The studies' results will provide insight on the degree of change achieved in the targeted communities. However, no information on the studies or their results has been shared with the CVPP team, their GOES counterparts, or the participating communities (at least one of which has refused to continue to allow data to be collected under those conditions, which it considers exploitative and unethical).

## 6 Results

In CVPP, RTI and our local partners have exceeded the results expected, surpassing targets for creating municipal CVP councils (CMPVs), catalyzing civic action, improving citizen safety, helping develop a model crime and violence observatory, training national and municipal GOES staff, designing technical and policy tools, engaging the private sector, and leveraging resources via private sector partnerships.

**The most fundamental accomplishment** has been contributing to a new approach to address crime and violence in El Salvador. Rather than continuing to rely on enforcement measures as almost the only solution, GOES programs now support the use of preventive approaches. That shift in national policy has been largely due to CVPP along with other projects that showed the feasibility and usefulness of RTI's participatory community-based, municipal-led approach to violence prevention, by fostering strengthened CMPVs and/or violence observatories in 18 municipalities.

In the sections that follow, we first provide a review of key results by municipality for Activities 1 and 3. Then, we provide an analysis of CVPP's results that have contributed to an evolution in perceptions, attitudes, and actions at the national level under two headings:

- (1) Performance as measured by the indicators
- (2) Achievements reflected in products and outcomes not covered by the indicators.

### 6.1 Activity 1: Key Results and Achievements by Selected Location

Activity 1, which began in January 2008 in four locations and then expanded to eight locations in Phases 2 and 3, implemented CVPP's model of municipality-led, community-based CVP in 37 communities that worked with nine CMPVs located in San Salvador, Santa Tecla,<sup>11</sup> Armenia, Ahuachapán, Izalco, San Martín, Ilopango, Tonacatepeque, and the Altavista residential neighborhood.

In its first year of operation, CVPP achieved a few notable successes. For example, four municipalities partnered with the project; 15 focal communities were chosen in a participatory manner, according to a common set of criteria; CMPVs were established and/or reinforced in all four localities; four small grant competitions were carried out; and 15 crime prevention projects were selected and developed with 13 nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and universities, pledging 100 percent of the funds originally reserved for small grants (US\$900,000) for Activities 1 (US\$600,000) and 2 (US\$300,000). In addition, CVPP supported the development of a crime prevention initiative in Santa Tecla to reinforce its crime observatory; and RTI received official approval of a new project for US\$250,000 funded by Qualcomm Reach Communications, reinforcing the Santa Tecla observatory and its crime-mapping capabilities. Overall, during 2008, CVPP generated a total of US\$299,044.43 in-kind and cash contributions

---

<sup>11</sup> Although in Phases 2 and 3 all work associated with Santa Tecla was moved to Activity 2, it is reported here under Activity 1.

from municipalities, implementers, and the private sector, as complements to the grants approved in San Salvador, Tonacatepeque, Armenia, and Izalco.

Regarding policy, best practices, M&E, and methodology, CVPP also had significant achievements during Phase 1 that laid the foundation for successful implementation during CVPP's period of performance. First, the project developed a comprehensive, three-pronged crime prevention strategy consisting of social prevention, situational prevention, and crime observatories and disseminated it among project stakeholders. Second, CVPP in conjunction with USAID developed a comprehensive set of indicators to establish baseline studies and measure impacts in terms of crime rates and perceptions of security. Finally, CVPP prepared the terms of reference to conduct a comparative analysis of local and national crime prevention policies; and, in so doing, the project reviewed and compiled several existing policies and strategies from El Salvador and other Central American countries.

Through 2009, CVPP and our partners carried out several key activities. These activities were conducted amidst an electoral context during the first quarter and the subsequent post-electoral environment, in which both municipal and national governments underwent administrative changes as a result of municipal, legislative, and presidential elections. The year was also marked by a substantial increase in the homicide rate, which rose from 55 per 100,000 inhabitants in 2008 to an estimated 72 per 100,000 in 2009, making El Salvador one of the most violent countries in Latin America and the world. According to data from the PNC, 4,365 individuals were murdered in 2009, a new high since 1992, the year when El Salvador signed its Peace Accords that put an end to 12 years of civil war.

During FY 2010, CVPP continued working toward the result sought under this activity, "Community-based CVP programs improved and expanded," by consolidating the CMPVs fostered in the project's first phase (January 2008–January 2010), adding new communities in each municipality (see Table 2), systematizing and disseminating best practices, and establishing new partnerships with public and private sector actors who had a vested interest in reducing violence and gang activity in targeted areas. Because of CVPP's proven track record in crime prevention since 2008, GOES, through Sub-Secretariat for Territorial Development and Decentralization (*Sub-Secretaría de Desarrollo Territorial y Descentralización* [SSDTD]) and CNSP, established Municipal Crime Prevention Councils—similar to the CVPP-supported IIWGs—in several municipalities.

As part of its community-based CVP model, CVPP continued fostering the creation of CMPVs in each supported municipality that brought together community leaders, youth, CSOs, and representatives from the public sector to implement prevention initiatives aimed at improving citizen safety in at-risk communities. Excluding representatives from the public sector, during FY 2011, the project provided training in CVP modules to 375 community representatives under this activity (179 men and 196 women).

During FY 2011, the project under Activity 1 also provided technical and financial assistance to 11 organizations (grantees) that conducted prevention activities in response to thematic and crosscutting objectives of local CMPVs, thus enhancing their capabilities to work in a complex field of intervention and to manage grants per USAID's and RTI's rules and regulations.

By this time, CVPP had also achieved substantial impacts at some of our intervention sites—higher than the project’s targeted outcomes and indicators. For example, in La Chacra, District 6 of San Salvador, citizen safety was notably improved, as shown by CVPP’s intermediate evaluation study, which compared baseline data from 2009 with results from 2010. This study included a household survey on victimization, police statistics, and maps that depicted risk and protection factors. Some of the study’s results were as follows:

- The number of crimes reported to police was reduced by 49 percent
- The number of homicides dropped from eight to one
- The number of risk factors diminished by 30 percent
- Protection factors increased by 45 percent
- The victimization rate was reduced by 38 percent
- The percentage of those interviewed whose perception of living in a safer community rose from 12.7 to 43.7 percent (RTI and CECI, 2011b)

Although these results were very positive, they could not be solely attributed to CVPP’s actions, since the project’s activities occurred during the same period of time when effective rule of law and judicial measures were also implemented in La Chacra. The combination of intervention and prevention proved to be positive for this community, whose territory is controlled by the 18th Street Gang.

In terms of sustainable development, numerous CVP plans, ordinances, and policies have been adopted by local governments, as a result of CVPP’s and our grantees’ assistance in participatory processes. For example, the municipal councils of Armenia and Nahuizalco passed a municipal ordinance in 2011 that legally recognized its respective CMPV.

The integrated effort of the Altavista Residential neighborhood is also noteworthy. In this location, the CMPV (*Mesa Intersectorial de Prevención de la Violencia de Altavista* [MIPVA]) was formally recognized by the three mayors that govern this urban community of 90,000 inhabitants—the largest of its kind in Central America—having signed a letter of commitment that pledged to maintain support and legalize MIPVA as a tri-municipal association. In Altavista, on September 29, 2011, the computer center was officially reopened after a robbery in 2010 forced it to shut down. With assistance provided by the *Fundación Salvadoreña para la Promoción Social y el Desarrollo Económico* (FUNSALPRODESE) grant, 9 of the 15 stolen computers were replaced. Also, the PNC opened a new police station dedicated exclusively to Altavista, publicly recognizing the legitimacy of the CMPV and adopting the MIPVA prevention plan as its own, to contribute to improving citizen safety.

During the first quarter of FY 2012 (October–December 2011), five out of the eight (not including Santa Tecla) CMPVs included in this activity completed their grant’s period of performance with CVPP. As such, San Salvador, Armenia, Izalco, Altavista, and Ahuachapán,<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> In agreement with USAID and in the context of the CVPP add on award for 2012, USAID advised CVPP to close out the IIWGs that received CVPP support since 2008, specifically San Salvador, Armenia, Izalco, and Altavista. Ahuachapán was closed because the mayor completely disengaged with the IIWG’s activities.

began the closeout process that included delivering notification letters to the local government, holding closeout meetings with mayors, and conducting CMPV evaluations and 2012 CVP plan preparation workshops. In addition, CVPP assisted the CMPVs of San Martín, Ilopango, and Tonacatepeque in three main areas: (1) preparing the 2012 CVP plans to launch a small grants competitive selection process; (2) integrating new members into their respective prevention councils; and (3) promoting closer ties with the private sector in the region.<sup>13</sup>

The newly elected municipal officials from San Martín, Ilopango, and Tonacatepeque were sworn in on May 1, 2012. Although these new administrations were not incumbent administrations, CVPP maintained continuity in the prevention council's activities and facilitate the transition process for newly elected officials by engaging them, providing orientations about the project, and assisting with their integration into the CMPVs. In fact, CVPP continued working with San Martín, Ilopango, and Tonacatepeque in four main areas: (1) preparing a transition process for the Prevention Council from the old to the new administration during the month of April; (2) meeting with the new municipal councils to orient them about CVPP and obtain their commitment to continue collaborating (as a result, all three municipalities signed letters of commitment with CVPP in May 2012); (3) selecting four communities in each municipality to receive CVPP's support and revising and finalizing CVP plans; and (4) launching the small grants competitive selection process for CSOs to submit proposals for community projects.

In terms of sustainability, the four CMPVs whose CVPP support ended in December 2011, namely Armenia, Izalco, Ahuachapán, and La Chacra, are functioning well. CVPP staff visited these communities and conducted interviews with key actors about their CMPVs' operation since December 2011. Overall, we verified that the prevention committees (two municipal councils and one community organization) were supported by the municipal government (e.g., Armenia and Izalco), and La Chacra had a strong presence of leadership and support from the community.

### **6.1.1 Review of Activities per Municipality**

**Santa Tecla.**<sup>14</sup> This was initiated in 2008 to improve the crime observatory through better coordination and hot-spot mapping capabilities; initially, a short-term technical assistance (STTA) RTI team conducted an operational diagnostic of the observatory and its Municipal Security Council. This STTA team provided key recommendations such as the need to define roles and responsibilities of observatory personnel and to define data sharing protocol among participating entities. The technical assistance continued to the Inter-institutional Council on Crime Prevention, bolstering the city's crime prevention observatory and policies. In the second quarter of 2009 (January–March 2009), the observatory had its own local staff and building, dedicated 100 percent to its mandate. In spite of political changes at the national level, the Santa

---

<sup>13</sup> These three municipalities are located in the metropolitan area of San Salvador near an industrial park that employs many of the municipalities' residents. Since October 2011, industrial leaders have attended and actively participated in the prevention council meetings.

<sup>14</sup> Although the work with Santa Tecla after Phase 1 was moved to Activity II, the detail are presented here for consistency with the municipal/territorial approach.

Tecla observatory continued to have commitment from all national level agencies. The municipality's cost-share contribution largely exceeded the original target.

As a complement to the support given to the crime observatory, RTI's information technology team provided support and training to implement crime and violent incident reports, using 3G telephone technology. The software was developed and seven telephone units were deployed to PNC and Municipal Police officers' for a pilot test. A total of 40 officers participated in two-day training sessions to prepare for the pilot test requirements.

Having received CVPP's support since 2008 through the *Instituto de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas* (IDHUCA) grant (Phases 1 and 2), the Santa Tecla Observatory on Violence Prevention is now fully equipped and well trained on performing criminal data analysis. As such, it is recognized as a model for other observatories such as the San Salvador Metropolitan Observatory on Violence, located within the Council of Mayors of the Greater Metropolitan Area of San Salvador (*Consejo de Alcaldes del Área Metropolitana de San Salvador* [COAMSS]). Moreover, technical staff from the Santa Tecla Observatory have trained representatives from other cities around the country interested in establishing similar efforts.

Phase 2 of the IDHUCA grant (USAID contribution: US\$118,436; cost share: US\$33,035; municipality contribution: US\$50,620), which focused on consolidating the work of the Observatory in Santa Tecla and systematizing its experience, ended in the first quarter of FY 2012 (October–December 2011) with the achievement of the proposed objectives. In addition five documents were published under this grant: (1) the *Organizational and Functional Manual for the Santa Tecla Municipal Observatory on Violence Prevention*, (2) the *Organizational and Functional Manual for the Inter-institutional Council for Crime Prevention*, (3) the *Monitoring and Evaluation System for Santa Tecla's Observatory on Violence Prevention and the Inter-institutional Council for Crime Prevention*, (4) the *Doctrine Manual for the Community Municipal Agent of Santa Tecla*, and (5) *Conflict Mediation: An Alternative for Violence Prevention*. These documents will not only contribute to strengthening Santa Tecla's Observatory, but will also enable the scale up/replication of Santa Tecla's violence prevention efforts elsewhere in the country.

As a result of the success of the Wireless Security project in Santa Tecla, Qualcomm Wireless Reach approved new funds for Phase 2 of the grant to carry out a similar initiative with the metropolitan observatory of the COAMSS. RTI/CVPP/USAID, Qualcomm, and COAMSS launched the Wireless Security Program Phase II on September 12, 2012, with the selected municipalities of Antigua Cuscatlán, Santa Tecla, San Martín, San Salvador, Ayutuxtepeque, and Ciudad Delgado.

**San Salvador/La Chacra**, San Salvador. The CMPV work was strongly oriented to follow up four projects that were carried out under the small grants program through 2008–2009:

- *Fundación Salvadoreña de Desarrollo y Vivienda Mínima* (FUNDASAL) concluded a new park and remodeled two community centers, which benefit approximately 2,000

people. It concentrated its efforts on training community leaders on how to sustainably maintain these facilities.

- *Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo (FEPADE)* implemented its vocational training program for 390 youths who have received their diplomas. Some of them, along with community leaders, participated in subsequent workshops on project management.
- *Fundación Maquilishuat (FUMA)* concluded its social services, including sex education, computer-based resource centers, training on positive values, and counseling for 735 children and adolescents.
- *Fe y Alegría* implemented after-school activities, vocational training, and psychological counseling for 1,760 students and teachers, having renewed its interest in ensuring the sustainability of CVPP's support in 2010.
- As a sign of its commitment to be sustainable and continue implementing activities this CMPV also incorporated surrounding communities to the group although CVPP's support ended in 2011.

During FY 2010, The *Mesa Comunitaria e Intersectorial de Prevención de la Violencia* evaluated its 2010 work plan, updated it for 2011, and restructured its thematic commissions. Three NGOs carried out projects in six selected communities under the small grants fund: *Fe y Alegría* (after-school activities for at-risk youth); *Fundación Maquilishuat (FUMA)* (arts, culture, and leadership activities for youth); and *Complejo Técnico San Francisco de Sales (COMTEC)* (entrepreneurship for youth and leaders). The strength of this CMPV and its NGOs resulted in three other crime prevention projects being carried out by *Fe y Alegría*, FUMA, and FUNDASALVA, with funding from the Canada Fund for Local Initiatives and the Catholic Overseas Development Agency. Finally, CVPP's intermediate evaluation on citizen safety was completed and the results indicated significant improvements in focal communities since the 2009 baseline study in terms of an increase in protection factors and a decrease in the number of crimes reported to the police and the rate of victimization. Moreover, the experience of this CMPV piqued the interests of the private sector. *Industrias la Constancia (ILC)*, one of the biggest firms in El Salvador, with CVPP's support, met with the CMPV to learn from its experience and analyze ways to support violence prevention programs in those communities and others.

A CVPP follow-up visit during 2013 to this CMPV concluded that this community organization has continued to function and operate with discipline and strong commitment of leaders and residents, after CVPP support ended in 2011.

**Armenia.** In FY 2009, the municipal government approved a municipal ordinance (by-law) that gave legal recognition to the CMPV, which CVPP launched in 2008. The World Vision project concluded, having improved sports facilities in four schools. In addition, the municipality confirmed its agreement to co-invest in the construction of a new community center in the San Damian neighborhood. During the last quarter of FY 2009, the Armenia CMPV presented a new proposal to CVPP's grants fund, which was approved for US\$70,075.00. In FY 2010, two new

communities were incorporated into the CMPV, raising the total to seven that received support from the CVPP. As part of this project, the local CVP plan was updated, and new alliances with the Swiss Foundation for Technical Support (Swisscontact), Salvadoran Institute for Professional Training (*Instituto Salvadoreño de Formación Profesional* [INSAFORP]) the Spanish NGO *Círculo Solidario*, and *Universidad Modular Abierta* (UMA) were established, bringing new resources to enhance technical and vocational training for the CMPV's members and youth.

The *Mesa de Prevención del Riesgo Social Armeniense* (MEPERSA) went through an important change in leadership in the second quarter of FY 2011, due to differences among its members. With greater involvement from the mayor, this CMPV reorganized itself and restructured its thematic commissions, implementing its CVP plan that included four projects supported by CVPP in seven communities: MEPERSA, which sponsored recreation and training activities and improved sports infrastructure for youth; FUNPRES, which provided conflict resolution and psychological counseling support in schools; *Organización de Mujeres Salvadoreñas por la Paz* (ORMUSA), which supported domestic violence prevention and gender equality activities; and AGAPE, which conducted education, sports, culture, and small infrastructure improvement activities. Also worth noting is the drafting of a Municipal Gender Equality Policy, which was developed with CVPP's support. As in La Chacra, CVPP concluded its intermediate evaluation in citizen safety in Armenia's focal communities. However, in contrast to the results in La Chacra, the outcomes were not as positive as those observed in Armenia, partly related to rampant criminality at the municipal level and the lack of a solid community organization in some of the CVPP's focal communities (RTI and CECI, 2009d; RTI, 2012f).

However, MEPERSA's new leadership partnered with the mayor, garnered strong support from the local government, and developed a 2012 CVP plan. As a result, the CMPV completed its prevention CVP plan that included four projects supported by CVPP in seven communities. As in the case of La Chacra, this municipal-led organization is functioning with the support of the local government and the participation of citizens and institutions, since CVPP support ended in 2011.

**Izalco.** The local CMPV, known as *Mesa de Prevención y Desarrollo Integral de Izalco* (MEPREDIZAL), legalized in 2009 by the municipality, updated its CVP plan in 2010 and assigned a specific, thematic commission for each of its strategic areas of intervention. As in Armenia, the Izalco group also conducted a small grants fund (US\$42,197) through a series of community-based activities with schools, youth, community leaders, public sector actors, and CSOs that reached more than 1,300 families. Three new communities were incorporated as part of the CVPP Phase 2 bringing the total to seven communities in this municipality. As part of its consolidation efforts, the CMPV established new collaborations with *Instituto Salvadoreño de la Niñez y la Adolescencia* (ISNA) and UNICEF, further reducing the vulnerability of high-risk groups such as youth and women. Moreover, the CMPV hired a sports coach to manage two sports clinics, an initiative designed to provide children and youth with guided recreational activities.

MEPREDIZAL evaluated its work plan from 2010 and updated it for 2011. Although the local mayor did not participate in this CMPV, the commitment of leaders from its seven focal

communities and other GOES officials was high. Moreover, the CMPV organized two experience exchange meetings during FY 2011 with the 13 CMPVs that were participating in CVPP to address certain key challenges such as local leadership and sustainability. In Izalco, CVPP concluded its intermediate evaluation on citizen safety with mixed results, indicating improvements in citizen safety in certain areas, but limited progress in other areas (RTI, 2012e).

MEPREDIZAL completed its CVPP-funded activities in November 2011. The commitment of all members of the CMPV was crucial for the successful implementation of its CVP plan. Through CVPP's support, this CMPV integrated a systematic planning methodology and culture among the institutions included in the CMPV; integrated the working group and its organization in thematic commissions; effectively integrated communities and schools; and obtained the full participation of children and youth in its projects and all activities.

As noted for La Chacra and Armenia above, this municipal-led organization is functioning with the support of the local government and the participation of citizens and institutions, since CVPP's support ended.

**Altavista.** In this residential community, the largest of its kind in Central America and home to more 90,000 inhabitants, the Altavista Sports Complex and eight parks were rehabilitated through the FUNDASAL grant. The parks were officially re-inaugurated in January 2010 with the U.S. Embassy's Chargé d'Affaires and the mayors of the three cities taking part in the CMPV (Tonacatepeque, Ilopango, and San Martín). Unfortunately, shortly after this inauguration, the community center was robbed at gunpoint, and the computer room was emptied of its 15 newly installed computers. Other important achievements in the sports complex include water, sewage, and electrical connections. In addition, the municipalities of San Martín and Ilopango provided significant counterpart contributions by installing public lighting and trash cans and by painting murals in the eight rehabilitated parks. A new, social entrepreneurship grant for youth was awarded to *Fundación Salvador del Mundo* (FUSALMO). In this context, CVPP supported further institutional reinforcement of the CMPV through a small grant to *Fundación para la Democracia, Seguridad y Paz* (FUNDEMOSPAZ). Finally, implementation of the post-Hurricane Ida risk mitigation activities funded by CECI through a US\$115,000 grant carried out by FUNDASAL and administered by CECI was also another notable achievement.

During FY 2011, the *Mesa Intersectorial de Prevención de la Violencia de Altavista* (MIPVA) evaluated its 2010 CVP plan and updated it for 2011, defining new thematic commissions and implementing three projects that were carried out by several grantees: FUSALMO, which strengthened youth leadership and entrepreneurship; FUNSALPRODESE, which supported a youth training and culture of peace initiative; and FUNDEMOSPAZ, which built the capacities of this CMPV and its members, while doing advocacy work with the mayors of Tonacatepeque, Ilopango, and San Martín to achieve legal recognition of the MIPVA. Among the year's achievements was an increase in the number of community leaders participating in the CMPV, and the signing of a letter of commitment (LOC) by all three mayors, recognizing the legitimacy of the CMPV and the need to legally establish it. Also, after the robbery of 15 computers in 2010 and the reinforcement of security measures within the Altavista Sports Complex by the municipality of Tonacatepeque, the computer center was re-opened with information technology

equipment provided by CVPP through one of the small grants. Another important achievement for this CMPV was that the PNC opened a new station with exclusive service to Altavista and adopted the MIPVA's CVP plan as its own.

During FY 2012, the MIPVA was very active although no CVPP intervention or funded project was implemented. However, with CVPP's technical support, this CMPV made substantial steps to ensure its sustainability in the future. For example, MIPVA made progress on institutionalizing itself, including the preparation and actualization of technical and methodological documents; finalization of its institutional profile; the development of a comprehensive CVP plan, including updating its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis; completing organizational evaluation and a 2012 CVP plan; and the systematization of the basic mechanisms of organizational functioning. For example, staff are now receiving training in Tonacatepeque's reopened computer center. Although the CVPP-funded activities have ended, this CMPV is deeply entrenched in the community and continues supporting crime prevention activities.

**San Martín.** This municipality, as well as Ahuachapán, was added to CVPP's Activity 1, per instructions from USAID. During FY 2010 the CVPP, in coordination with the SSDTD, provided intensive technical assistance to the local CMPV, known as the *Consejo Municipal Inter-Institucional de Prevención de Violencia (CMIPV)*, in establishing its CVP plan. In San Martín, as in Altavista and Ahuachapán, CVPP supported social entrepreneurship among youth through a small grant to FUSALMO. CVPP also supported the establishment of a local, crime prevention policy, as well as strengthened the municipal crime observatory through a grant to FUNDEMOSPAZ.

In FY 2011, CVPP continued to provide technical and financial assistance to the CMIPV, while supporting prevention activities through two grantees: FUSALMO, which provided youth entrepreneurship training in six locations; and FUNDEMOSPAZ, which conducted capacity-building training for the CMPV and the San Martín crime prevention policy and observatory. Unfortunately, this CMPV was unable to evaluate its 2010 work plan due to the municipality's lack of interest. However, in part due to CVPP and the grantees' insistence, a strategic CVP plan was finalized for 2011, including implementing after-school activities for several hundred children in the seven participating schools, during the first quarter of FY 2012 (October–December 2011).

Before and after the March 2012 municipal elections, CVPP continued to provide technical support to the CMIPV mainly in three areas: (1) finishing the project "Strengthening Spaces for Citizen Participation in Violence Prevention" implemented by FUNDEMOSPAZ; (2) evaluating the CMPV's 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating the 2012 (including the Municipal Observatory CVP Plan) CVP plan to ensure seamless and efficient programming for 2012 project implementation, including selecting four new communities for inclusion in CVPP. At the end of the second quarter and in the middle of a change in municipal government administration (effective May 1, 2012), CVPP had several achievements: (1) the prevention council continued functioning during the transition period between incoming and outgoing municipal administrations; (2) new youth organizations were included in the prevention council;

- (3) the prevention council proposed four communities to receive CVPP's support; and
- (4) increased the engagement of private sector in prevention council's work.

On May 11, 2012, the municipality of San Martín signed an LOC with CVPP. This renewed commitment with the new authorities facilitated completion of the new CMIPV's action plan and the launch of a competitive small grants process on May 18, 2012. In fact, on that date, the prevention council presented its action plan to the following 10 CSOs: Cultural Association for the Arts (*Asociación Cultural para las Artes Escénicas* [ESCENICA]), FEPADE, FUNPRES, FUMA, FUNDASAL, FUSAL, FUSALMO, IDHUCA, Plan International, and Tutela Legal. All of these CSOs submitted proposals to the council for a maximum of US\$175,000. The council shortlisted three CSOs (FUNPRES, Tutela Legal, and FUNDASAL) and invited them to present their full proposals on June 6, 2012. Subsequently, the prevention council evaluated their proposals and awarded each shortlisted NGO an award:

- a. "Prevention of Violence through Psychological Care in Schools in the Municipality of San Martín." Awarded to FUNPRES. US\$30,838.00.
- b. "Preventing Violence, Promoting Social Harmony and Youth Safety." Awarded to Tutela Legal. US\$37,900.00
- c. "Promoting Community Peaceful Coexistence in Selected Locations of San Martín, through Situational Preventive Infrastructure." Awarded to FUNDASAL. US\$68,601.00

At the end of 2012, several achievements of CMIPV can be highlighted: (1) consolidation of the new CMIPV as an IIWG to reduce and prevent violence; (2) the signature of an LOC with CVPP; (3) the identification and selection of four new communities to integrate into CMIPV and participate in CVPP; (4) the integration of CVPP and the Municipal Competitiveness Project (which is also implemented by RTI); (5) participation in the Wireless Security program along with six other municipalities of the Metropolitan Area of San Salvador; (6) the launch of the competitive small grants process; and (7) the implementation of the three aforementioned subprojects.

**Ahuachapán.** CVPP signed an LOC with the mayor in May 2010, thus securing CVPP's technical and financial support. The city has since reinforced its CMPV, known locally as the *Comité Municipal de Seguridad Ciudadana* and strengthened its observatory on crime prevention, both of which have been supported before by the National Council for Public Safety (*Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Pública* [CNSP]) and Pan American Health Organization. This CMPV had a significant number of participants (40), who were mainly from the public sector. However, with substantial advocacy efforts from CVPP's facilitator in this municipality, the number of community leaders participating increased from 2 to 11.<sup>15</sup> As part of the CVPP crosscutting themes, sub-grants were signed with FUNPRES and FUSALMO/FundaGeo, both of which implemented projects on creative conflict resolution and training for social entrepreneurship opportunities for youth, respectively. CVPP also supported the strengthening of the crime observatory through a small grant to FUNDEMOSPAZ.

---

<sup>15</sup> These 11 community leaders represent the total number of communities that participated in the IIWG. The CVPP project focused on only six communities in accordance with USAID's guidance.

In FY 2011, the project reinforced the capabilities of this CMPV, helping expand its base to include the aforementioned community leaders and carrying out strategic planning and evaluation exercises. Three grants were implemented in response to the local CVP plan: FUNPRES (psychological counseling and creative conflict resolution in local schools); FUSALMO/FundaGeo (12 entrepreneurship projects for youth); and FUNDEMOSPAZ (capacity-building training for the CMPV in developing a local crime prevention policy and strengthening the local crime observatory). The main challenge of this CMPV was to achieve active participation from the mayor and his council and to carry out process-oriented initiatives instead of discrete activities. As noted in the October 2011–March 2012 Semiannual Report, in agreement with USAID, this CMPV was closed in December 2011 because of the unwillingness of the mayor to fully engage in the CMPV’s activities.

**Ilopango.** During the second quarter of FY 2011 (January–March 2011), and after receiving a formal request from the mayor of Ilopango, the *Consejo de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana* (CPCCI) began receiving technical assistance from CVPP through the FUNDEMOSPAZ grant, which enabled this CMPV to better define its mission, vision, strategic objectives, and values, while strengthening the municipality’s crime observatory. To combine these types of institutional reinforcement objectives with concrete prevention activities, the CMPV accepted CVPP’s recommendation to conduct prevention activities in six schools, benefitting more than 5,000 students from first through ninth grades by raising their awareness on topics such as youth violence, human rights, self-esteem, and sexuality. This activity mobilized nine organizations from the public and civil society sectors that gave talks to students on the aforementioned topics. Also, FUNDEMOSPAZ sponsored an art contest in each of the six schools for students who wished to express their thoughts or feelings on the topics. More than 2,500 drawings were submitted for evaluation to the CMPV, and 80 prizes were awarded to students whose work was selected.

As in San Martín and Tonacatepeque, before and after the municipal elections, CVPP continued to provide technical support to the CPCCI in three areas: (1) finishing the subproject “Strengthening Spaces for Citizen Participation in Violence Prevention” implemented by FUNDEMOSPAZ; (2) evaluating the CMPV’s 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating the 2012 prevention action plan (including the Municipal Observatory Action Plan) to ensure seamless and efficient programming for 2012 project implementation process, including the selection of four new communities to be included in CVPP. At the end of the second quarter and in the middle of a change in municipal government administration (effective May 1, 2012), CVPP had several achievements: (1) the prevention council continued functioning during the transition period between incoming and outgoing municipal administrations; (2) new youth organizations were included in the prevention council; (3) the prevention council proposed four communities to receive CVPP support; and (4) increased the engagement of private sector in prevention council’s work.

The new municipal government, which was inaugurated on May 1, 2012, signed an LOC with CVPP on May 11, 2012. With this formal assurance, CVPP supported the CMPV to select four communities that received CVPP’s support and finalize the new CVP plan for the *Consejo de*

*Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana de Ilopango (COPACIL)*. On May 30, 2012, COPACIL and CVPP together with *Consejo Municipal de Desarrollo y Participación Social de Tonacatepeque (COMDEPAST)* invited 13 CSOs to the CVP plan presentation: ASAPROSAR, COMTEC, Fe y Alegría, FEPADE, *Fundación de Innovación Educativa Centroamericana (FIECA)*, FUNDASAL, FUNPRES, FUSALMO, IDHUCA, *Iniciativa Social para la Democracia (ISD)*, *Centro de Capacitación Profesional Para la Mujer (Fundación SIRAMA)*, and *Asociación el Camino*. All of these CSOs competed for a total award ceiling of US\$225,000. On June 6, 2012, the prevention council evaluated proposals and selected the following three subprojects for awards:

- a. “Strengthen Technical, Entrepreneurial, and Productive Techniques for Women at Risk.” Awarded to Fundación SIRAMA. US\$75,000.00
- b. “Building Entrepreneurial Skills for 270 Children and Youth in the Municipality of Ilopango.” Awarded to COMTEC. US\$27,145.00
- c. “Technical Skills Development and Entrepreneurship in Ilopango.” Awarded to FEPADE. US\$27,888.00

Several achievements of COPACIL can be highlighted as part of their work with CVPP: (1) the continuity of COPACIL and its consolidation as an CMPV to reduce and prevent violence; (2) the signature of an LOC with CVPP; (3) the identification and selection of four new communities to integrate COPACIL and participate in CVPP; (4) the launch of the competitive small grants process; and (5) the implementation of the three aforementioned subprojects.

**Tonacatepeque.** As in Ilopango, COMDEPAST started benefitting from CVPP’s technical assistance in the second quarter of FY 2011 (January–March 2011). Through a capacity-building grant implemented by FUNDEMOSPAZ, this CMPV now has a better defined strategy, a draft municipal ordinance that would legalize COMDEPAST, and a local crime observatory that has been reinforced. CVPP continued to provide technical support in three areas: (1) finishing the subproject “Strengthening Spaces for Citizen Participation in Violence Prevention” implemented by FUNDEMOSPAZ; (2) evaluating the CMPV’s 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating the 2012 prevention action plan (including the Municipal Observatory Action Plan) to ensure seamless and efficient programming for 2012, including the selection of two new communities to be included in CVPP. Also, the prevention council integrated new organizations, including government agencies and religious organizations. On March 20, 2012, CVPP staff met with the newly elected officials to orient them about the project and facilitate a smooth transition.

As in Ilopango and San Martín, on May 11, 2012, the new local government signed an LOC with CVPP. As a result, CVPP continued providing technical support to COMDEPAST such as identifying and selecting two communities to receive CVPP’s support and finish the crime prevention action plan in order to launch a competitive small grants process for the municipality. As discussed in the previous section, COMDEPAST, CVPP, and COPACIL presented their CVP plans to 13 CSOs on May 30, 2012. All of these CSOs competed for a total award ceiling of US\$50,000. On June 6, 2012, the prevention council evaluated the five submitted proposals and selected the following two subprojects for awards:

- a. “Reducing Youth Violence Risk Factors in Selected Communities of Tonacatepeque.” Awarded to FUNDASAL. US\$39,968.00
- b. “Building Entrepreneurial Skills for 270 Children and Youth in the Municipality of Tonacatepeque.” Awarded to COMTEC. US\$7,975.00

Several achievements of COMDEPAST can be highlighted as part of their work with CVPP: (1) the continuity of prevention council and its consolidation as an CMPV to reduce and prevent violence; (2) the signature of an LOC with CVPP; (3) the identification and selection of two new communities to integrate into COMDEPAST and receive CVPP’s support; (4) the launch of the competitive small grants process; and (5) the implementation of the two aforementioned subprojects.

### **6.1.2 Selection of Municipalities and CMPVs’ work**

The participant municipalities were selected competitively throughout CVPP’s period of performance. During the project’s first year (2008), this was done with active participation of the GOES counterpart institutions and in accordance with the CVPP pre-defined criteria, such as high crime rates, political will of local governments, and the existence of participatory development mechanisms. In so doing, San Salvador, Armenia, Izalco, and Altavista (Tonacatepeque) were initially selected and memoranda of understanding (MOUs) were signed with each local government. For focalization purposes, 14 communities were selected with the active participation of each CMPV through a consultative process.

CVPP’s fifth municipality of intervention during Phase I, Santa Tecla, was chosen based on its proven track record in participatory development and prevention policies, and due to the existence of an Inter-institutional Council on Crime Prevention and a crime observatory.<sup>16</sup>

After having received more than two and a half years’ of CVPP’s support since 2008, the CMPVs in Armenia, Izalco, San Salvador, and Altavista achieved substantial consolidation, with updated CVP plans, increased membership for 2010–2011, and successfully implemented new grants. In these municipalities, the CMPVs expanded to include a greater number of communities. Although CVPP’s commitment to USAID was to add eight additional communities, CVPP expanded to 37 during Phase 2, including those in the two new municipalities, taking into account the CMPVs’ willingness to include more locations that comply with CVPP’s selection criteria.

Table 2 presents the localities/communities that received CVPP support from January 2008 to December 2010.

---

<sup>16</sup> CVPP’s work in Santa Tecla was limited to strengthening the prevention council’s violence observatory.

**Table 2. CVPP-supported Municipalities during Phases 1 and 2**

Municipalities	Phase 1	Phase 2
Armenia	Barrio Nuevo, Barrio San Sebastián, Colonia San Fernando, and Colonia San Damián	Barrio San Juan, Barrio Sigüenza, and Colonia Divina Providencia
Ahuachapán		El Triunfo, Getsemaní, Girasoles I and II, La Labor, Los Ausoles, Los Cocos, Los Rodríguez, and Santa Lucía
Izalco	Barrio San Juan, Colonia Santa Emilia, Barrio Santa Cruz, and Las Palmeras	Barrio Cruz Galana, Colonia Lourdes, and Colonia San José
San Salvador/La Chacra	La Chacra, Quiñónes I, Quiñónes II, and Francisco Morazán	San Luis Portales I and San Martín Municipal
Altavista (Toncatepeque)	Blocks No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 51, and 54	Blocks No. 11, 31, 32, 40, 41, 49, Blocks A, D, I, K, O, N, and Comunidad Bendición de Dios <sup>17</sup>
San Martín		Los Olivos Centro, Olivos Oriente, Olivos Poniente, and Tierra Virgen 1 and 2

Throughout the period of performance, CVPP sponsored exchange experiences among the CMPVs of Armenia, Santa Tecla, and Izalco. In addition, violence prevention workshops were held in Izalco, and the CMPVs were actively involved in the process of conducting and analyzing the baseline studies and evaluations carried out in each community.

During FY 2011, CVPP's original four CMPVs in Armenia, Izalco, San Salvador, and Altavista continued evolving and consolidating themselves, having updated their respective CVP plans with increased membership, renewed thematic commissions, and ongoing grants. The two CMPVs receiving technical and financial assistance since early 2010 (San Martín and Ahuachapán) also continued to build their capacities, having adopted CVPP's local development and crime prevention models, implementing CVP plans, and funding specific initiatives through small grants. The two CMPVs receiving CVPP's support since early 2011 in Ilopango and Toncatepeque made steps toward their consolidation. Please note that these two municipalities are not included in Table 2 CVPP only worked with the prevention councils (CMPVs).

In Armenia, Izalco, San Salvador, Altavista, San Martín, and Ahuachapán, CVPP worked in 37 communities under Activity 1 (Table 2). Ilopango and Toncatepeque were included in Phase 2 but without communities, only CMPV support.

In November 2011, CVPP was officially notified about a new extension in two phases: one *no-cost extension* from October to December 2011 and one *cost extension* from January to December 2012. In turn, CVPP informed our national and municipal partners (CMPVs) about its operational plans: (1) support those CMPVs that will be closing at the end of 2011; and (2) support those CMPVs that will continue into 2012.

<sup>17</sup> Although this community is not part of Altavista, it is located immediately next to this residential area and is an active participant in its IIWG. Therefore, CVPP includes this community in recognition of its commitment and work.

For the CMPVs that ended in December 2011 (i.e., Armenia, Izalco, Ahuachapán, Altavista, and San Salvador), CVPP developed a comprehensive closeout process that included delivering notification letters to the local governments, holding closeout meetings with mayors, and conducting CMPV evaluation and 2012 action plan preparation workshops. At the end of 2011, all of these CMPVs had clear roles and CVP plans as key instruments for resource mobilization without CVPP's financial support. In addition, each municipal government supported its respective CMPV as part of the national violence prevention programs. In fact, CVPP during the second quarter of 2012 (January–March 2012) visited three of these CMPVs—La Chacra in San Salvador, Armenia, and Izalco—to verify the status of the working groups. All of these CMPVs were functioning well: they held regular recurring meetings; kept abreast of ongoing CVPP-supported subprojects and they had either municipal or community support; and, in the case of La Chacra, mobilized resources from other organizations such as ILC, one of the biggest firms in El Salvador.

For the CMPVs that continued to receive support during 2012 (i.e., San Martín, Ilopango, and Tonacatepeque), CVPP worked closely in three main areas: (1) finalizing the preparation of the 2012 action plans to launch an open and competitive grants selection process; (2) integrating new member organizations into their respective prevention councils; (3) identifying and selecting new communities to be part of CVPP; and (3) promoting closer ties with the private sector in the region.<sup>18</sup>

In March 2012, a major change took place within these three municipalities. In fact, as a result of the municipal elections, there was a change in the political affinity of the municipal councils. This caused uncertainty about whether the newly elected governments would continue with the prevention efforts supported by CVPP. Fortunately, as aforementioned, CVPP was able to maintain continuity in the prevention council's activities by proactively engaging incoming officials in April and May to familiarize them with the project, facilitate their transition, and obtain their concurrence. By the end of 2012, the three prevention councils became fully operational, they renewed their LOCs with CVPP, selected new communities to be part of CVPP, finished their CVP plans, and were able to commit more than US\$300,000 in grants.

During FY 2012, new communities were included within CVPP, in Ilopango, Tonacatepeque, and San Martín. By December 2012, 49 communities in eight localities were participating in CVPP-sponsored activities as shown in Table 3.

---

<sup>18</sup> These three municipalities are located in the metropolitan area of San Salvador near an industrial park that employs many of municipalities' residents. Since October 2011, industrial leaders started to attend and participate in the prevention council meetings.

**Table 3. CVPP-supported Municipalities during Phases 1–3**

Municipalities	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
Armenia	Barrio Nuevo, Barrio San Sebastián, Colonia San Fernando, and Colonia San Damián	Barrio San Juan, Barrio Sigüenza, and Colonia Divina Providencia	
Ahuachapán		El Triunfo, Getsemaní, Girasoles I and II, La Labor, Los Ausoles, Los Cocos, Los Rodríguez, and Santa Lucía	
Izalco	Barrio San Juan, Colonia Santa Emilia, Barrio Santa Cruz, and Las Palmeras	Barrio Cruz Galana, Colonia Lourdes, and Colonia San José	
San Salvador/La Chacra	La Chacra, Quiñónez I, Quiñónez II, and Francisco Morazán	San Luis Portales I and San Martín Municipal	
Altavista	Blocks No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 51, and 54	Blocks No. 11, 31, 32, 40, 41, and 49; Blocks A, D, I, K, O, and N; and Comunidad Bendición de Dios <sup>19</sup>	
San Martín		Los Olivos Centro, Olivos Oriente, Olivos Poniente, and Tierra Virgen 1 and 2	Colonia Santa Gertrudis, Lotificación San Andrés, Valle las Delicias, and Proyecto Santa Teresa
Ilopango			Colonia San Bartolo 9 Etapa, Colonia Bosques de la Paz, Sector Santa Lucía, Comunidad Dolores de Apulo, and Comunidad Banco Hipotecario
Tonacatepeque			Los Henriquez, Comunidad Los Naranjos, and La Hermita

### 6.1.3 Competitive Small Grants Program

In 2008, during CVPP's first year of operation, six implementing partner organizations were selected, of which five were already engaged in activities in each of the participating municipalities. The implementers were FEPADE, CARE, FUMA, Fe y Alegría, Junior Achievement, and World Vision. Although the activities varied widely by community, they responded directly to the needs identified by CMPV diagnostics and proposed solutions. Some examples included vocational training, small infrastructures, arts and culture, training workshops, sport activities, and psychological counseling.

In the municipalities of Izalco and San Salvador, cost share totaling US\$87,434 in cash and US\$99,792, respectively, came mainly from the implementing partners, with the exception of

<sup>19</sup> Although this community is not part of Altavista, it is located immediately next to this residential area and is an active participant in its IIWG. Therefore, CVPP includes this community in recognition of its commitment and work.

Junior Achievement, which brought contributions from Shell Oil Company, Fundación Poma, AES El Salvador, and Compañía Azucarera Salvadoreña (CASSA), totaling US\$42,836 of all cash contributions generated under Activity 1. The competitive small grants program in Izalco and San Salvador municipalities enabled their CMPVs to be empowered and able to supervise the programs being implemented.

As of December 31, 2008, a total amount of \$600,000 had been pledged for implementation of grants-funded projects under Activity 1, of which US\$339,293 had been officially approved.

By December 31, 2009, CVPP generated in-kind and cash contributions totaling US\$959,683.69 from municipalities, implementers, communities and the private sector to complement the grants approved in all of the project's five locations: San Salvador, Santa Tecla, Armenia, Izalco, and Altavista (Toncatepeque, San Martín, and Ilopango).

During the last quarter of FY 2009 two grants were approved:

- Izalco CMPV, which carried out a community-based prevention project including several components, with a strong focus on vocational training and recreational activities for youth at risk (USAID contribution: US\$42,197.00 and cost-share: US\$9,905.00).
- Armenia CMPV, which implemented an initiative to provide kids with recreational activities during their vacation, as well as vocational with significant cost share from the Swiss Contac company and the Salvadoran Institute for Professional Training (INSAFORP) (USAID contribution: US\$70,074.40, and cost-share: US\$17,035.00).

Overall, 100 percent of funds earmarked for grants under Activities 1 and 2 (US\$600,000 and US\$300,000, respectively) were pledged. Also, the US\$375,000 allocated for grants per Amendment No. 4 was pledged when the newly elected mayors were inaugurated. They, along with the CMPVs, determined how these funds were used. From these funds, US\$158,000 was invested in Altavista (FUNDASAL, US\$152,000; and FUNPRES, US\$6,000). The rest was committed to Izalco, Armenia, San Salvador, and Santa Tecla, as well as to the comparative study on crime prevention policies from El Salvador and Central America that *Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo* (FUNDAUNGO) carried out.

In-kind cost-share was provided by implementing partners (NGOs), community volunteers, and the municipalities. Junior Achievement, however, brought private sector cash contributions from Shell Oil Company, *Fundación Poma*, *AES El Salvador*, and *Compañía Azucarera Salvadoreña*, totaling US\$44,744 generated under Activities 1 and 2; and FUSAL brought US\$25,366 in cash from *Grupo Roble* under Activity 2.

During the first quarter of FY 2010 (October–December 2009), CVPP organized an open grants competition for crosscutting themes that apply to all of CVPP's municipalities:

- i. Youth leadership
- ii. Economic opportunities for youth
- iii. Creative conflict resolution
- iv. Domestic violence prevention, gender equality, and developing a cohesive family

This competition was launched with an informational meeting on April 28, 2010, where more than 25 NGOs and foundations, in addition to representatives of the CMPVs, attended. Considering the nature of the crosscutting themes and that CVPP aimed to cover as many municipalities as possible, organizations interested in presenting proposals were required to include at least two municipalities in their respective projects. Two separate amounts were set aside: US\$150,000 for projects under Activity 1, and US\$500,000 for initiatives to be implemented in municipalities under Activity 3, El Salvador CARSÍ (formerly the Merida Initiative).

The evaluation of the proposals was undertaken by a Technical Review Committee (TRC) consisting of representatives from CVPP and USAID's Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR). The proposals were evaluated through concept papers and an illustrative budget against a set of predetermined criteria that were specified in the request for application guidelines. The AOR's participation proved to be highly beneficial for the next stage of the process and subsequent final approval of the full proposals by USAID. Those achieving the highest scores advanced to the submission of a full proposal. The TRC took care to ensure that participating municipalities received assistance from various organizations covering as many as possible of the crosscutting themes.

The following grants were implemented:

- i. Izalco and Armenia, where ORMUSA provided training on domestic violence prevention and gender equality (USAID contribution: US\$49,803; cost-share: US\$40,011).
- ii. Ahuachapán, San Martín, and Altavista, where FUSALMO focused on violence prevention through participatory processes for developing social entrepreneurship for youth (USAID contribution: US\$84,536; cost-share: US\$27,220).
- iii. Armenia and San Salvador, where FUMA worked on prevention and responding to domestic, gender, and family violence (USAID contribution: US\$49,840; cost-share: US\$20,600).
- iv. Izalco and Ahuachapán, where FUNPRES carried out a psychological support program to prevent and reduce violence in eight schools (USAID contribution: US\$56,498; cost-share US\$12,950).

## **6.2 Activity 3: Key Results and Achievements by Selected Location**

Activity 3, which started in 2010 and supported El Salvador CARSÍ (formerly the Merida Initiative) with two components: (1) the gang prevention program and (2) the community action fund. For both components, and following CVPP's proven model of municipality-led, community-based CVP, the project involved up to 34 communities throughout the seven selected municipalities.

Since the beginning in the case of Zaragoza and San Juan Opico, Vanderbilt University played an important role in this CVPP activity, having been contracted by the USAID/Washington to conduct impact evaluation studies in both municipalities. This entailed substantial coordination between the CVPP and Vanderbilt teams during the planning phase of the baseline study and

diagnosis carried out by Vanderbilt University. CVPP coordinated with them, albeit in a limited manner, to keep the CMPVs in both selected municipalities abreast of their ongoing field work. This was aimed to reach two basic results, “Gang recruitment of youth and community crime and violence are decreased,” and “Opportunities for basic education, vocational training and leadership for youth increased.” During the first year of work under this activity, the major achievements were as follows:

- v. Four municipalities were selected in collaboration with USAID and SSDTD: Zaragoza, San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Nahuizalco, bringing the total number of new communities assisted to 25 (USAID requested 17).
- vi. The CVPP team worked closely with the Vanderbilt University team in Zaragoza and San Juan Opico, where Vanderbilt conducted baseline studies, household surveys, focus groups, and impact evaluations, as stipulated in CVPP’s modified cooperative agreement under CARSÍ. Vanderbilt did not share their selected target or treatment communities for these two cities where CVPP implemented CARSÍ components.
- vii. Training sessions and continued technical assistance were provided to the CMPVs in Zaragoza, San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Nahuizalco, strengthening their capacities for participatory planning of CVP at the local level. All four municipalities completed their planning processes, determined priority areas to be targeted by CVP activities, and conducted competitive, open grant processes with CVPP funding.
- viii. The CVPP team supported GOES, local governments, communities, civil society organizations, business leaders, and others by fostering more interest and involvement in developing projects designed to assist at-risk youth. The project team brought to bear its expertise in forming public-private partnerships to secure adequate cost-share funding from various donors to implement the projects. Such is the case of *Fundación Educando a un Salvadoreño*, a foundation formed by business leaders in the country, dedicated to providing academic and sport scholarships to poor youth who show potential to excel in soccer or baseball. CVPP also negotiated a sole-source sub-grant to support these types of violence prevention activities in municipalities under Activity 3.

During FY 2011 (which ended on September 30, 2011), CVPP through its small grants fund, supported 30 subprojects carried out by 11 grantees, in response to CVP plans developed locally and in a participatory fashion by the each municipality’s CMPV, with the project’s technical and financial assistance, through its small grants fund.

Eleven of those subprojects were extended until December 2011 to ensure they could successfully complete their activities. Also during this period, CVPP worked with these CMPVs, evaluating their efforts and updating their action plans for the 2012 CVPP add on. As a result, all four CMPVs under this activity were ready to start with the identification and implementation of prevention projects. Moreover, the four CMPVs of Ciudad Arce, San Juan Opico, Nahuizalco, and Zaragoza took steps to raise awareness about their crime prevention activities. By collaborating with *Audio Visuales-UCA*, each CMPV prepared a strategic communication plan and produced promotional materials. These efforts helped to raise the profile of the CMPVs in their respective communities and among local government actors.

Between January and March 2012, CVPP initiated a competitive selection process for small grants where 16 CSOs presented 12 prevention proposals to the four participating CMPVs. Concurrently, CVPP collaborated with PREPAZ to select the following three new municipalities to receive CVPP support: San Antonio del Monte, Nejapa, and Soyapango. This process involved the following:

- PREPAZ identifying 20 municipalities with high homicide rates
- Joint meetings between PREPAZ and CVPP to review municipalities and shortlist 10 municipalities based on two criteria (1) the existence of an established prevention council; and (2) the municipality's proximity to existing CVPP-supported municipalities
- On February 15, 2012, CVPP invited the 10 shortlisted municipalities to submit responses within seven days. San Antonio del Monte, Nejapa, and Soyapango submitted responses by the requested deadline

On May 2012, LOCs were signed between CVPP and each of the new municipalities. In addition, CVPP successfully engaged ILC to financially support two of these new prevention councils. ILC had committed US\$80,000 to support Nejapa's CVP plan adding resources to CVPP's ongoing process. This process was not finished by CVPP due to end of the project. But ILC continued its support to the prevention council. ILC signed MOUs, respectively, with Nejapa's and Soyapango's prevention councils.

In addition, during January–March FY 2012, a small grants competitive selection process was launched for the four municipalities of Zaragoza, Ciudad Arce, San Juan Opico, and Nahuizalco; and 15 CSOs were awarded grants. An important point to note is that the homicide rate has declined in all four CVPP-supported communities. According to the PNC data, in September 2011, three homicides, respectively, were reported for Ciudad Arce and San Juan Opico; 13 for Nahuizalco; and 4 for Zaragoza. In contrast, in September 2012, only 1 homicide was reported for Ciudad Arce and San Juan Opico, respectively; 10 were reported for Nahuizalco; and 1 for Zaragoza.

A description of CVPP's key activities and achievements under Activity 3 is presented below according to the main tasks conducted across the selected municipalities.

### **6.2.1 Review of Activities per Municipality**

**Ciudad Arce.** The CMPV, known as the *Comité Municipal por la Paz y Convivencia Social* (CMPCS), was formed approximately in 2009. However, when CVPP started providing technical assistance, in April 2010, it took off and developed its first planning process that led to defining its organizational structure and areas of priority. This CMPV moved forward in gaining public recognition as the precursor to sponsoring violence prevention activities, in great part due to expanding the membership to include youth and community leaders. However, the challenge of refining the role and responsibilities of the various commissions formed to carry out the work of the CMPV remained (coordination, youth, recreation and sports, citizen security, health, and environment). This was especially true for the members of the Coordination Commission—in charge of coordinating the work of the other commissions—who had difficulty in assuming their

responsibility and feeling empowered to carry out their tasks. A significant, politically charged obstacle that faced Ciudad Arce was the internal dispute of the governing political party, Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (*Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional*). Fortunately, CVPP's facilitator successfully navigated this politically charged environment and assisted in bringing both sides to the table to reach decisions affecting project implementation.

During the first quarter of FY 2012 (October–December 2011), CVPP continued to provide technical support to the CMPCS in three core areas: (1) monitoring and finishing the seven subprojects being implemented by different organizations; (2) evaluating the CMPCS's 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating its 2012 prevention action plan (including the Municipal Observatory Action Plan) to ensure seamless and efficient programming in early 2012, including the competitive small grants selection process launched in January.

Starting in January 2012 with the new add-on award, CVPP continued to provide technical support to CMPCS in two main areas: (1) monitoring four new subprojects being implemented; and (2) supporting the implementation of the different activities identified in the CVP plan. The subprojects implemented during this period through the small grants program focused on the following areas: domestic violence prevention; youth leadership; conflict resolution; job opportunities for youth; rehabilitation of small infrastructures; arts and theatre; vocational training and entrepreneurship; and institutional strengthening of the CMPV. This municipality was selected to continue working with a new USAID prevention project, due to its good performance and management.

**San Juan Opico.** The CMPV, known as the *Comité Municipal de Prevención Social*, was established before CVPP's arrival in the municipality so that CVPP's facilitator mainly focused on improving representation in the CMPV and promoting cooperation among its members. A strategic, participatory planning process was conducted over four months, and the CMPV engaged in drafting its annual operating plan for 2011. The CVPP facilitator spent considerable time mentoring the CMPV—specifically its Coordination Commission—to ensure it attained full ownership of the projects being implemented under the crosscutting themes and thematic priority areas. It is noteworthy to highlight the community association's close supervision and monitoring of the projects; they were fully engaged in making sure the expected results were achieved to benefit their youth population. However, the municipal council's desire to centralize decisions and exert control made it difficult for other members of the CMPV to take on responsibilities, ultimately decreasing their sense of ownership.

As in Ciudad Arce, CVPP continued to provide technical support to the *Consejo de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana* in three core areas during the first quarter of FY 2012: (1) finishing five subprojects that were implemented by different organizations; (2) evaluating the CMPV's 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating its 2012 prevention action plan to ensure seamless and efficient programming in early 2012, including the competitive small grants selection process launched in January 2012.

In January 2012, CVPP continued to provide technical support to the *Consejo de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana* (CPCCI) in two main areas: (1) monitoring four new subprojects being implemented; and (2) supporting the implementation of the different activities identified in the CVP plan. The subprojects implemented during this period were in the following areas: youth leadership; psychological counseling; conflict resolution; vocational training; and youth entrepreneurship.

**Nahuizalco.** The CMPV, known as the *Consejo de Prevención Social y Seguridad Ciudadana*, was strengthened through the technical assistance of CVPP's facilitator, to the extent that the CMPV's board was officially launched in September 2010 in a public celebration attended by approximately 2,000 residents. One of the major achievements the CVPP was the strengthening of the CMPV in various topics new to them, especially regarding the prevention of gender and domestic violence, which is a prevalent problem in Nahuizalco for decades. Through training, the members of the CMPV acquired knowledge and tools to combat this problem.

During the first quarter of FY 2012, the *Consejo de Prevención Social y Seguridad Ciudadana* continued to receive technical support from CVPP in three areas: (1) finishing five prevention projects that were being implemented by different organizations; (2) evaluating the CMPV's 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating its 2012 prevention action plan (including the Municipal Observatory Action Plan) to ensure seamless and efficient programming in early 2012, including the competitive small grants selection process launched in January 2012.

As part of this group of prevention councils that continued working with CVPP in January 2012, CVPP kept on working in two main areas: (1) monitoring the new subproject being implemented; and (2) supporting the implementation of the different activities identified in the prevention plan. Only one project was selected by the prevention council. This was aimed to contribute to reducing the violence, crime, and insecurity of Nahuizalco; improve the security; promote the culture of peace; encourage citizen participation; and strengthen social cohesion. This prevention councils is very active and been as a model for other municipalities.

**Zaragoza.** At the beginning of CVPP's work with this prevention council (*Consejo Municipal de Prevención*), the priority was to define strategic priorities in time for launching the small grants competition. Unfortunately, the CMPV faced intermittent interruptions in their meeting schedule because of severe weather emergencies, and the desire of the mayor to control the decisions and actions of the CMPV. In this context, the selection process for small grants was a hard task to achieve, but finally succeeded in the selection of the best proposals. However, the mayor and religious leaders in the CMPV had some objections, and CVPP's senior management scheduled a follow-up meeting to sort out their discomfort and disagreement with the process. Eventually this situation was resolved, and the CMPV was able to focus on monitoring progress of the two projects being implemented and gearing up to quick start the four selected projects under the thematic areas. Sustained efforts in fostering increased commitment and participation from selected community leaders and youth were done to ensure successful implementation of the subprojects.

Throughout 2011, The *Consejo Municipal de Prevención* published a municipal diagnosis on citizen safety and a strategic CVP plan for 2011–2015, while monitoring six subprojects implemented by as many grantees on the following themes: vocational training; psychological counseling and conflict resolution; gender-based violence; youth entrepreneurship; small infrastructures; and the participatory establishment of a local crime prevention policy. Some of the highlights for FY 2011 included strong support of the municipality’s staff; capacity building of the CMPV’s members; sponsoring vocational training and entrepreneurship for more than 500 youth and leaders; providing arts, recreational, and psychological counseling services for students, teachers, and parents in seven schools; rehabilitating and illuminating three parks for daytime and nighttime sports programs; and, finally, the drafting of a local CVP policy approved in the first quarter of FY 2012. As in San Juan Opico, this municipality was part of Vanderbilt University’s impact study and, as such, the communities where CVPP works were chosen by the Vanderbilt University team as a target for USAID CARSI funds assistance.<sup>20</sup> Notwithstanding this impact study, CVPP carried out its own baseline study in Zaragoza (RTI, 2012l).

The *Consejo Municipal de Prevención* continued to receive technical support from CVPP in three areas during the first quarter of FY 2012 (October–December 2011): (1) finishing six prevention projects with different organizations; (2) evaluating the CMPV’s 2011 performance; and (3) reviewing and updating its 2012 prevention action plan (including the Municipal Observatory Action Plan) to ensure seamless and efficient programming in early 2012, including the competitive small grants selection process that was launched in January 2012.

As part of this group of prevention councils that continued working with CVPP in January 2012, CVPP kept on working in two main areas: (1) monitoring the new subprojects being implemented; and (2) supporting the implementation of the different activities identified in the CVP plan. Five subprojects were being implemented by five grantees in the following areas: prevention of domestic violence, youth and adult leadership, rehabilitating the physical environment; vocational training; psychological counseling and conflict resolution; and preventing gender-based violence.

**San Antonio del Monte.** On March 22, 2012, the *Consejo Municipal para la Convivencia, Prevención y Seguridad Ciudadana* signed an LOC with CVPP. As a result of this commitment from the new authorities, CVPP was able to support the finalization of the CVP plan. CVPP also provided technical assistance with launching the competitive small grants process. On May 3, 2012, the Prevention Council of San Antonio del Monte met with five CSOs (i.e., FUNPRES, Fe y Alegría, COMTEC, ASAPROSAR, and FUMA) and presented its CVP plan to the CSOs.

**Nejapa.** On May 23, 2012, the municipality of Nejapa signed an LOC with CVPP. As a result of this commitment from the new authorities, CVPP was able to support the finalization of the CVP plan. CVPP also provided technical assistance with launching the competitive small grants process on June 22, 2012, when the Prevention Council of Nejapa presented its plan to eight invited CSOs.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

Overall, several achievements of this prevention council can be highlighted as part of their work with CVPP: (1) the reorganization of the prevention council and continuity of activities as a new local government was being integrated; (2) the signature of an LOC with CVPP; (3) the identification and selection of four communities to integrate into the prevention council and participate in CVPP; and (4) the launching of the competitive small grants process. In addition, ILC supported the entire process and contributed US\$80,000 (allocated by CVPP) to support prioritized activities identified in the CVP plan.

**Soyapango.** The new municipal administration signed an LOC with CVPP on May 25, 2012, after a series of substantive advocacy visits from CVPP to orient the newly inaugurated local government about the project. Several achievements of this prevention council can be highlighted as part of their work with CVPP: (1) the reorganization of the prevention council and continuity of activities as a new local government was being integrated; (2) signing an LOC with CVPP; (3) the identification and selection of four communities to integrate into the prevention council and participate in CVPP; and (4) the launching of the competitive small grants process. As in Nejapa, ILC's support was instrumental throughout the engagement process; it has agreed to provide financial contributions to fund some of the identified activities in the CVP plan.

### **6.2.2 Target Municipalities and Communities and Consolidation of the Work of the CMPVs**

In Phases 1 and 2, target municipalities with high crime and poverty rates were chosen from a list provided by the SSDTD, and the mayors of these municipalities were invited to attend an informational meeting. As a result, Zaragoza and San Juan Opico were first selected. Subsequently, and to achieve a greater number of municipalities under this activity, Ciudad Arce was chosen by the SSDTD and was invited to receive technical and financial assistance. Afterward, USAID requested that CVPP work with the municipality of Nahuizalco to join its efforts with other contractors (e.g., Creative Associates, ICMA, and Checchi) working in this locality, thus augmenting the probabilities of having a cumulative impact on citizen safety at the local level.

To select specific communities in Nahuizalco and Ciudad Arce, the local CMPVs, with CVPP's guidance, chose locations that complied with CVPP's selection criteria that included freedom of movement, community organization, infrastructure availability, municipal investments, proximity to other selected communities, and population density.

In the case of Zaragoza and San Juan Opico, Vanderbilt University shortlisted approximately 20 communities according to criteria such as freedom of movement, population density, percentage of youth population, and crime and poverty rates. These communities then underwent an in-depth diagnosis using more specific criteria, similar to CVPP's criteria. Finally, the team from Vanderbilt University randomly selected six *treatment* communities where prevention activities were being implemented with CARSI funds, as well as three *control* communities that complied with the selection criteria but that did not receive assistance from CVPP. Understandably, neither the CMPVs nor the CVPP team was notified about the names of the control communities.

During the first three months of 2012 (Phase 3), three new municipalities were selected from a list of 20 with the highest crime rates in the country, given by PREPAZ.<sup>21</sup> Nejapa, Soyapango, and San Antonio del Monte were selected to be supported by CVPP. This selection was guided by four main criteria:

1. The municipality was ranked as having one of the 20 highest crime rates in the country.
2. The municipality already had a prevention organization
3. The municipality was close to the existing communities included in CVPP
4. The municipality submitted a letter formally expressing its interest in participating in CVPP

After these municipalities were selected and CVPP started working with the prevention councils, four communities in each municipality were also selected using the seven criteria defined in RTI's prevention manual.

The following chart presents a list of municipalities and communities that were participating in Activity 3.

**San Juan Opico**

El Papayal, Buenos Aires, Jabalincito, and Nueva Candelaria Las Flores, and Cantón Sitio Grande

**Ciudad Arce**

Santa Lucía Sector 1 and Sector 2, Casco Urbano: San Andrés & Santa Rosa, and Urbanización San Francisco

**Zaragoza**

Colonia Los Cedros, El Zaité II, Lotificación El Corralito, Esmeraldita II, Colonia Miramar San Antonio I and San Antonio II

**Nahuizalco**

Cantones Pushtan and Sisimitepec, Colonias: Xochilt-Ixtatec, Milagrosa 2 Barrios: San Juan, La Trinidad, and Las Mercedes

**San Antonio del Monte**

Colonia el Mirador  
Colonia el Carmen  
Residencial San Antonio  
Lomas de San Antonio II

**Nejapa**

Colonia Nuevo Ferrocarril  
Colonia Nueva Esperanza  
Comunidad Bonete  
Comunidad Cedral-Rosario

**Soyapango**

Colonia San Fernando  
Colonia Lo Santos 1  
Bosques de Prusia  
San José

---

<sup>21</sup> Please note the change in CVPP's national government counterpart. In Phases 1 and 2, our counterpart was first the *Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Pública*, and then changed to SSDTD; and finally in Phase 3, PREPAZ became our counterpart.

### **6.2.3 Competitive Small Grants Program**

At the beginning of this activity in 2010, to accelerate the response to urgent needs of the targeted municipalities and to more efficiently cover common concerns in CVPs, during January–March, CVPP organized an open competition for crosscutting themes that for all CVPP-supported municipalities. These four themes were as follows:

- i. Youth leadership
- ii. Economic opportunities for youth
- iii. Creative conflict resolution
- iv. Domestic violence prevention, gender equality, and developing a cohesive family

All of the following proposals that target Activity 3 under the crosscutting themes were reviewed and approved by the CVPP team and USAID, and the projects were implemented successfully:

- i. Ciudad Arce, San Juan Opico, and Nahuizalco, where ASAPROSAR/ASHOKA developed innovative social entrepreneurship programs for youth (USAID contribution: US\$78,772; cost-share: US\$26,445).
- ii. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, and Zaragoza, where Complejo Tecnico de Sales developed employment skills of young men and women (USAID contribution: US\$49,255; cost-share: US\$15,640).
- iii. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, and Zaragoza, where FUNPRES carried out a psychological support program to prevent and reduce violence in school students and parents, and communities (USAID contribution: US\$93,951; cost-share: US\$23,598).
- iv. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Nahuizalco, where Plan International promoted youth leadership and work on prevention of domestic violence within a gender equity environment (USAID contribution: US\$141,624; cost-share: US\$64,800).

In addition to the aforementioned crosscutting themes, CVPP also held an open and limited small grants competition in each municipality under Activity 3. The terms of reference (TORs) for these competitions responded to the crime prevention priorities established in each of the communities as set forth in their respective CVP plans. The CVPP team, in collaboration with the CMPVs, organized information meetings and drafted specific TORs through which local NGOs and foundations were invited to present proposals. The submitted proposals were jointly reviewed, but final selection and approval was issued by the CMPVs with CVPP's technical assistance, thus empowering them and facilitating their subsequent project M&E. The projects below started in November 2010, in the following locations:

- i. Zaragoza, where FIECA contributed to prevent youth and gender-based violence prevention while institutionally strengthening the local CMPV (USAID contribution: US\$82,334; cost-share: US\$27,659).

- ii. San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce, where ESCENICA carried out drama, painting, and puppetry classes for youth and supported groups for cultural activities after the end of the grant (USAID contribution: US\$50,821; cost-share: US\$26,650).
- iii. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Nahuizalco, where FUNDASAL carried out small infrastructure work and fostered community organization for nonskilled labor to contribute and maintain the public spaces to be built (USAID contribution: US\$356,994; cost-share: US\$142,038).
- iv. Nahuizalco, where MSM trained community leaders and youth to proactively prevent social and gender-based violence (USAID contribution: US\$101,587; cost-share: US\$25,575).
- v. San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce, where ISD implemented an institutional strengthening project aimed at building the capacities of the CMPVs, ultimately reinforcing CVPP's sustainability and impacts on both locations (USAID contribution: US\$119,883; cost-share: US\$45,585).
- vi. Nahuizalco, where ORMUSA implemented an initiative to empower youth and women to proactively prevent gender-based violence, from a human rights perspective (USAID contribution: US\$104,295; cost-share: US\$34,550).

CVPP used three basic mechanisms to commit funds from its small grants program: open competitions in response to participatory, locally driven CVP plans;<sup>22</sup> open competitions per CVPP's four, crosscutting themes;<sup>23</sup> and sole-source grants, considering the unique expertise of some grantees.<sup>24</sup>

As part of Activity 3, during FY 2011, CVPP supported 30 subprojects in the four focal municipalities, carried out by 12 grantees, several of whom worked in two or more municipalities, implementing proposals that respond to locally developed CVP plans that were established in a participatory manner by the CMPVs.

The following is a list of projects implemented as part of the small grants program under Activity 3 as of December 31, 2012. Some of these grants started up in FY 2010, whereas others got underway in FY 2011. All of these projects ended during first quarter of FY 2012 and are designated by the term "CLOSED."

**Grants that began in FY 2010:**

- i. Salvadoran Association for Rural Health (*Asociación Salvadoreña Pro-Salud Rural* [ASAPROSAR]) developed innovative leadership and social entrepreneurship programs with 180 youth in Ciudad Arce, San Juan Opico, and Nahuizalco (USAID contribution: US\$99,772; cost-share: US\$33,444). CLOSED.

<sup>22</sup> The majority of the funds were committed in this fashion.

<sup>23</sup> The four themes are youth leadership, economic opportunities for youth, creative conflict resolution, and domestic violence/gender-based violence prevention, and promoting equality/family cohesion.

<sup>24</sup> For example, FUNDEMOSPAZ is one of the few NGOs specializing in citizen safety and crime observatories.

- ii. *Complejo Tecnico San Francisco de Sales* conducted vocational training and entrepreneurship workshops that developed the employment skills of 522 young men and women in San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Zaragoza, and Nahuizalco (USAID contribution: US\$51,740; cost-share: US\$15,640). CLOSED.
- iii. FUNPRES carried out a psychological support program to prevent and reduce violence in public schools with 10,800 students, parents, and community leaders in San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, and Zaragoza. An additional component was added to the project in Zaragoza, benefiting 50 young men and women at-risk who were not attending school and 40 women and their children victims of domestic violence (USAID contribution: US\$121,399; cost-share: US\$30,122). CLOSED.
- iv. Plan International promoted youth leadership and prevented domestic violence through gender equality for 766 beneficiaries in San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce (USAID contribution: US\$141,624; cost-share: US\$59,334). CLOSED.

**Grants that began in FY 2011:**

- v. FIECA contributed to preventing youth and gender-based violence prevention in seven schools in Zaragoza by sponsoring recreational and cultural activities, while institutionally strengthening the local CMPV for 2,435 beneficiaries (USAID contribution: US\$106,584; cost-share: US\$34,618). CLOSED.
- vi. ESCENICA sponsored drama, painting, and puppetry classes for 270 youth while developing groups to work on cultural activities after its grant ended in San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce (USAID contribution: US\$61,381; cost-share: US\$26,650). CLOSED.
- vii. *Movimiento Salvadoreño de Mujeres (MSM)* trained 802 community leaders, youth, and public sector officials to proactively prevent social and gender-based violence in Nahuizalco, while creating a youth network (USAID contribution: US\$100,987; cost-share: US\$25,575). CLOSED.
- viii. *Iniciativa Social para la Democracia (ISD)* implemented an institutional strengthening project in San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce, built the capacities of CMPV members and reinforced CVPP's sustainability and impact in both municipalities (USAID contribution: US\$111,882; cost-share: US\$40,435). CLOSED.
- ix. FEPADE strengthened the technical, productive, and entrepreneurial skills of 2,000 youth and community leaders in San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Zaragoza, and Nahuizalco (USAID contribution: US\$323,440; cost-share: US\$81,102). CLOSED.
- x. *Fundación Salvadoreña de Desarrollo y Vivienda Mínima (FUNDASAL)* carried out small infrastructure works and fostered community organization for nonskilled labor to contribute and maintain the public spaces and parks in San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Nahuizalco (USAID contribution: US\$360,849; cost-share: US\$142,038). CLOSED.

- xi. *Asociación Intersectoral para el Desarrollo Económico y el Progreso Social* (CIDEP) built and rehabilitated small, recreational infrastructures while enhancing the entrepreneurial and leadership skills of 2,030 youth in San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Zaragoza (USAID contribution: US\$278,297; cost-share: US\$95,700). CLOSED.
- xii. FUNDEMOSPAZ provided technical assistance to the Zaragoza Municipal Council and its CMPV in developing a local citizen safety policy in a participatory fashion (USAID contribution: US\$19,138; cost-share: US\$6,600). CLOSED.

During FY 2012, the following projects were implemented as part of the small grants program:

- xiii. Ciudad Arce, San Juan Opico, and Nahuizalco, where Salvadoran Association for Rural Health (*Asociación Salvadoreña Pro-Salud Rural* [ASAPROSAR]) developed innovative social entrepreneurship programs with 180 youth (USAID contribution: US\$78,772; cost-share: US\$26,445). CLOSED.
- xiv. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Zaragoza, and Nahuizalco, where *Complejo Tecnico de Sales* conducted vocational training workshops developing the employment skills of 522 young men and women (USAID contribution: US\$51,740; cost-share: US\$15,640). CLOSED.
- xv. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, and Zaragoza, where FUNPRES provided a psychological support program to prevent and reduce violence in public schools with 10,800 students, parents, and community leaders. An additional component was added to the project in Zaragoza, benefiting 50 young men and women at-risk who are not attending school, and 40 women who were victims of domestic violence and their children (USAID contribution: US\$121,399; cost-share: US\$30,122). CLOSED.
- xvi. Zaragoza, where *Fundación de Innovación Educativa Centroamericana* (FIECA) contributed to prevent youth and gender-based violence while institutionally strengthening the local CMPV for 2,435 beneficiaries (USAID contribution: US\$81,584; cost-share: US\$27,659). CLOSED.
- xvii. San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce, where ESCENICA provided drama, painting, and puppetry classes for 270 youth and increased capacity of groups to continue working on cultural activities now that the grant has ended (USAID contribution: US\$61,381; cost-share: US\$26,650). CLOSED.
- xviii. Nahuizalco, where MSM trained 802 community leaders, youth, and public sector officials to proactively prevent social and gender-based violence (USAID contribution: US\$100,987; cost-share: US\$25,575). CLOSED.
- xix. San Juan Opico and Ciudad Arce, where ISD implemented an institutional strengthening project aimed at building the capacities of CMPV members, ultimately reinforcing CVPP's sustainability and impact (USAID contribution: US\$111,882; cost-share: US\$40,435). CLOSED.
- xx. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Zaragoza, and Nahuizalco, where *Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo* (FEPADE) strengthened the technical,

- productive, and entrepreneurial skills of 2,000 youth and community leaders (USAID contribution: US\$323,440; cost-share: US\$81,102). CLOSED.
- xxi. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, and Nahuizalco, where *Fundación Salvadoreña de Desarrollo y Vivienda Mínima* (FUNDASAL) provided small infrastructure work and fostered community organization for nonskilled labor to contribute and maintain the public spaces to be built (USAID contribution: US\$360,849; cost-share: US\$142,038). CLOSED.
  - xxii. San Juan Opico, Ciudad Arce, Nahuizalco, and Zaragoza, where CIDEP built small, recreational infrastructures while enhancing the entrepreneurial and leadership skills of 2,030 youth (USAID contribution: US\$278,297; cost-share: US\$95,700). CLOSED.
  - xxiii. Zaragoza, where FUNDEMOSPAZ provided technical assistance to the Municipal Council and its CMPV in developing a local citizen safety policy in a participatory fashion (USAID contribution: US\$19,138; cost-share: US\$6,600). CLOSED.

As part of the 2012 extension, in January, CVPP launched a new round of small grants competitive selection process with the participation of the four municipalities. For this phase, CVPP did not publish a public announcement requesting applications; instead, the project directly solicited applications from local and private sector CSOs that had worked on previous phases of the project and had a proven track record of successfully implementing violence prevention activities.

Sixteen CSOs were invited to a Capacity Building Workshop on January 25–26, 2012, which constituted the first step of the competition. Out of the 16 invitees, 15 CSOs participated. Those 15 CSOs were invited to a second workshop on February 16, 2012, at FEPADE and February 17, 2012, at Nahuizalco City Hall where the CVPP-supported CMPVs working under Activity 3 presented their prioritized activities based on their 2012 annual work plans.

The participating CSOs were asked to submit expressions of interest (EOIs) to each of the CMPVs with which they wanted to work. CVPP's grants staff screened EOIs for compliance with USAID's rules and regulations before submitting to each CMPV's TRC for evaluation.

Offerors were required to meet the following selection criteria: (1) previous experience in the intervention area (10 percent); (2) successful track record of executing similar projects (15 percent); (3) technical approach that responds to CMPVs' needs (15 percent); (4) methodology of work described (10 percent); (5) demonstrated capacity of inter-institutional work (15 percent); (6) personnel assigned to project (15 percent); and (7) value of cost-share (20 percent).

On February 29, 2012, in the municipality of Zaragoza, nine CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC, and the following six CSOs were shortlisted and invited to present full proposals (with all supplemental documents): FUNPRES, ESCENICA, FEPADE, FUNDASAL, Plan International, and Fe y Alegría). Plan International withdrew its proposal, and the TRC awarded the remaining five CSOs grants.

For the municipality of Ciudad Arce, 12 CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC, of which six CSOs were shortlisted and invited to present their full proposals: FUNPRES, ESCENICA, ASAPROSAR, UCA, Plan International, and FUNDASAL. Ultimately, Ciudad Arce's TRC awarded five grants as FUNDASAL withdrew its proposal.

For the municipality of Nahuizalco, 13 CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC. After the evaluation process, the TRC decided that only one NGO's (FUSAL's) proposed activity aligned with the prioritized actions of their work plan. Therefore, FUSAL presented its full proposal with all of the requested supplemental documents.

For the municipality of San Juan Opico, nine participating CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC, and the following five CSOs were shortlisted and invited to present their full proposals (with supplemental information): FUNPRES, ESCENICA, UCA, Plan International, and FEPADE. Ultimately, the TRC awarded each shortlisted NGO a grant.

For the municipality of San Antonio del Monte, six participating CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC, and the following five CSOs were shortlisted and invited to present their full proposals (with supplemental information): FUNPRES, ESCENICA, AGAPE, FUNDASAL and COMTEC. Ultimately, the TRC awarded four grants excluding COMTEC.

For the municipality of Nejapa, seven participating CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC, and the following four CSOs were shortlisted and invited to present their full proposals (with supplemental information): *Cámara Salvadoreña de Artesanos (CASART)*, FUNDASAL, FUSALMO, and FIECA. Ultimately, the TRC awarded three of the awards excluding FUSALMO. Later with the resources that ILC contributed to CVPP, the prevention council invited seven CSOs (i.e., Jóvenes 360, *Fundación de Asistencia Técnica para el Desarrollo Comunal Salvadoreño (ASISTEDCOS)*, Fe y Alegría, Catholic Relief Services, FUSALMO, *Instituto Tecnológico Centroamericano*, and *Fundacion Salvadoreña de Educacion y Trabajo*) to present EOIs. Only three presented proposals from which the TRC short listed and awarded two CSOs: Jóvenes 360 and ASISTEDCOS.

For the municipality of Soyapango, seven participating CSOs presented their EOIs to the TRC, and the following three CSOs were shortlisted and invited to present their full proposals (with supplemental information): COMTEC, FUNDASAL, and CONEXION. Ultimately, the TRC awarded each shortlisted NGO a grant.

With CVPP's support, the CMPVs under Activity 3 monitored 17 subprojects carried out by 13 subgrantees for an amount of US\$1,105,019 mobilizing US\$375,397 as the subgrantees' cost-share.

The following is a list of projects carried out as part of the small grants program under Activity 3:

- i. San Juan Opico, Zaragoza, Nahuizalco, and San Antonio del Monte where ESCENICA provided drama, painting, and puppetry classes for 1,925 youth and increased capacity of groups to continue working on cultural activities. (USAID contribution: US\$126,333.78; cost-share: US\$41,104.10).

- ii. San Juan Opico, Zaragoza, and San Antonio del Monte, where FUNPRES provided a psychological support program to prevent and reduce violence in public schools benefitting 1,793 students, parents, and community leaders. (USAID contribution: US\$74,095.34; cost-share: US\$24,839.88).
- iii. San Juan Opico and Zaragoza, where FEPADE strengthened the technical, productive, and entrepreneurial skills of 470 youth and community leaders. (USAID contribution: US\$99,987.29; cost-share: US\$40,717.56).
- iv. Zaragoza, San Antonio del Monte, Soyapango and Nejapa, where FUNDASAL provided small infrastructure work and fostering community organization for nonskilled labor to contribute and maintain the public spaces that will be built (USAID contribution: US\$366,516.28; cost-share: US\$178,167.30)
- v. Ciudad Arce, where ASAPROSAR developed an innovative social entrepreneurship programs with 100 youth (USAID contribution: US\$18,954.03; cost-share: US\$7,433.64).
- vi. Ciudad Arce and San Juan Opico where UCA provided technical assistance to the Municipal Council and its CMPV in developing capacities to prepare communication strategies and materials and a local citizen safety policy in a participatory fashion (USAID contribution: US\$75,586.91; cost-share: US\$39,420.00)
- vii. Zaragoza where Fe y Alegría provided counseling and programming aimed at preventing youth and gender-based violence to 149 at-risk youth and their families (USAID contribution: US\$49,434.33; cost-share: US\$13,923.45)
- viii. San Antonio del Monte, where AGAPE implemented a comprehensive project with a variety of activities, including education, sports, culture, and small infrastructure improvements (USAID contribution: US\$42,999.00; cost-share: US\$14,580)
- ix. Nahuizalco, where FUSAL implemented an all-inclusive project to promote a culture of peace, encourage citizen participation, and strengthen social cohesion (USAID contribution: US\$94,992.00; cost-share: US\$30,899.96).
- x. Nejapa, where CASART implemented a craft workshop as an occupation alternative to prevent violence and crime in their communities (USAID contribution: US\$45,328.98; cost-share: US\$17,066.78)
- xi. Nejapa, where FIECA implemented a series of workshops aimed to sensitize, inform, and educate young men and women and their families to strengthen social cohesion and promote a culture of peace (USAID contribution: US\$34,639.36; cost-share: US\$11,563.62)

- xii. Soyapango, where ComTec implemented workshops to raise the job-readiness skills of young men and women and their abilities (USAID contribution: US\$35,120.00; cost-share: US\$11,000.00)
- xiii. Soyapango, where CONEXION implemented training programs aimed at strengthening the technical, productive, and entrepreneurial skills for young men and women (USAID contribution: US\$35,993.80; cost-share: US\$12,075.00)

### **6.3 Performance as Measured by the Indicators**

The M&E charts in Annex A reflect a very high level of performance with 67 percent of the indicators attaining 100 percent or more of the targeted levels. The more important ones consistently exceeded the target levels.

#### *Highlights:*

- The number of communities that participated in CVP programs via CVPP was 86, which is 47 percent more than the 59 anticipated.
- The 217 women elected to CMPVs was almost three times the target of 77.
- 100 percent of small grants had cost sharing from third-party contributions, better than the 95 percent targeted.
- Horizontal replication: two nontargeted municipalities (i.e., Chalchuapa and Santa Ana) established CMPVs based on the CVPP model, learning from nearby CVPP-supported municipalities. That was double the targeted level.
- Almost twice as many municipal staff and six times as many community representatives received CVPP training in CVP modules as had been targeted.
- The number of communities in crime prevention programs where the social risk factors reported by participatory talking maps decreased by 5 percent or more was double the target
- The communities in crime prevention programs where the social protection factors reported by participatory talking maps increased by 5 percent or more was triple the targeted number.
- The small grants program trained 55 percent more subgrantees than targeted in presenting sound proposals, managing grants in accordance with RTI and USAID rules and regulations, and communicating their results.
- 34 small grants rather than 18 were approved by CMPVs in support of their CVP Plans using participatory methods.
- 2,513 youths received vocational and basic education training rather than the original target of 1,400 (80 percent extra).
- 803 youth leaders received leadership training, instead of 525 (53 percent increase).
- 208 national-level GOES staff received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities.

## 6.4 Achievements Reflected in Products and Outcomes Not Covered by the Indicators

Many of the contributions of CVPP are not fully captured by the indicator framework. Here, we discuss these contributions in three sections: illustrative highlights; a summary of the available evaluation data (measuring before and after CVPP interventions), and a discussion of salient themes like gender.

### *Highlights*

The following list summarizes CVPP's innovative results beyond those foreseen, both broad and narrow:

- CVPP has worked in more municipalities and communities than anticipated (15 core municipalities and 86 communities versus the original target of 11 and 59, respectively). Previous to RTI's CVPP work, CVP efforts were spotty and isolated.
- All four of the original CMPVs have continued working a year after CVPP support ended (e.g., Altavista, Armenia, Izalco, and La Chacra/San Salvador District 6). Altavista had some problems after the 2012 municipal elections, in which all three component municipalities changed governing parties, but it is now functioning again after restructuring to work more directly under the wing of Tonacatepeque.
- More than 7,000 children and youth in high-risk neighborhoods have received creative conflict resolution training and psychological support.
- Sustainable local finance mechanisms are working in at least half of the CVPP Phase 1 municipalities; RTI has received considerable private sector support for CVP processes, particularly via FEPADE.
- CVPP played an active role in developing the National Violence Prevention Strategy (EPV). In 2009 and 2012, RTI supported the planning phases and GOES's plans to roll out both the first EPV and its updated version to cover a wide range of municipalities. In fact, CVPP has provided substantive input in the final version of the strategy.
- CVPP-led training workshops and -developed materials on the EPV were used to train PREPAZ staff and three CMPVs fostered by PREPAZ in late 2012.
- Ordinances on CVP have been passed in 10 municipalities.
- No CMPV processes have been lost to electoral change. RTI's nonpartisan methodology has allowed it to continue to operate seamlessly amidst changes in local and national governments administrations.
- Three model outreach centers have been established through CMPVs and are operating sustainably for at-risk youth: two in Nahuizalco and one in Nejapa.
- A collaborative relationship has been established with the PNC through RTI's longstanding work with them on CVP projects and in developing improved data collection and analysis systems.

- Youth now actively participate in local initiatives, especially those aimed at supporting younger children. These youth have assumed leadership roles in community processes and present proposals to CMPVs for programming.
- The grant management system handled more than 34 grants.
- CVPP provided key technical support and funding to strengthen Santa Tecla's Violence Observatory.
- Development of a cell phone-based wireless crime reporting system in Santa Tecla, leveraging private sector and UNDP funding. With a Qualcomm Wireless Reach grant and RTI training and technical assistance, it is being extended to the six selected municipalities<sup>25</sup> in the Greater San Salvador Metropolitan Area.
- Manuals, guides, toolkits, and supporting materials have been developed and validated on a range of topics (see Annex F References and List of CVPP Publications):
  - Participatory CMPV set-up and operation (RTI and CECI, 2010; IDHUCA, 2011a; ISD, 2011a,b)
  - How to facilitate participatory community-based CVP processes (RTI and CECI, 2009a, 2010)
  - Communications strategies for communities (RTI and CECI, 2011a)
  - Training in culture of peace and citizen coexistence (RTI and CECI 2009a, n.d.)
  - Crime and violence observatory set-up and operation (IDHUCA, 2009, 2011c)
  - Monitoring and evaluation for observatories and CMPVs (IDHUCA, 2011d)
  - Municipal gender violence policy (IDHUCA, 2011a)
  - CVP policies in Central America (FUNDAUNGO, 2009)
  - Community victimization surveys (Galdámez, 2010; RTI, 2012a)
  - Community police handbook (IDHUCA, 2011b)
  - Conflict mediation (IDHUCA, 2011e)
  - Services available for youth in El Salvador (Diakonia, 2010)
  - The small grant management process for USAID/RTI projects (RTI, 2012d)
  - Procedures for transfer of municipal small grant funds to local CVP organizations (GMP-Santa Tecla, n.d.)
- Systematizations
  - The La Chacra (San Salvador District 6) community-based CVP process (Galdámez, 2012)<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> The selected municipalities are as follows: Antiguo Cuscatlán, Santa Tecla, San Martín, San Salvador, Ayutuxtepeque, and Ciudad Delgado.

<sup>26</sup> The Systematization for La Chacra is available online <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzMw>.

- The strong families intervention in La Chacra (Fe y Alegría, 2011)
- Conflict mediation in Santa Tecla (IDHUCA, 2011e)
- Systematization of the private sector involvement: case of Nejapa
- CVPP has instituted human subject study standards and certification for surveys that meet U.S. federal requirements, such as providing for fully informed consent and avoiding queries that might harm subjects.

## 7 Before and After Evaluation Data

The indicator framework adopted by agreement with USAID in the M&E Plans did not include measuring the impact or effect indicators, and thus the CVPP was not obliged to report on them. Indeed, measuring impact directly by showing reductions in crime and violence levels linked to project activity would be a complex task. Among the reasons is that crime and violence rates fluctuate on a larger scale in response to factors beyond the project's control. Between 2008 and 2009, for example, homicide rates increased by 38 percent in the country as a whole, though they dropped by 9 percent in both the preceding and following years. Since May 2012, homicide rates have dropped by more than half nationally due to a truce between Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) and Mara Dieciocho (18th Street Gang). Attempts to measure the impact of CVPP on homicide rates would have to show results that were clearly in addition to those broader patterns. Similar challenges arise in comparing other crime rates.

A second level of complication is introduced by the difficulty of getting accurate and comparable before-and-after data from the high-risk communities being targeted, due to the danger of working there and the fear of many residents to respond candidly or even to be seen collaborating with the study. Outsiders cannot obtain baseline information and it cannot be obtained before the inception of activities. Instead, confidence-building work has to start, participatory risk mapping and diagnostics have to be underway, and a rapport must be established with local youth who can be trained as survey interviewers. It takes several months before reasonably accurate baseline data can be obtained. Later, when measurements are repeated, greater accessibility and decreased fear may provide more abundant and more accurate information, but comparability may be affected. For instance, if more people characterize the gang problem as getting worse, as happened in Altavista (see Table 4), it may be either because that is how it is perceived or because more people were openly talking about the gang problem (i.e., increase in empowered citizenry and decreased fear of gang reprisals for speaking out).

**Baseline studies.** Despite these difficulties, CVPP conducted 14 baseline studies in as many municipalities. The questionnaires included basic information about the geography and population of the places targeted, participatory (spoken) mapping of risk and protection factors, summaries of police data on crime reports, and carefully designed surveys to measure KAPP on a series of topics. Most of these do not directly address the question of impact but serve as proxy or surrogate variables. The KAPP data permit assessment of households' opinions on the prevalence and danger of crime and violence in their neighborhood and homes, the degree of

problems with gangs, measures adopted to lower risk in the home and the neighborhood, the effectiveness of the police, the existence and efficacy of CVP activities, and similar topics. In addition, respondents are asked about the tendency for change in all these; i.e., whether the situations with citizen safety, violence, crime, gangs, and police and CVP programs are perceived as improving or worsening. In most areas redundancy is used: multiple questions getting at similar aspects are asked in different ways to produce a more robust portrait. Still the total number of questions is less than three dozen, which are organized in hierarchies so that not all must be asked of every respondent. Well done and well presented, the baseline studies are a key product of the project and have been used effectively in the local processes to select priority communities and to formulate CVP action plans.

**Intermediate evaluations.** In the first four municipalities of Altavista, Armenia, Izalco, and La Chacra/San Salvador District 6 in which baselines were established (Phase 1), a second measurement was made about 17 months later and analyzed comparatively. A summary of the comparisons is provided in Table 4. The original intermediate evaluation reports are much more extensive and well worth examining. Unfortunately, additional comparative measurements were not conducted, despite the promising results—especially given the short time spans covered by the comparisons and the improved approaches used at later sites (e.g., the inclusion of psychosocial community support and of job skills and entrepreneurial training).

**Table 4. Change in Crime Reports and Citizen Perceptions Where Before-and-After Surveys Were Conducted**

Place	Trends of Results									
	Source =>	Police Records	Participatory Mapping		Perception Surveys					
	Survey Dates	Crimes Reported	Risk Factors Mapped	Protection Factors Mapped	Chance of Being Crime Victim is Low to Very Low	Security Condition in Neighborhood Is Improving	Gangs Are a Serious Problem	Gang Problem Getting Worse	Police Improved in Past Year	Knowledge of Local CVP Activities
Izalco	May 2008–June 2010	Down 10% 21 to 19	Up 58% 73 to 115	Up 13% 8 to 9	Up 5% 22% to 27%	Up 16% 19% to 35%	NA	NA	NA	Up 8% 6% to 14%
Altavista	Sept 2007–Feb 2009	Down 36% 102 to 65	Up 92% 39 to 71	Up 57% 23 to 36	Up 9% 9% to 18%	Up 15% 87% to 72%	Down 3% 88% to 85%	Up 4% 35% to 39%	Up 9% 35% to 43%	Up 15% 9% to 24%
Armenia	Sept 2008–July 2010	Down 54% 48 to 22	Down 13% 55 to 48	Up 67% 9 to 15	Down 23% 42% to 19%	Up 9% 11% to 20%	NA	NA	NA	Up 1% 1.6% to 2.4%
La Chacra/ San Salvador Distr. 6	Sept 2008–May 2010	Down 51% 68 to 33	Down 29% 68 to 48	Up 50% 18 to 27	Up 32% 20% to 52%	Up 48% 21% to 69%	NA	NA	NA	Up 6% 21% to 27%

RTI. (2012a). *A Balanced Assessment of Social Prevention of Violence and Perceptions of Security in the Communities of Francisco Morazán, La Chacra, and Quiñonez I*. Prepared by Ernesto Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI. (2012e). *A Balanced Assessment of Social Prevention of Violence in the San Juan and Santa Cruz neighborhoods and in the Las Palmeras and Santa Emilia Neighborhoods of the Municipality of Izalco*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador

RTI. (2012f). *Midterm Evaluation of Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in the 4 Population Settlements of the Municipality of Armenia where Interventions Have Taken Place*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI. (2012g). *Principal Findings of the Evaluation on Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in the Municipality of Altavista*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

Among the results in these four intermediate evaluations are the following:

- Police records in all four municipalities show a reduction in crime reported in the second evaluations. The overall effect was decrease from 239 to 139 crimes reported in a standardized period, a reduction of 42 percent overall.
- Risk factors identified in participatory (spoken) mapping significantly increased in Izalco and Altavista but decreased to a lesser extent in the Armenia and La Chacra.
- Protection factors increased in all four municipalities, in part due to actions taken under the municipal CVP Plans, but the effect was much lower in Izalco than in the other three.
- The perception that there is only a low or very low chance of being a crime victim increased, as might be expected, everywhere but in Armenia, where more respondents felt vulnerable than 19 months before.
- The neighborhood security situation is perceived as improving by more of the population in the intermediate evaluation at each site.
- Knowledge of local CVP activities increased at each of the sites, in some cases more than doubling. However, by the second evaluation, only 2.4 percent to 27 percent of respondents were aware of them. It would be of great interest to learn how that evolved in the subsequent two years.
- Some of the overall results raise questions that warrant further investigation. For example, investigating the sharp rise in risk factors mapped at Izalco and Altavista or the very low level of knowledge about local CVP activities in Armenia can lead to programmatic adjustments to improve future results. Such improvements could be made in each place by the CMPVs as they continue their work after CVPP support has ended.

These surveys are relatively simple to conduct once community engagement has occurred and are well documented. In fact, local CMPVs could conduct these follow-up surveys since they have been trained and mentored by CVPP facilitators. For example, local youth administered the KAPP questionnaires and could recruit and train peers for future evaluations. The potential for contributing to evidence-based decision making, to fundraising among local businesses that want to see proof of results, to gaining further political support, and thus to sustainability is evident.

**Lesson learned:** Simple results surveys appear to be a feasible and valuable tool for managers of local CVP projects to use periodically to assess impact, identify weaknesses, inform stakeholders of results, and garner political and material support.

In general, the results of these four intermediate evaluations reflect substantial and consistent positive outcomes for CVPP, especially considering the short time periods covered. Crime reports decreased and presumably overall crime and violence as well. Perceptions of the situation are positive. Protection factors were on the rise, as is awareness of the CVP programs in each municipality.

Many other aspects reported, not shown here, also supported that conclusion, as well as pointing toward some potentially educational inconsistencies or shortcomings. Informal assessment of the

conditions in 2012 at these and the other 11 sites where baselines were conducted would have provided additional valuable information.

### *Salient Themes*

CVPP has produced several results in crosscutting areas that are particularly important.

**Gender.** Improving on some initial targets, women were equally or better represented than men in training events and decision-making bodies, as well as in the CVPP staff. The 538 women community representatives trained in CVP methods (57.2 percent) was significantly more than the 403 men. However, in other activities the ratio between men and women was not distinguishable—i.e., women were equally represented. Women were 217 of 460 or 47 percent of the CMPV members elected in the 15 supported municipalities (e.g., Indicator 1.E, etc.). However, this result is not statistically significant. Similarly, the number of female municipal staff trained in CVPP’s participatory CVP methodology (49), though somewhat greater than the number of males (44), was not significantly different (e.g., Indicator 1.K, etc.). Although the CVPP staff composition oscillated during the period of performance, our overall ratio of women to men was equal.

**Capacity for self-adjustment.** In several municipalities, the local government and/or the CMPV found the initial CVP programs lacking and took measures to tailor them to meet the communities’ needs. Measures included changing the CMPV structure, its membership, the municipal CVP Plan, the selection of target populations, or decision-making processes. Examples include Armenia, which restructured the CMPV, engaged a most representative membership, and switched the target from in-school youth to more at-risk out-of-school youth. Parallel adjustments were made in Izalco, Zaragoza, and elsewhere.

**Visibility and inclusion of youth.** An important but unquantified characteristic of the CVPP results is our success with engaging youth in leadership roles, with adults serving as advisors. This provided effective role models and sources of future

#### **Gang Youth Turning Their Lives Around**

When a CVPP job skills program began in San Bartolo, Ilopango, it targeted non-gang youth at risk on the streets and in schools. But 23 local gang members saw a chance to learn skills, become employed, and reintegrate into society leaving illegal activity aside.

They approached the mayor and the CMPV to work out an arrangement: their group would be trained in metal work and entrepreneurship, and committed to no longer loiter around the school or harass local youth, and to repair a sports field and a community center that needed metal work (it became their classroom). They also obtained the consent of their gang leadership.

While learning metalwork, they took the initiative of practicing by doing community service, rehabilitating local structures in need of repair (e.g., doors, balconies, and window bars of a childcare center and neighborhood homes). As a result, eight trainees were hired to do repairs more widely by CVPP-supported CSO.

After completing the internship, the young men formed a microenterprise to provide metal products and repair services in their neighborhood, as well as baked goods (some had previous training as bakers). With the owner’s consent they have rehabilitated a dilapidated, abandoned house to use as a shop, bakery, and living quarters. The mayor has donated an oven.

The CMPV job training program might have attracted opposition from the gang as it reduced their recruiting base; instead, it has earned its support and participation. This job training program has successfully engaged and reintegrated gang youth into the community, and ultimately expanded the number of beneficiaries.

leadership that could be widely appreciated. Outstanding examples were found in Nejapa, Zaragoza, Ciudad Arce, and the gang-affiliated youth of Ilopango who led a successful initiative to increase the inclusivity and impact of a local job training program (see text box).

**Improved relations between communities and police.** Collaborating with the national PNC and municipal police has been both a success factor and a product of the CVPP approach. CMPVs include police representatives as members, plan ways to involve police with youth and communities in low-profile, participatory ways, and benefit from the improved coordination and two-way information flow that results. Moreover, the Santa Tecla community policing model has been systematized in a handbook for police.

## 8 Voices of Participants

During preparation of this report, we conducted a systematic review of CVPP by gathering input from interviews, focus groups, and workshop participants on CVPP's strengths and weaknesses; highlights and unanticipated results; and factors that contributed to success, project areas for improvement, and sustainability. A summary of those points are discussed below and in Tables 5 and 6.

### 8.1 Strengths of CVPP

#### 1. CVPP approach to organization of local CVP programs (consensus of all respondents)

- Positive, bottom-up approach to each municipality: RTI accepts existing municipal development process and is seen as an ally helping to focus on CVP needs and contributing with technical assistance and funding.
- Organization of CMPVs is an effective model of democratic governance; participatory mapping and diagnosis of the situation in communities provides an objective basis for an informed and realistic prioritization process, resulting in an executable CVP plan that is more likely to be sustainable.
- Focus on objective circumstances and actual needs, avoiding partisan considerations, earned widespread support and sustainability in the face of political changes.
- Catalytic role of RTI as a link between the mayor's office and the CMPV; and capacity to change the dynamic in municipalities from against CVP to supporting CVP initiatives.

#### 2. Focus on youth leadership (CSO partner responses)

- CVPP works in economically disadvantaged schools.
- Training content reflects needs of youth in communities as well as CVPP goals.
- Use of innovative methods like peer education and youth camps to improve learning and consolidate municipal networks of youth.
- Citizenship developed by youth working on local initiatives that support neighborhood children.

- Choice of strategic “neutral spaces” to convene leaders and youth from settlements controlled by specific gangs.
- Space made for intergenerational support and growth among adult leaders and youth groups.

**3. Community leadership trained in organization and advocacy for violence prevention (CSO respondents)**

- Relationships built between communities in sharing of training spaces with mutual recognition of common problems and parallel histories.
- Material can be tailored to meet the situation and needs of the community organizations
- Exchanges with model communities to show examples of self-empowerment; appropriation of contents; and sustainability of organizational, educational, and advocacy activities.
- Self-reliance built through training in project development and resource mobilization.
- Organizational skills and consolidation of CBOs around CVP activities further legitimates them.

**4. Improvement of community infrastructure to support CVP plan (all participants)**

- Inclusion of CVP awareness building and education in the process of improving public spaces.
- Community organizations lead the promotion of local participation in rehabilitation of spaces.
- Mutual aid on infrastructure work by extensive mobilization (brigades) of neighbors and nearby communities avoided delays in completion. Infrastructure work often scheduled in the evenings or on weekends to avoid interfering with day jobs.
- Youth begin to use rehabilitated spaces even before work is finished.
- The educational process culminates with training in the Operation and Maintenance Manual for the rehabilitated spaces in each community, contributing to sustainability.

**5. Small grants management (all participants)**

- CSOs are trained on CVPP’s model of municipal/community CVP work. Performance is monitored to ensure work is conducted in close cooperation with the CMPV.

**Table 5. Factors that Enhanced or Limited Success**

Type of Factor	Internal	External
Enhances Success	<p>RTI has earned the reputation of being a transparent, fair actor that can be trusted to work objectively.</p> <p>Tailoring municipal CVP plans to explicit community needs</p> <p>Mapping and diagnostics of conditions on the ground helps make CVP plans realistic</p> <p>Availability of resources (small grants) to jumpstart plans</p> <p>Regular CMPV meetings provide opportunities to share progress, address problems, and coordinate solutions.</p>	<p>Availability of innovative construction technology to make infrastructure projects safer and quicker.</p> <p>Political will and support of most mayors</p>

Type of Factor	Internal	External
	<p>Communities organized into networks.  Close coordination with local government.  Appropriation of project goals by both adults and youth  Use of local purveyors, if feasible, builds the local economy and buy-in.  Involvement of local schools and local, regional MINED officials  Non-partisan stance of CVPP and of CMPV plans, participants  Active participation of local actors in CMPVs, community steering groups, and approval of proposals for funding  Inter-generational involvement  Rise of property values in neighborhoods after physical improvement projects are completed  Empowerment of CMPVs and community organizations (awareness and training); building capacity to sustain processes; follow up by them on actions  Involvement of (government) service agencies in sustaining components  Social fabric organized, trained, strengthened  Coordination between RTI and CMPVs  Identification of capacities (e.g., weaknesses that need strengthening and/or developing a roster of skills of community members)  Participation of entire families in all stages of local programming (e.g., planning, coordination, mobilization, and implementation)  Strengthening internal family bonds through psycho-social support  Accessibility of psychological support and willingness of population to use it.  Motivation of participants; identification of leaders (women and men);  Teamwork among partners, leaders, all  Consolidation, interest, inter-institutionality, and experience of CMPVs  Influence of women, children and youth, local actors, institutions, working groups, CMPVs, and municipal councils—all working together  Appropriation by communities of initiatives implemented at municipal level</p>	
Limits Success	<p>Lack of strategic alliance with Ministry of Education (MINED) at the national level.</p> <p><b>Small Grants Management</b>  In some places, delay in awarding small grants undermined results and limited community roles.  CMPV expectations of small grant partners at times exceeded what was eventually approved and financed. Unaware of changes made during the process, CMPVs demanded compliance with the original proposals.</p> <p>Some CSO partners did not have previous experience in their municipalities  Budgetary pressures on/from the mayor's office or municipal council; lack of budget lines for CVP  Lack of resources on the part of the donor or of ability to approve  Politic attitudes on the part of some CSOs  CSOs having little-to-no knowledge about the contents of the CVP Plan</p>	<p>Gang control of territory restricts movement and interchange among communities.  High-handed attitudes on the part of local leaders who assumed overlapping roles (in CBOs, on CMPV, etc.).  Initial opposition (passive or active) of a few mayors  Low organizational capacity in communities, particularly in urban areas  Partisan attitudes in municipal participants  Changes of government administrations (not always smooth)  Internal conflicts of local governments</p>

**Table 6. Factors That Enhanced or Limited Sustainability**

Type of Factor	Internal	External
Enhances Sustainability	Municipal leadership in fostering democratic educational and organizational processes for youth and communities. Local government funding sports fields, street lighting, video cameras to monitor danger zones, sports and arts programs. Municipal budget support for CVP Plan Interactions between communities forged mutual understanding and links Follow-up with operating and maintenance manuals in caring for infrastructure improvements	Provision of local counterpart funding for new CVP activities carried out under local initiative
Limits Sustainability	Little preparation of CMPVs to conduct resource mobilization and establish partnerships with the private sector Somewhat “bare-minimum” approaches at times (e.g., low counterpart funding, doing participants’ work, etc.) Weak development of communications capacities Limited ability of CMPVs to track successes and areas for improvement to adjust programs accordingly	Municipalities that conducted activities that support CVP but did not report them as such Partisan attitudes in municipal participants

## 8.2 Observations and Recommendations

Below, we list overarching themes:

- The dissonance or tension introduced by the need to induce lasting local processes in the context of a short-term, external project.
- To ensure social processes are truly transformative requires a long-term approach; the five-year project timeframe is only short term.
- In-depth evaluation of processes is needed—periodic measurement and comparison of attitudes and perceptions—yet the project format is structured to focus on process more than results, and there is a lack of funding allocated to measure longitudinal effects and impacts further.
- The GOES’s move to house CVP programs in national agencies, making them long term.
- It is important to conduct comprehensive and multifaceted interventions, as evident in the municipality of Altavista, which had several successes but also a few challenges. (For example, lack of local resource mobilization and lack of robust communications strategies in most communities limited success.) Although CVPP produced a communication manual, it should be part of a larger communication strategy. Similarly, some municipalities had limited success with fundraising efforts because no one was assigned to conduct follow up or training.
- There needs to be a sustainable entity to oversee and maintain the processes that have been established through CVPP.
- RTI’s structured, yet participatory approach to linking CVP programming in municipalities and their communities supported the broader need to consolidate democratic governance at the local level.

- Integrating CVPP’s primary crime and violence prevention with secondary and tertiary prevention measures provided a more comprehensive operating mechanism.
- It is critical to link with other programs and agencies at multiple levels to create an integrated self-sustaining network of actors across sectors: economic development, decentralization, education, social services, police, etc.

The former needs working with well-qualified national and local partners to enable GOES to attain its CVP goals, using El Salvador’s rapidly consolidating institutional and policy frameworks in this area. Fuller integration of CVPP’s primary prevention work with secondary prevention measures should be a priority. This may be approached by tapping the expertise of the Los Angeles Mayor’s Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development to (1) provide strategic input and (2) implement and evaluate a comprehensive place-based, data-driven model in one or more clusters; training local service providers and GOES agencies to adapt in a culturally congruent manner the community-based, family-centered CVP principles and practices developed in the areas of Los Angeles affected by Salvadoran gangs.

## Annex A. Monitoring and Evaluation Charts

CVPP Phases I and II: Performance Indicators															
PERIOD: October–December 2012										FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES										Total (T) for FY 2011 and Variations (V) for FY 2012	Total Accumulated Phases I and II		End-of-Project Target	
	Armenia		Ahuachapán		Izalco		San Salvador		Tonacatepeque®						
<b>Result 1: Community-based CVP programs improved and expanded</b>															
1.A: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs	7 (Barrios Nuevo, San Juan, and San Sebastián; and Colonias San Damián, Sigüenza, Divina Providencia, and San Fernando II)		9 (Communities El Triunfo, Getsemani, Girasoles I and II, La Labor, Los Ausoles, Los Cocos, Los Rodríguez, and Santa Lucía)		7 (Colonias Las Palmeras, Santa Emilia, Lourdes y San José; Barrios San Juan, Santa Cruz, and Cruz Galana)		6 (Communities Francisco Morazán, La Chacra, Quiñonez I, Quiñonez II, San Luis I and San Martín Municipal)		4(*) Clusters that include: 2 common areas (Sports Complex and Roundabout); 9 Blocks that joined in 2008; 9 Blocks that joined in 2009; 7 Blocks in 2010		33 T	33		18	
											0 V				
1.B: No. of targeted municipalities that have approved an a crime and violence prevention (CVP) policy	0		1 (+)		0		1		0		2 T	2		2	
											0 V				
1.C: No. of targeted municipal governments that have approved an ordinance recognizing a local CVP inter-institutional committee	1		1		1		0		0		3 T	3		5	
											0 V				
1.D: No. of local CVP inter-institutional committees in targeted areas that have established a local Inter-institutional Work Group (IIWG)**	1		1		1		1		1		5 T	5		5	
											0 V				
1.E: No. of women who have been elected to serve on the municipal CVP inter-institutional committee	Men (M)	Women (W)	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	4
	18	15	21	14	9	18	11	13	18	16	77 T	76 T	77	76	
											0 V	0 V			
1.F: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have developed Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		1		1		5 T	5		4	
											0V				
1.G: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have implemented one or more activities contemplated in their Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		1		1		5 T	5		4	
											0V				

CVPP Phases I and II: Performance Indicators								
PERIOD: October–December 2012					FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES					Total (T) for FY 2011 and Variations (V) for FY 2012	Total Accumulated Phases I and II	End-of-Project Target
	Armenia	Ahuachapán	Izalco	San Salvador	Tonacatepeque®			
1.H: No. of targeted municipalities that have systematically evaluated CVP programs according to evaluation criteria as advised by CVPP	1	1	1	1	1	5 T 0 V	5	4

® = This is actually the Altavista IIWG, which includes blocks (*Polígonos*) located in the municipalities of Tonacatepeque, Ilopango, and San Martín. M = Men; W = Women; NA = Not applicable

(\*) Per discussions with USAID's AOR, at the end of FY 2010, this number was reduced from 21 to 4, regrouping the communities into four sub-groups: Cluster 1, Altavista Sports Complex and Unicentro Roundabout; Cluster 2.: Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, I, N, O; Cluster 3, Blocks 11, 14, 31, 32, 41, 51, 54, A, D; and Cluster 4, Blocks 8, 16, 40, 49, 60, K, and Bendición de Dios Community.

(+) The CVP policy counted as such is the one denominated "Municipal Policy for the Prevention of Violence against Women."

\*\*We have retained the term IIWGs for Annexes A and B. Note that the GOES uses the term Municipal Violence Prevention Committees (CMPVs) instead of IIWGs.

CVPP Phases I and II: Performance Indicators															
PERIOD: : October–December 2012					FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013										
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES					Total (T) for FY 2011 and Variations (V) for FY 2012	Total Accumulated Phases I and II	End-of-Project Target							
	Armenia	Ahuachapán	Izalco	San Salvador	Tonacatepeque®										
<b>Result 1: Community-based CVP programs improved and expanded</b>															
1.I: Percent of CVPP-approved grants with cost sharing (CS) from third-party contributions (in cash, labor, or in-kind)	1 in Armenia, Izalco, and Tonacatepeque (Empresarios Juveniles): 100%; CS; + 2: World Vision and MEPERSA: 100%; CS % range = [29–45]	1 in Ahuachapán and Izalco (FUNPRES: 100%; CS% = 18.6%) + 1 in Ahuachapán and San Martín (FUNDEMOSPA Z: 100%; CS% = 28.33%)	3: FEPADE, CARE, and MEPREDIZAL: 100%; CS % range = [19–48] + 2 in Izalco and Armenia (ORMUSA: 100%; CS% = 44.5%) + (AGAPE: 100%; CS% = 28.1%)	6: FEPADE, Fe y Alegría (2), FUNDASAL and FUMA (2), including Armenia's intervention: 100% CS % range = [57; 35 & 25; 51; 41 & 29, respectively]	7: FUSAL [2], FEPADE, RNP, UEES, Atletas contra el SIDA, and FUNSALPRODESE: 100%; CS % range = [45, 47, 22, 36, 37, and 33, respectively]	25T  0V	25 (a) 100%	95%							
1.J: No. of nontargeted municipalities that have established IIWGs based on the CVPP model	NA					2 T 0 V	2 (b)	1							
1.K: No. of municipal staff in target areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	17	18	8
	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	11(c)	15(c)	17 T 0 V	18 T 0 V			
1.L: No. of community representatives (community-based organizations, local leaders, etc.) in targeted areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules	11	2	36 (d)	16 (d)	77 (e)	98 (e)	17 (f)	41 (f)	38 (g)	33 (g)	179 T 0 V	190 T 0V	179	190	40

CS = Cost sharing

(a) Includes 16 grants carried out in Armenia, Izalco, San Salvador, and Tonacatepeque plus 3 carried out by IDHUCA in Santa Tecla (CS = 50%, 23.5%, and 325.9%, respectively).

(b) The two nontargeted municipalities that have established IIWGs are Ilopango and Tonacatepeque.

(c) Includes two men and six women, reported for the fourth quarter of 2010, who attended a two-day workshop on gender equality and preventing domestic violence; includes four men and two women, reported for the second quarter of 2011, who attended the workshops.

(d) The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 36 men and 16 women who completed the training and implemented the project “Youth Social Entrepreneurs” of FUSALMO.

(e) Includes 9 men and 7 women who attended at least 80 percent of the two courses implemented during the fourth quarter of 2008. Also includes 25 men and 14 women who attended four workshops conducted in the first quarter of 2009. Also includes 1 man and 1 woman who attended the course implemented during the fourth quarter of 2009. It includes 15 men and 28 women who attended the seminar “I Am a Person Too” during the second quarter of 2010. The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2010 includes 5 men and 8 women who attended all of the sessions of the workshop on Creative Conflict Solutions; includes 5 men and 17 women, reported for the first quarter of 2011, who attended the workshops “Formulating Violence Prevention Plans” and accountability; includes 4 men and 16 women, reported for the second quarter of 2011, who attended the workshops “Drawing Talking Maps of Risk and Prevention Factors.” The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 10 men and 12 women trained by AGAPE.

(f) Includes three women, reported for the second quarter of 2011, who attended the workshops. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes three women.

(g) Includes the representatives of blocks 4, 7, and N who have been incorporated in the local IIWG for the second semester of 2008. It also includes 2 men and 3 women who attended at least 80 percent of the five courses implemented during the last quarter of 2008, and 5 men and 7 women who attended 100 percent of the two courses implemented during the first semester of 2009. Also includes 6 men and 5 women who attended the course implemented during the fourth quarter of 2009. It includes 5 men and 2 women who attended at least 80 percent of the workshops about topics directly related to violence prevention, implemented during the second quarter of 2010. The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2010 includes 6 men and 7 women who attended a two-day workshop on gender equity and preventing domestic violence. The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes 11 men and 9 women of the communities who attended the workshops.

CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators										
QUARTER: : October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013				
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phases II and III	End-of-Project Target	
	Ilopango		San Martín		Tonacatepeque					
<b>Result 1.1:</b>										
<b>Capabilities of the existing 3 Local IIWGs or Prevention Councils/Committees in advocating for and expanding prevention activities strengthened</b>										
1.A: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs	5 (Colonia San Bartolo 9ª etapa, communities Banco Hipotecario and Dolores Apulo, residencial Bosques de la Paz, and urbanización Jardines de Santa Lucía)		8 (Communities Tierra Virgen, Olivos Centro, Oriente, and Poniente; Colonia Santa Gertrudis, lotificaciones San Andrés and Valle Las Delicias, and Proyecto Santa Teresa)		3 (Communities La Ermita, Los Henríquez y Los Naranjos, the rural and urban areas of cantón Malacoff)		16 T	16	12	
						0 V				
1.B: No. of targeted municipalities that have approved a CVP policy	0		0		0		0 T	0	3	
						0 V				
1.C: No. of targeted municipal governments that have approved an ordinance recognizing a local CVP inter-institutional committee	0		1		1		2 T	2	3	
						0 V				
1.D: No. of local CVP inter-institutional committees in targeted areas that have established a local IIWG	1		1		1		3 T	3	3	
						0 V				
1.E: No. of women who have been elected to serve on the municipal CVP inter-institutional committee	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	12	5	14	16	30	19	56 T	40 T	56	40
							0 V	0 V		
1.F: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have updated Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		3 T	3	3	
						0 V				
1.G: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have implemented one or more activities contemplated in their Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		3 T	3	3	
						0 V				
1.H: No. of targeted municipalities that have systematically evaluated	1		1		1		0 T	3	3	

CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators												
QUARTER: : October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phases II and III		End-of-Project Target		
	Ilopingo		San Martín		Tonacatepeque							
CVP plans according to evaluation criteria as advised by CVPP							3 V					
1.I: Percent of CVPP-approved grants with cost sharing (CS) from third-party contributions (in cash, labor, or in-kind)	4 [COMTEC (29.84%) + FEPADE (25.04%) + FUNDASAL (39.78%) + SIRAMA (25.8%)]		4 [FUNDASAL (36.39%) + FUNPRES (24.76%) + FUSALMO (24.35%) + Tutela Legal del Arzobispado (26.21%)]		2 [COMTEC (29.84%) + FUSAL (26.1%)]		10 T 0 V		10 (100%)		95%	
1.J: No. of GOES staff (national and municipal), members of the CVP IIWGs in targeted areas, who have received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	0	0	6 (b)	8 (b)	0	0	6 T 0 V	8 T 0 V	6	8	6	6
1.K: No. of community representatives (community-based organizations, local leaders, etc.) in targeted areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules	177 (d)	623 (d)	250 (c)	503 (c)	51 (e)	87 (e)	0 T 478 V	6 T 1,207 V	478	1,213	9	9

NA (+) = CVPP's intervention was limited to providing technical assistance to the IIWG, and no grants funds were invested in focal communities.

(a) This baseline study was conducted only in Ilopingo.

(b) The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 3 men and 4 women.

(c) The total includes 3 women, reported for the second quarter of 2011, who attended the workshops. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 3 women.

(d) The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes 769 youths (161 men and 608 women) who received vocational training and 16 men and 15 women as community representatives who have received CVPP training in CVP modules. The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes 726 youths (238 men and 488 women) who received vocational training and 12 men and 17 women as community representatives who have received CVPP training in CVP modules

(e) The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes 105 youths (33 men and 72 women) who received vocational training and 18 men and 15 women as community representatives who have received CVPP training in CVP modules

CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators												
QUARTER: : October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phases II and III		End-of-Project Target		
	Ilopingo		San Martín		Tonacatepeque							
<b>Result 1.1:</b>												
<b>Capabilities of the existing 3 Local IIWGs or Prevention Councils/Committees in advocating for and expanding prevention activities strengthened</b>												
1.L: No. of CVP IIWGs initiatives oriented to fund raising or getting technical or financial cooperation from third parties	0		0		0		0 T 0 V		0		2	
1.M: No. of baseline studies conducted in the targeted areas (a)	1		2		1		9T 1 V		9(a)		2	
1.N: No. of intermediate evaluation studies conducted in the targeted areas (b)	0		0		NA (+)		0 T		0		1(++)	
1.O: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the delinquency and crime acts reported by the official police data decreased by 5% or more	0		0		NA (+)		0 T 0 V		0		1	

CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators												
QUARTER: : October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phases II and III	End-of-Project Target			
	Ilopango		San Martín		Tonacatepeque							
1.P: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the social risk factors reported by participatory talking maps decreased by 5% or more	0		0		NA (+)		0 T	0	1			
							0 V					
1.Q: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the social protection factors reported by participatory talking maps increased by 5% or more	0		0		NA (+)		0 T	0	1			
							0 V					
1.R: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the households participating actively in the prevention activities increased by 5% or more	4		4		2		10 T	10.	1			
							0 V					
<b>Result 1.2: Competitive small grants program implemented</b>												
1.S: No. of subgrantees trained and capabilities reinforced in presenting sound proposals, managing them in accordance with RTI's and USAID's rules and regulations, and communicating their outcomes with CVPP's requisites	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	0	2 (+)	0	0	NA (+)		0 T	2 T	0	2	5	5
1.T: No. of approved grants in a participatory fashion with IIWGs, in response to their CVP plans	4 (b)		3 (c)		2 (d)		9 T	9	6			
							0 V					
1.U: No. of CVPP-approved grants by RTI with at least 25% CS from third-party contributions (in cash, labor or in-kind)	4 [COMTEC (29.84%) + FEPADE (25.04%) + FUNDASAL (39.78%) + SIRAMA (25.8%)]		3 [FUNDASAL (36.39%) + FUNPRES (24.76%) + Tutela Legal del Arzobispado (26.21%)]		2 [COMTEC (29.84%) + FUSAL (26.1%)]		9 T	9	6			
							0 V					

NA (+) = CVPP's intervention will be limited to providing technical assistance to the IIWG, and no grants funds will be invested in focal communities.

(a) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded during the grant's competitive process: FUNDASAL, SIRAMA, FEPADE, and COMTEC.

(b) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded during the grant's competitive process: FUNDASAL, FUNPRES, and Tutela Legal.

(c) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded during the grant's competitive process: FUSAL and COMTEC.

(+) The trained subgrantees came to the workshop representing SIRAMA.

(++) This intermediate evaluation study was conducted only in San Martín.

CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators												
QUARTER: : October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phases II and III		End-of-Project Target	
	Ilopango		San Martín		Tonacatepeque							
<b>Result 1.3: Capabilities of the existing 3 Municipal Violence Observatories strengthened</b>												
1.3.1: No. of municipal staff officially assigned to operate the municipal observatory of crime and violence	2		1		2		5 T 0 V		5		3	
1.3.2: No. of municipal observatory crime and violence staff who had been the recipient of technical assistance in statistics organization, database management, and constructing indicators.	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	2	1	3	0	2	1	0 T 7 V	0 T 2 V	7	2	2	1
1.3.3: No. of administrative manuals designed and established for collecting, processing, and producing data and indicators of local crime and violence	1		1		1		3T 0 V		3		3	
1.3.4: No. of reports and analysis produced by the municipal observatory for crime and violence prevention	0		0		0		0T 0 V		0		3	

NA (+) = CVPP's intervention will be limited to providing technical assistance to the IIWG, and no grants funds will be invested in focal communities.

(a) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded during the grant's competitive process: FUNDASAL, SIRAMA, FEPADE, and COMTEC.

(b) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded during the grant's competitive process: FUNDASAL, FUNPRES, and Tutela Legal.

(c) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded during the grant's competitive process: FUSAL and COMTEC.

(+) The trained subgrantees came to the workshop representing SIRAMA.

CVPP Phases I, II, and III: Performance Indicators												
PERIOD: October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	NATIONAL ENTITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phase I,II, and III		End-of-Project Target	
<b>Result 2: National capacity for the prevention of violence and crime increased</b>												
2.A: No. of targeted IIEC partner members who have made financial or in-kind contributions with HCOLC funds to CVPP projects	CNSP		MSPJ		SJ		13T 0V		13		5	
	7		4		2							
2.B: No. of public safety initiatives self-initiated by targeted IIEC partner members based on the CVPP model	NA						1T 0V		1		1	
2.C: No. of targeted municipalities that have shared risk map data with the PNC	NA						1T 0V		1		7	
2.D: No. of GOES employees who have received CVPP training in CVP data collection and analysis according to the project-advised standard indicator list	CNSP		MSPJ		SJ		M	W	M	W	M	W
	M	W	M	W	M	W	0T	0T	0	0	3	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0						

**CVPP Phases I, II, and III: Performance Indicators**

PERIOD: October–December 2012

FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	NATIONAL ENTITIES								Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phase I,II, and III		End-of-Project Target	
	CNSP		MSPJ		SJ		OTHERS		M	W	M	W	M	W
2.E No. of national-level GOES staff who have received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	109 T	99 T	111	103	10	10
	4 (a)	0	88 (++)	78 (++)	0	0	19 (*)	25 (**)	2 V	4 V				
2.F: No. of targeted IIEC partner members who have collected standardized indicator data from the CVPP-advised list	CNSP		MSPJ		SJ				0 T		0		3	
	0		0		0				0 V					
2.G: No. of CVP case studies produced by universities that have received CVPP grants	NA								2 T		2 (+)		7	
									0 V					
2.H: No. of studies of El Salvador's crime and prevention policy and proposal of pertinent recommendations	NA								1 T		1		1	
									0 V					
2.I: No. of targeted GOES institutions who have made financial or in-kind contributions to CVPP projects	CNSP		MSPJ		SJ				4T		4		4	
			4						0 V					

(\*) Includes one person from ISNA, one from PNC, and one from MINED participating in Altavista. Also includes one man from MINED who attended at least the 80 percent of the five courses implemented during the last quarter of 2008 and one man from the PNC who attended 100 percent of the training courses implemented during the first quarter of 2009. Also includes one man from PNC/Ilopango who attended the course implemented during the fourth quarter of 2009. The total amount reported for the fourth quarter of 2010 includes one man from PNC who attended a two-day workshop on gender equality and domestic violence prevention in Tonacatepeque. Also, includes two men and two women from ME, and one woman from PREPAZ, who attended a four-day seminar in Nahuizalco. The total amount reported for the fourth quarter of 2010 includes one man from MISPAS who attended all the sessions of the workshop on Creative Conflict Solutions. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes one man from PNC, one from ISNA, and one from SSDTD trained in San Martín; 2011 includes two men from PNC in San Juan Opico. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes two men from PNC in San Antonio del Monte.

(\*\*) Includes one person from the Health Unit and two from ISSS, participating in Altavista. Also includes one woman from the Health Unit who attended at least 80 percent of the five courses implemented during the last quarter of 2008; two women from the Salvadoran Social Security Institute (ISSS) Community Clinic, and one woman from the Health Unit who attended 100 percent of the courses implemented in the first quarter of 2009. Also includes two women who attended the course implemented during the fourth quarter of 2009; one represented ISSS and other represented the Health Unit, both located in Altavista. The total amount reported for the fourth quarter of 2010 includes four women (1 from ME and 3 from ISSS) who attended a two-day workshop on gender equality and domestic violence prevention. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes one woman from PDDH trained in San Martín, one woman from the Health Unit, and one woman from INDES, trained in Zaragoza by FUNDEMOSPAZ. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes two women from PREPAZ and the Health Unit in San Antonio del Monte.

(+) Includes systematization of MSPJ's Nocturnal Sports Program as well the Altavista Systematization, both produced in collaboration with UEES.

(++) Includes the 51 men and 49 women of PREPAZ trained on the *How to Work in Violence and Crime Prevention at the Local Level/Use of the Prevention Manual* during the July–September 2010 quarter. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 1 woman from PREPAZ trained in San Martín and 1 woman from PREPAZ in San Juan Opico. Also includes 36 men and 27 women of PREPAZ who completed the three-day Train the Trainers course, conducted by the project between May and July 2011. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 1 man of CONJUVE trained in San Martín.

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators							
PERIOD: October–December 2012				FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR			Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phase III		End-of-Project Target
<b>Result 2.1:</b>							
<b>Action plan to implement the EPV in at least 3 municipalities designed and executed</b>							
2.J No. of joint action plans to implement the <i>Estrategia de Prevención de la Violencia</i> (EPV) in three focal municipalities			2T 1 V		2 (b)		1
2.K No. of PREPAZ and/or CONJUVE staff trained in the EPV content			M   W 0T   0T 23 V   16 V		M   W 23   16		M   W 20   20
2.L No. of municipal staff and CVP IIWGs members of at least three municipalities trained in the EPV content			M   W 0 T   0T 16 V   10 V		M   W 16   10		M   W 30   30
2.M No. of public events celebrated with local actor for the public diffusion of the EPV			0T 0V		0		3
2.O No. of FEPADE consortium staff trained in the EPV content			M   W 1 T   2 T 0 V   0 V		M   W 1(a)   2(a)		M   W 10   10
2.P No. of municipal activities carried out under the joint action plans to implement the EPV in three focal municipalities			0 T 0 V		0		6
<b>Result 2.2:</b>							
<b>National tracking and mapping system for prevention interventions and strategies designed and implemented in consultation with GOES agencies</b>							
2.2.1 No. of national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions designed and implemented in a central governmental institution			0T 0V		0		1
2.2.2 No. of government agencies staff trained in the content and functioning of the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions			M   W 0T   0T 0V   0V		M   W 0   0		M   W 3   2
2.2.3 No. of Council of Salvadoran Municipalities ( <i>Corporación de Municipalidades de la República de El Salvador</i> [COMURES]) informed about the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions			M   W 0T   0T 0V   0V		M   W 0   0		M   W 15   15
2.2.4 No. of FEPADE consortium staff trained in the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions			M   W 0T   0T 0V   0V		M   W 0   0		M   W 5   5
2.2.5 No. of municipal staff and/or CVP IIWGs members of at least 30 municipalities involved the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions that are sensitized about its content			M   W 0T   0T 0V   0V		M   W 0   0		M   W 75   75
2.2.6 No. of public events where results of tracking and mapping system for prevention interventions are publicly presented			0T 0V		0		1

(a) This result corresponds to the workshop carried out on January 25–26, 2012.

(b) The plan reported is for the municipality of Cuscatancingo and Ayutuxtepeque

**CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators**

PERIOD: October–December 2012				FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013				Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phases II and III	End-of-Project Target		
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES											
	Ciudad Arce		Nahuizalco		San Juan Opico		Zaragoza					
<b>Result 3: Gang recruitment of youth and community crime and violence decreased</b>												
3.A: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs	5 (Communities Santa Rosa, Santa Lucía zone 1 and zone 2, and San Andrés; and urbanización San Francisco)		7 (Caseros Centro of cantones Pushtán and Sisimitepec; communities Milagrosa II and Xochilt-Ixtatec; and Barrios Las Mercedes, La Trinidad y San Juan)		6 (Communities: El Papayal, Las Flores, Jabalincito, Buenos Aires, Nueva Candelaria, and Sitio Grande)		7 (Communities: Esmeraldita II, Los Cedros, El Corralito, and El Zaite II; and, colonias San Antonio I and II, and Miramar)		25T  0V	25	17	
3.B: No. of targeted municipalities that have approved a CVP policy	2 (*)		1 (**)		1 (***)		1 (e)		5T 0V	5	4	
3.C: No. of targeted municipal governments that have approved an ordinance recognizing a local CVP inter-institutional committee	0		1		0		1 (f)		2T 0V	2	4	
3.D: No. of local CVP inter-institutional committees in targeted areas that have established a local IIWG	1		1		1		1		4T 0V	4	4	
3.E: No. of women who have been elected to serve on the municipal CVP inter-institutional committee	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	4	
	15	17	15	19	16	11	20	26	66T 0V	73T 0V		66
3.F: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have developed Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		1		4T 0V	4	4	
3.G: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have implemented one or more activities contemplated in their Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		1		4T 0V	4	4	
3.H: No. of targeted municipalities that have systematically evaluated CVP programs according to evaluation criteria	1		1		1		1		4T 0V	4	4	
3.I: Percent of CVPP-approved grants with cost sharing (CS) from third-party contributions (e.g., cash, labor, or in-kind)	5 [Plan Internacional (CS= 31.4%) + 2 ESCENICA (CS= 19.07 and 14.61%) + ASAPROSAR (CS= 28.17%) + UCA (CS= 34.27%)]		3 [COMTEC (CS= 24.19%) + FUNDASAL (CS= 28.24%) + FUSAL (CS= 24.54%)]		7 [ASAPROSAR (CS= 25.13%) + 2 FEPADE (CS= 25 and 27.32%) + ISD (CS= 26.54%) + UCA (CS= 34.27%) + FUNPRES (CS= 25.19%) + ESCENICA (CS=14.61%)]		7 [2 FUNPRES (CS= 20.32 and 25.19%) + FIECA (CS= 29.5%) + CIDEP (CS= 27.01%) + Fe y Alegría (CS= 15.06%) + FUNDASAL (CS% = 13.91%) + FEPADE (CS = 27.32%)]		22T  0V	22 grants (100% with C.S)	95%	

(\*) Municipal Policy for Citizen Coexistence, Social and Public Safety, voted on 02/09/2012; Municipal policy for Gender Equity, voted on 11/30/2010.

- (\*\*) Municipal policy for Gender Equity, voted on 11/30/2010.  
 (\*\*\*)Municipal policy for Citizen Coexistence, Social and Public Safety, voted on 11/03/2011.  
 (e) Municipal Policy for Childhood and Adolescence, voted on 02/09/2012  
 (f) The municipal act is dated February 4, 2010

CVPP Phases II and III: Performance Indicators														
PERIOD: October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013								
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES								Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phases II and III		End-of-Project Target	
	Ciudad Arce	Nahuizalco		San Juan Opico		Zaragoza								
<b>Result 3: Gang recruitment of youth and community crime and violence decreased</b>														
3.J: No. of municipal staff in targeted areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	8	
	3	0	4 (+)	13 (+)	3	8	13 (++)	1	18 T 5 V	20 T 2 V	23	22		
3.K: No. of community representatives (community-based organizations, local leaders, etc.) in target areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules	64	50	164 (*)	278 (*)	108 (b)	143 (b)	198 (+)	463 (+)	210 T 324 V	341 T 592 V	534	933	40	
	Not applicable (NA)								1T 0V		1		1	
3.L: No. of centralized crime and violence observatories established in the San Salvador Metropolitan Area	NA								4 T					
									0 V		4 (d)		5	
3.M: No. of municipalities from the San Salvador Metropolitan Area supported to create or strengthen crime and violence observatories	NA													

(+) The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes three men and three women. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes eight men and six women trained by FUNDEMOSPAZ. The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2011 includes one man and three women. The total reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes one woman.

(++) The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 is 56 persons who attended the vocational workshops on cosmetology, electricity, and sewing. Because this figure was not originally disaggregated by gender, it was arbitrarily divided into 28 men and 28 women from the communities who attended the workshops in that quarter.

(\*)The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes 27 men and 85 women. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 57 men and 81 women; the total reported for the fourth quarter of 2011 includes 76 men and 106 women.

(\*\*)The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes 184 men and 228 women of the communities who attended the workshops, including 47 men and 40 women who participated in the groups of dance, music, and theater. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 133 men and 165 women trained by FEPADE. The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2011 includes 133 men and 165 women.

(\*\*\*) The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes 68 men and 68 women who attended the workshops. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 33 men and 17 women who were trained in youth leadership and social projects by ASAPROSAR; includes 12 men and 19 women who were trained in youth leadership and cultural rescue of Nahuizalco; includes 27 men and 33 women who were trained in prevention of social violence and gender violence by Salvadorian Women’s Movement (Movimiento Salvadoreño de Mujeres [MSM]); includes 47 men and 40 women who attended the workshops of dance, music, and theatre given by MSM; the total reported for the fourth quarter 2011 includes 136 men and 119 women; the total reported for the second quarter of 2012 includes 9 men and 6 women who attended the three-day workshop Leadership and Youth Reality.

(a) The total reported for the first quarter of 2011 includes 39 men and 82 women from the communities who attended the workshops. The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes 47 men and 108 women from the communities who attended the workshops. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 4 men and 17 women who completed the training in culinary gastronomy offered by FEPADE; it includes 10 men and 7 women who completed the training in maintenance and repairing of electronic equipment offered by FEPADE; includes 59 men and 72 women who completed the training in entrepreneurship; includes 16 men and 33 women who completed the training in associative entrepreneurship, youth leadership, and social projects by ASAPROSAR; includes 12 men and 19 women who were trained in youth leadership and cultural rescue of Nahuizalco; includes 27 men and 33 women who were trained in prevention of social violence and gender violence by MSM; and includes 47 men and 40 women who attended the workshops of dance, music, and theatre given by MSM.

(b) The total amount reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes five men and one woman who attended the workshops. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes one man and one woman who attended at least 80 percent of the workshops. The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes 27 men and 51 women who attended at least 80 percent of the training workshops offered by FEPADE.

(c) The total reported for the first quarter of 2011 includes 66 men and 83 women of the communities who attended the workshops. The total reported for the second quarter of 2011 includes 32 men and 70 women of the communities who attended the workshops. The total reported for the third quarter of 2011 includes 1 man and 16 women who completed the training in culinary gastronomy offered by FEPADE; includes 21 women who completed the training in pastry offered by FEPADE; includes 66 men and 82 women who completed the training in entrepreneurship; includes 14 men and 7 women

who completed the training in baking offered by FEPADE; includes 15 men and 36 women who completed the training in software operations offered by FEPADE; includes 12 men and 4 women who completed the training in electrical wiring offered by FEPADE. The total reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes 22 men and 38 women trained by FEPADE.

(d) Includes the municipality of Santa Tecla, San Martín, Ilopango, and Tonacatepeque. The former has received technical assistance through the UCA; the last three received technical assistance and training through FUNDEMOSPAZ, during the third quarter of 2011.

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators							
Expected Result 3: Municipal-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Strengthened							
PERIOD: October–December 2012				FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	NEW MUNICIPALITIES				Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phase III	End-of-Project Target
	Ciudad Arce	Nahuizalco	San Juan Opico	Zaragoza			
<b>Result 3.1: Capabilities of the existing four local IIWGs or Prevention Councils/Committees in advocating for and expanding prevention activities strengthened</b>							
3.N: No. of activities contemplated in the Municipal Crime Prevention Plans in targeted areas in which the FEPADE Crime Prevention Consortium has been involved	0	0	0	0	0 T 0 V	0	4
3.O: No. of CVP IIWGs initiatives oriented to fundraising or getting technical or financial cooperation from third parties	0	1	1	0	2T 0 V	2	4
3.P: No. of systematized success stories of local violence prevention	0	0	0	0	0 T 0 V	0	2
3.Q: No. of events organized for the public dissemination of systematized success stories of local violence prevention	0	0	0	0	0 T 0 V	0	2
3.R: No. of intermediate evaluations studies conducted in the targeted areas	0	0	NA (+)	NA (+)	4 T 0 V	4 (a)	2
3.S: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the delinquency and crime acts reported by the official police data decreased by 5% or more	1(b)	0	0 (+)	3 (c)	4 T 0 V	4	2
3.T: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the social risk factors reported by participatory talking maps decreased by 5% or more	0	0	NA (+)	NA (+)	6 T 0 V	6 (d)	2
3.U: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the social protection factors reported by participatory talking maps increased by 5% or more	0	0	NA (+)	NA (+)	9 T 0 V	9 (e)	2

NA (+) = Not applicable. In these municipalities, CVPP did not conduct intermediate evaluations studies because Vanderbilt University led the activity. Therefore, the CVPP did not handle the information to measure the 3.S, 3.T, 3.U, and 3.W performance indicators.

(a) Represents the intermediate evaluation studies conducted in District 6 of San Salvador (La Chacra), Armenia, Izalco, and Altavista.

(b)The community where the delinquency and crime acts reported by PNC decreased is Urbanización San Francisco (2010, 5 acts; 2011, 5; and September 2012, 2)

(c) The communities where the delinquency and crime acts reported by PNC decreased are: (i) Esmeraldita II (2010, 9 acts; 2011, 4; and in September 2012, 0); (ii) San Antonio 1 (in 2010, 2 acts; 2011, 0; and in September 2012, 0); and (iii) San Antonio 2 (in 2010, 1 act; 2011, 0; and in September 2012, 0).

(d) The reported communities are Barrio Nuevo, Barrio San Juan, and Colonia San Damián of Armenia; and the Communities Francisco Morazán, Quiñonez 1, and Quiñonez 2 of District 6 of San Salvador.

(e) The reported communities are Barrio Nuevo, Barrio San Juan, and Colonia San Damián of Armenia; Barrio Santa Cruz, Colonia Las Palmeras, and Colonia Santa Emilia of Izalco; and, Communities La Chacra, Quiñonez 1 and Quiñonez 2 of District 6 of San Salvador.

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators							
Expected Result 3: Municipal-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Strengthened							
PERIOD: October–December 2012				FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	NEW MUNICIPALITIES				Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phase III	End-of-Project Target
	Ciudad Arce	Nahuizalco	San Juan Opico	Zaragoza			
<b>Cont. Result 3.2: Competitive small grants program implemented</b>							
3.W: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the households participating actively in the prevention activities increased by 5% or more	0	0	NA (+)	NA (+)	12 T 0 V	12(1)	2
3.X: No. of subgrantees trained and capabilities reinforced in presenting sound proposals, managing them in accordance with RTI's and USAID's rules and regulations, and communicating their outcomes with CVPP's requisites.	12 (a)	1 (b)	0 (c)	2 (d)	15 T 0 V	15	5
3.Y: No. of approved grants in a participatory fashion with IIWGs, in response to their CVP plans	4 (*)	1 (+)	5 (**)	5 (++)	15 T 0 V	15	6
3.Z: No. of CVPP-approved grants with at least 25% cost sharing (CS) from third-party contributions (in cash, labor, or in-kind)	2 [ASAPROSAR (CS 28.17%) + UCA (CS 34.27%)] (e)	1 [FUSAL (CS 24.54 %)]	3 [FEPADE (CS 27.32%) + FUNPRES (CS 25.19%) + UCA (CS 34.27%)] (f)	2 [FEPADE (CS 27.32%) + FUNPRES (CS 25.19%)] (g)	8 T 0 V	8	6

(a) These are the CSOs that attended the workshop held on January 25–26, 2012; they submitted proposals per the grant's competitive process: *Asociación Salvadoreña Pro-Salud Rural* (ASAPROSAR), *Complejo Técnico San Francisco de Sales* (COMTEC), *Asociación Cultural para las Artes Escénicas* (ESCENICA), *Asociación Fe y Alegría*, *Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo* (FEPADE), *Fundación Salvadoreña de Desarrollo y Humanismo Maquilishuatl* (FUMA), *Fundación Salvadoreña de Desarrollo y Vivienda Mínima* (FUNDASAL), *Fundación para la Educación Especial* (FUNPRES), *Fundación Salvador del Mundo* (FUSALMO), *Iniciativa Social para la Democracia* (ISD), *Plan International Inc. El Salvador* (PLAN), and *Instituto de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas* (IDHUCA).

(b) These are the CSOs that attended the workshop held on January 25–26, 2012; they submitted proposals per the grant's competitive process: ASAPROSAR, COMTEC, ESCENICA, FEPADE, FUMA, FUNDASAL, FUNPRES, IDHUCA, and *Fundación Salvadoreña para la Salud y el Desarrollo Humano* (FUSAL). However, to prevent double accounting, we have excluded the CSOs listed in (a).

(c) Nine CSOs attended the workshop held on January 25–26, 2012, per the grant's competitive process. However, to prevent double accounting, we have excluded them because they are listed in (a) or (b).

(d) Nine CSOs that attended the workshop held on January 25–26, 2012, including the Universidad "José Simeón Cañas" (UCA) and *Fundación Innovaciones Educativas Centroamericanas* (FIECA), prepared a proposal for the grant's competitive process. However, to prevent double accounting, the other seven listed in (a) or (b) are excluded.

(e) During the second quarter of 2012 (January–March 2012), one more grant was approved by RTI for Ciudad Arce: ESCENICA. Its cost-share percent was 14.61 percent.

(f) During the second quarter of 2012, one more grant was approved by RTI for Ciudad Arce: ESCENICA. Its cost-share percent was 14.61 percent.

(g) During the second quarter of 2012, three more grants were approved by RTI for Zaragoza: Fe y Alegría, FUNDASAL, and ESCENICA. Their cost-share percent was 15.06 percent, 13.91 percent, and 14.61 percent, respectively.

(\*) These are the CSOs that attended the workshop held on January 25–26, 2012, and whose proposals were awarded during the grant’s competitive process: ASAPROSAR, ESCENICA, PLAN, and IDHUCA.

(\*\*) These are the CSOs that attended the workshop held on January 25–26, 2012, and whose proposals were awarded during the grant’s competitive process: ESCENICA, FUNPRES, FEPADE, PLAN, and IDHUCA.

(+) This is the CSO whose proposal was awarded during the grant’s competitive process: FUSAL.

(++) These are the CSOs whose proposals were awarded in the grant’s competitive process: FUNPRES, FUNDASAL, FEPADE, ESCENICA, and Fe y Alegría.

(+++) The reported community is Quiñonez 1 of District 6 of San Salvador.

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators												
Expected Result 3: Municipal-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Expanded and Strengthened												
PERIOD: October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES					Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phase III		End-of-Project Target		
	Nejapa	San Antonio del Monte		Soyapango								
<b>Expected result 3.1: Community-based CVP programs improved and expanded</b>												
3.1.1: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs	4 (Colonias Nuevo Ferrocarril y Nueva Esperanza; and, communities Bonete y El Cedral-Rosario)		4 (Colonias El Mirador and El Carmen; residencial San Antonio; and, urbanización Lomas de San Antonio, II etapa)		4 (Colonias San Fernando, Los Santos 1, Bosques de Prusia y San José 2)		12 T 0 V		12		12	
3.1.2: No. of targeted municipalities that have approved a CVP policy	0		1 (a)		0		1 T 0 V		1		3	
3.1.3: No. of targeted municipal governments that have approved an ordinance recognizing a local CVP inter-institutional committee	1		1		1(b)		3 T 0 V		3		3	
3.1.4: No. of local CVP inter-institutional committees in targeted areas that have established a local IIWG	1		1		1		3 T 0 V		3		3	
3.1.5: No. of women who have been elected to serve on the municipal CVP inter-institutional committee	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	16	6	20	14	8	8	44 T 0 V	28 T 0 V	44	28	30	30
3.1.6: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have developed Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		3 T 0 V		3		3	
3.1.7: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have implemented one or more activities contemplated in their Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	1		1		1		3 T 0 V		3		3	
3.1.8: No. of activities contemplated in the Municipal Crime Prevention Plans in targeted areas in which the FEPADE Crime Prevention Consortium has been involved	0		0		0		0 T 0 V		0		3	
3.1.9: No. of targeted municipalities that have systematically evaluated CVP programs according to evaluation criteria	1		1		1		0 T 3 V		3		3	
3.1.10: No. of municipal staff in target areas who have received CVPP	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	0	0	3	3	0	0	3 T	3 T	3	3	6	6

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators												
Expected Result 3: Municipal-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Expanded and Strengthened												
PERIOD: October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013		Total Accumulated Phase III		End-of-Project Target	
	Nejapa		San Antonio del Monte		Soyapango							
training in CVP modules and activities							0 V	0 V				
3.1.11: No. of community representatives (community-based organizations, local leaders, etc.) in target areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
	7(d)	16 (d)	14	12	51 (e)	57 (e)	14 T	12 T	72	85	30	30
							58 V	73 V				
3.1.12: No. of CVP IIWGs initiatives oriented to fundraising or to get technical or financial cooperation from third parties	1		0		1		2T		2 (c)		3	
							1 V					
3.1.13: No. of baseline studies conducted in the targeted areas (a)	1		1		1		7T		7 (*)		3	
							1 V					
3.1.14: No. of systematized success stories of local violence prevention	1		0		0		2T		2		1	
							0 V					
3.1.15: No. of events organized for the public dissemination of systematized success stories of local violence prevention	0		0		0		0 T		0		1	
							0 V					
3.1.16: No. of activities contemplated in the Municipal Crime Prevention Plans in targeted areas in which the FEPADE Crime Prevention Consortium has been involved	0		0		0		0 T		0		3	
							0 V					

(\*) The baselines for Zaragoza, San Juan Opico, Nahuizalco, and Ciudad Arce are included.

(a) Municipal policy for Gender Equity, voted on 04/02/2007.

(b) The municipal agreement was voted on 10/07/2010.

(c) This is the funding provided by *Industrias la Constancia* (ILC).

(d) The total reported by FIECA for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes 7 men and 16 women.

(e) The total reported by COMTEC for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes 51 men and 57 women.

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators												
Expected Result 3: Municipal-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Expanded and Strengthened												
PERIOD: October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013						
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phase III	End-of-Project Target			
	Nejapa		San Antonio del Monte		Soyapango							
<b>Expected Result 3.2: Competitive small grants program implemented</b>												
3.2.1 No. of subgrantees trained and capabilities reinforced in presenting sound proposals, managing them in accordance with RTI and USAID rules and regulations, and communicating their outcomes with CVPP's requisites.	5 (b)		5 (b)		4 (b)		14 T		14		5	
							0 V					
3.2.2 No. of approved grants in a participatory fashion with IIWGs, in	3		4 (a)		3		10 T		10		6	

CVPP Phase III: Performance Indicators											
Expected Result 3: Municipal-led, Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Expanded and Strengthened											
PERIOD: October–December 2012						FISCAL YEAR: 2012–2013					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MUNICIPALITIES						Total (T) for FY 2012 and Variations (V) for FY 2013	Total Accumulated Phase III	End-of-Project Target		
	Nejapa		San Antonio del Monte		Soyapango						
response to their CVP plans							0 V				
3.2.3 No. of CVPP-approved grants with at least 25% cost sharing (CS) from third-party contributions (in cash, labor or in-kind)	3 [CASART (CS 27.0%) + FIECA (CS 25.03) + FUNDASAL (CS 27.75%)]		4 [AGAPE (CS 25.32%) + FUNPRES (CS 24.66%) + FUNDASAL (CS 24.82%)] (e)		3 [CONEXION (CS 25.12%) + COMTEC (CS 26.62%) + FUNDASAL (CS 27.5%)]		9 T	9	6		
							0 V				
Expected result 3.3: Opportunities for basic education, vocational training, and leadership for youth increased											
3.3.1 No. of youths in targeted areas who have received vocational and basic education training	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	600
	63 (f)	97 (f)	29 (c)	28 (d)	91 (g)	354(g)	29 T	28 T	183	479	
							154 V	451 V			
3.3.2 No. of youth leaders in targeted areas who have received training in leadership	24	22	0	0	16	26	0 T	0 T	40	48	225
							40 V	48 V			

(a) These are the CSOs whose proposals were selected as winners in the grant's competitive process: AGAPE, ESCENICA, FUNDASAL, and FUNPRES.

(b) These are the CSOs that attended the workshop carried out June 15, 2012: Empresarios Juveniles, FUNDEMUN, CONEXION, *Fundacion Salvadoreña de Educacion y Trabajo* (EDYTRA), Center for Leadership Development (*Centro para el Desarrollo del Liderazgo* [CEDELID]), Salvadoran Chamber of Craftsmen (*Camara Salvadoreña de Artesanos* [CASART]), Universidad Don Bosco, FIECA, FUNDAMUNI, FUNDAUNGO, FUNIPRI, *Estatutos de la Asociación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Integral de la Familia* (ASDIF), *Asociación Agencia para El Desarrollo Local del Departamento de Sonsonate* (ADEL Sonsonate), and FUSALMO. The total trainees were 26 (10 men and 16 women).

(c) The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes 9 men that attended at least 80 percent of the bakery training workshops; 13 men who attended at least 80 percent of the basic electronics training workshops; and, 7 men who attended at least 80 percent of producing home cleaning products training workshops.

(d) The total amount reported for the third quarter of 2012 includes 16 women who attended at least 80 percent of the bakery training workshops; and 12 women who attended at least 80 percent of producing home cleaning products training workshops.

(e) During the second quarter of 2012 (January–March 2012), one more grant was approved by RTI for San Antonio del Monte: ESCENICA. Its cost-share percent was 14.61 percent.

(e) The total reported by CASART for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes 63 men and 97 women.

(g) The total reported for the fourth quarter of 2012 includes: 9 men and 145 women trained by CONEXION, and 82 men and 209 women trained by COMTEC.

Result 4: Opportunities for basic education, vocational training, and leadership for youth increased													
4.A: No. of youths in targeted areas who have received vocational and basic education training	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	800
		205 (a)	314 (a)	490 (**)	665 (**)	241 (c)	350 (c)	138 (++)	202 (++)	1,004 T	1,452 T	1,074	
									70 V	79 V			
4.B: No. of youth leaders in targeted areas who have received training in leadership	27	23	368 (***)	336 (***)	33	16	118	107	428 T	375 T	546	482	300
									118 V	107 V			

## Annex B. Status of Progress toward Performance Indicator Targets

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Activity 1		Activity 3		End-of-Project Target Activities 1 and 3 Combined	Total Accumulated	Percent Delivered	Comments
	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated				
1.A, 1.A, 3.A, 3.1.1: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs	30	49	29	37	59	86	146%	
1.B, 1.B, 3.B, 3.1.2: No. of targeted municipalities that have approved a crime and violence prevention (CVP) policy	5	2	7	6	12	8	67%	
1.C, 1.C, 3.C, 3.1.3: No. of targeted municipal governments that have approved an ordinance recognizing a local CVP inter-institutional committee	8	5	7	5	15	10	67%	
1.D, 1.D, 3.D, 3.1.4: No. of local CVP inter-institutional committees in targeted areas that have established a local Inter-institutional Work Group (IIWG)	8	8	7	7	15	15	100%	
1.E, 1.E, 3.E, 3.1.5: No. of women who have been elected to serve on the municipal CVP inter-institutional committee	13	249	64	211	47	217	462%	
1.F, 1.F, 3.F, 3.1.6: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have developed Municipal Crime Prevention Plans.	7	8	7	7	14	15	107%	
1.G, 1.G, 3.G, 3.1.7: No. of CVP IIWGs in targeted areas that have implemented one or more activities proposed in their Municipal Crime Prevention Plans	7	8	7	7	14	15	107%	
1.H, 1.H, 3.H, 3.1.9: No. of targeted municipalities that have systematically evaluated CVP programs according to evaluation criteria as advised by CVPP	7	8	7	7	14	15	107%	
1.I, 1.I, 3.I: Percent of CVPP-approved grants with cost sharing (CS) from third-party contributions (in cash, labor, or in-kind)	95%	100%	95%	100%	95%	100%	105%	
1.J: No. of nontargeted municipalities that have established IIWGs based on the CVPP model [there are two 1.Js; see following indicator also]	1	2			1	2	200%	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Activity 1		Activity 3		End-of-Project Target Activities 1 and 3 Combined	Total Accumulated	Percent Delivered	Comments
	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated				
1.K, 1.J, 3.J, 3.1.10: No. of municipal staff (and national GOES staff in 1.J) in targeted areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities [Note: two indicators are labeled 1.K in the original report and two as 1.J; one of each is here and the others in the following and preceding lines]	13 M, 13 W	17 M, 24 W	10 M, 10 W	21 M, 23 W	23 M, 23 W	38 M, 47 W	165% M 204% W 185 % avg.	
1.L, 1.K, 3.K, 3.1.11: No. of community representatives (community-based organizations, local leaders, etc.) in targeted areas who have received CVPP training in CVP modules. [Note: Two indicators are labeled 1.L in the original document, and two are labeled 1.K; one of each is shown here, while the other 1.K is in the previous line and the other 1.L is in the next]	29 M, 29 W	179 M, 186 W	50 M, 50 W	224 M, 352 W	79 M, 79 W	403 M, 538 W	510% M 681% W 596% avg.	
1.L, 3.O, 3.1.12: No. of CVP IIWGs initiatives oriented to fundraising or obtaining technical or financial cooperation from third parties	2	0	7	4	9	4	44%	This includes only 2 with CECI in San Juan Opico and Nahuizalco. Also includes the support of <i>Industrias la Constancia</i> to Nejapa and Soyapango
1.M, 3.1.13: No. of baseline studies conducted in the targeted areas (a)	2	9	3	7	5	16	320%	
1.N, 3.R: No. of intermediate evaluation studies conducted in the targeted areas (b)	1	0	2	4	3	4	133%	
1.O, 3.S: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the delinquency and crime acts reported by the official police data decreased by 5% or more	1	0	2	4	3	4	133%	
1.P, 3.T: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the social risk factors reported by participatory talking maps decreased by 5% or more	1	0	2	6	3	6	200%	
1.Q, 3.U: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the social protection factors reported by participatory talking maps increased by 5% or more	1	0	2	9	3	9	300%	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Activity 1		Activity 3		End-of-Project Target Activities 1 and 3 Combined	Total Accumulated	Percent Delivered	Comments
	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated				
1.R, 3.W: No. of U.S. government-assisted communities in crime prevention programs where the households participating actively in the prevention activities increased by 5% or more	1	10	2	12	3	22	733%	
1.S, 3.X, 3.2.1: No. of subgrantees trained and capabilities reinforced in presenting sound proposals, managing them in accordance with RTI's and USAID's rules and regulations, and communicating their outcomes with CVPP's requisites	10	2	10	29	20	31	155%	
1.T, 3.Y, 3.2.2: No. of approved grants in a participatory fashion with IIWGs, in response to their CVP plans	6	9	12	25	18	34	189%	
1.U, 3.Z, 3.2.3: No. of CVPP-approved grants by RTI with at least 25% CS from third-party contributions (in cash, labor, or in-kind)	6	9	12	17	18	26	144%	
1.3.1 : No. of municipal staff officially assigned to operate the municipal observatory for crime and violence prevention	3	5			3	5	167%	
1.3.2: No. of municipal observatory crime and violence staff who had been the recipient of technical assistance in statistics organization, database management, and constructing indicators	0 M, 0 W	0 M, 0 W			0 M, 0 W	0 M, 0 W	NA	
1.3.3: No. of administrative manuals designed and established for collecting, processing, and producing data and indicators of local crime and violence	3	3			3	3	100%	
1.3.4: No. of reports and analysis produced by the municipal observatory for crime and violence prevention	3	0			3	0	0%	The only supported violence observatory able to produce information on a weekly basis is the Santa Tecla Observatory. But CVPP does not have the reports. Although, the other three observatories produced information, they did not produce it on a weekly basis.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	Activity 1		Activity 3		End-of-Project Target Activities 1 and 3 Combined	Total Accumulated	Percent Delivered	Comments
	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated				
3.L: No. of centralized of crime and violence observatories established in the San Salvador Metropolitan Area			1	1	1	1	100%	
3. M: No. of municipalities from the San Salvador Metropolitan Area supported to create or strengthen crime and violence observatories			5	4	5	4	80%	
3.N: No. of activities contemplated in the Municipal Crime Prevention Plans in targeted areas in which the <i>Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo</i> (FEPADE) Crime Prevention Consortium has been involved			4	0	4	0	0%	FEPADE consortium is not on the field yet
3.P, 3.1.14: No. of systematized success stories of local violence prevention			3	2	3	2	67%	
3.Q, 3.1.15: No. of events organized for the public dissemination of systematized success stories of local violence prevention			3	0	3	0	0%	Local actors could not form consensus to enable the realization of these events
3.1.8, 3.1.16: No. of activities contemplated in the Municipal Crime Prevention Plans in targeted areas in which the FEPADE Crime Prevention Consortium has been involved			3	0	3	0	0	FEPADE consortium is not on the field yet
3.3.1, 4.A: No. of youths in targeted areas who have received vocational and basic education training			1,400	2,513	1,400	2,513	180%	
3.3.2, 4.B: No. of youth leaders in targeted areas who have received training in leadership			525	803	525	803	153%	

M, men; W, women; NA, not applicable

Activity 2				Comments
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated	Percent Delivered (%)	
2.A: No. of targeted Inter-institutional Executive Committee (IIEC) partner members who have made financial or in-kind contributions with host country-owned local currency funds to CVPP projects	5	13	260%	
2.B: No. of public safety initiatives self-initiated by targeted IIEC partner members based on the CVPP model	1	1	100%	
2.C: No. of targeted municipalities that have shared risk map data with the PNC	7	1	14%	
2.D: No. of GOES employees who have received CVPP training in CVP data collection and analysis according to the project-advised standard indicator list	3 W + 3 M	0	0%	CVPP did not produce this list. This was part of the EPV update conducted by GOES with another donor
2.E: No. of national-level GOES staff who have received CVPP training in CVP modules and activities	10W + 10 M	99 W + 109 M	990% W + 1,090% M	
2.F: No. of targeted IIEC partner members who have collected standardized indicator data from the CVPP-advised list	3	0	0%	CVPP did not produce this list. This was part of the EPV update conducted by GOES with another donor
2.G: No. of CVP case studies produced by universities that have received CVPP grants	7	5	71%	
2.H: No. of studies of El Salvador's crime and prevention policy and proposal of pertinent recommendations	1	1	100%	
2.I: No. of targeted GOES institutions who have made financial or in-kind contributions to CVPP projects	4	4	100%	
2.J No. of joint action plans to implement the EPV in three focal municipalities	1	2	200%	
2.K. No. of PREPAZ and/or CONJUVE staff trained in the EPV content	20 W, 20 M	17W, 26M	85W, 130M%	
2.L. No. of municipal staff and CVP IIWGs members of at least 3 municipalities trained in the EPV content	30 W, 30 M	23W,21M	76W%, 70M	
2.M. No. of public events celebrated with local actors for the public diffusion of the EPV	3	0	0%	GOES/PREPAZ moved this activity to 2013
2.N. No. of FEPADE consortium staff trained in the EPV content	10 W + 10 M	2W + 1 M	20%W + 10%M	
2.P. No. of municipal activities carried out under the joint action plans to implement the EPV in three focal municipalities	6	2	33%	
2.2.1: No. of national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions designed and implemented in a central governmental institution	1	0	0%	USAID removed this requirement because of shift in political focus/priorities. Therefore, no national CVP tracking and mapping system was established
2.2.2: No. of government agencies staff trained in the content and functioning of the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions	3 W, 2 M	0	0%	USAID removed this requirement because of shift in political focus/priorities. Therefore, no national CVP tracking and mapping system was established

Activity 2				Comments
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	End-of-Project Target	Total Accumulated	Percent Delivered (%)	
2.2.3: No. of COMURES informed about the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions	15 W, 15 M	0	0%	USAID removed this requirement because of shift in political focus/priorities. Therefore, no national CVP tracking and mapping system was established
2.2.4: No. of FEPADE consortium staff trained in the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions	5 W, 5 M	0	0%	USAID removed this requirement because of shift in political focus/priorities. Therefore, no national CVP tracking and mapping system was established
2.2.5: No. of municipal staff and/or CVP IIWGs members of at least 30 municipalities involved the national tracking and mapping system for municipal prevention interventions that are sensitized about its content	75 W, 75 M	0	0%	USAID removed this requirement because of shift in political focus/priorities. Therefore, no national CVP tracking and mapping system was established
2.2.6 No. of public events where results of tracking and mapping system for prevention interventions are publicly presented	1	0	0	USAID removed this requirement because of shift in political focus/priorities. Therefore, no national CVP tracking and mapping system was established
M, men; W, women.				

## Annex F. References and List of CVPP Publications

### References Cited<sup>27</sup>

- Diakonia. (2010). Construcción participativa de políticas locales para la inclusión social de jóvenes [Participatory construction of local policies for the social inclusion of youth]. In *Directory of Youth Services: El Salvador 2010* (CD Rom). Prepared by Diakonia in association with FUNDAMUNI, FUNDAUNGO, and SACDEL for the European Union and the Swedish Agency for Development Cooperation. [Database on over 50 providers of youth services in El Salvador: self-empowerment, job training and placement, social services, etc.]
- Citizen Participation Office of the Santa Tecla Mayor's Office (GMP-Santa Tecla). n.d. *Santa Tecla Modelo de Cambio. Manual de Descripción del proceso de Transferencia de Fondos*. [Santa Tecla Change Model. Manual for Describing the Process of Funds Transfer]. San Salvador, El Salvador: GMP-Santa Tecla. [Manual on transfers from Santa Tecla municipality of small grant funds to local CVP organizations. Procedures approved by the National Court of Accounts.]
- Fe y Alegría. (2011). *Sistematización de Familias Fuertes: Proyecto Educativo Integral para la Prevención de la Violencia en la Zona de la Chacra, Marzo 2008 a Agosto 2011* [Systematization of Strong Families: Integral Education Project for Violence Prevention in the La Chacra Area, March 2008 to August 2011]. San Salvador, El Salvador: Fe y Alegría.
- FUNDAUNGO. (2009). *Caminos hacia la Prevención: Inventario de Políticas de Prevención de la Violencia y del Crimen in Centroamérica* [Pathways to Prevention: Inventory of Violence and Crime Prevention Policies in Central America]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. [CVPP tool for national CVP policy development.]
- Galdámez, E. (2010). *Method for Victimization Surveys*. Prepared by RTI for USAID/El Salvador.
- Galdámez, E. (2012). *Sistematización del Proyecto en La Chacra* [Systematization of the La Chacra Project]. Prepared by RTI for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDNmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzMw>.
- Iniciativa Social para la Democracia (ISD). (2011a). *Manual para los Comités y Consejos Municipales de Prevención y Convivencia Social. Una Guía de Orientación Teórica y Práctica para el Buen Desempeño de los Comités y Consejos Municipales de Prevención y Convivencia Social, Desde un Enfoque de Seguridad Ciudadana* [Manual for Municipal Committees and Councils on Prevention and Social Co-existence. A Theoretical and Practical Guidebook for Proper Functioning of the Municipal Committees and Councils on

---

<sup>27</sup> The References Cited list only provides bibliographic information for citations identified in the main report (hence, some of the citations will not be in sequential order [e.g., RTI, 2012a is followed by RTI 2012d]. For a complete list of CVPP publications, see the second part of this annex entitled List of CVPP Publications.

Prevention and Social Co-existence from a Citizen Security Outlook]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. September 2011.

ISD. (2011b). *Plan Estratégico Municipal de Prevención Social de San Juan Opico* [San Juan Opico Municipal Social Prevention Strategic Plan]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. September 2011.

Instituto de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Centroamericana “José Simeón Cañas” (IDHUCA). (2009). *Elementos para el Fortalecimiento del Observatorio de Prevención de la Violencia en el Municipio de Santa Tecla* [Elements for Strengthening the Santa Tecla Violence Prevention Observatory]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. [CVPP manual for organization of a municipal CVP observatory, now superseded in part by IDHUCA, 2011c and 2011d.]

IDHUCA. (2011a). *Manual de Organización y Funcionamiento del Consejo Interinstitucional para la Prevención de la Violencia* [Inter-institutional Council for the Prevention of Violence and Crime Organizational and Functional Manual]. Prepared by G. M. Garzona (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.

IDHUCA. (2011b). *Manual de Doctrina del Agente Municipal Comunitario del Municipio de Santa Tecla* [Santa Tecla Municipal Community Policing Instructional Manual]. Prepared by J. A. Chinchilla Valdez (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador. [Manual on doctrine for community municipal (police) agents of the Santa Tecla Municipality.]

IDHUCA. (2011c). *Manual de Organización y Funcionamiento del Observatorio Municipal para la Prevención de la Violencia de Santa Tecla* [Manual on Organization and Functioning of the Santa Tecla Municipal Observatory for Violence Prevention]. Prepared by G. C. Corleto Carballo (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.

IDHUCA. (2011d). *Sistema de Monitoreo y Evaluación del Observatorio Municipal y del Consejo Interinstitucional de Prevención de la Violencia (CIPV) de Santa Tecla* [Monitoring and Evaluation System for the Santa Tecla Municipal Observatory and Inter-institutional Council for Violence Prevention (CIPV)]. Prepared by M. Góchez Rebollo (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.

IDHUCA. (2011e). *Mediación de Conflictos: una Alternativa para Prevención de la Violencia. Sistematización de la Propuesta de la Procuraduría General de la Republica* [Conflict Mediation: A Violence Prevention Alternative. Systematization of the Attorney General’s Office Proposal]. Prepared by C. Melara Ramírez Rebollo (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.

Krug, E.G., L.L. Dahlberg, J.A. Mercy, A.B. Zwi, and R. Lozano, eds. (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Organization of American States Observatory on Citizen Security. 2010.

[www.oas.org/dsp/Observatorio/database/countriesdetails.aspx?lang=en&country=USA](http://www.oas.org/dsp/Observatorio/database/countriesdetails.aspx?lang=en&country=USA).

RTI. (2012a). *Una Mirada Ponderativa a los Esfuerzos de la Prevención Social de la Violencia y de la Percepción de la Seguridad en las Comunidades Francisco Morazán, La Chacra, Quiñonez I* [A Balanced Assessment of Social Prevention of Violence and Perceptions of

Security in the Communities of Francisco Morazán, La Chacra, and Quiñonez I]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI. (2012d). *Guía Metodológico del Proceso de Convenios para Proyectos Que Se Ejecutan con Fondos de USAID/RTI* [Methodological Guide for the Project Contract Process for Projects Carried Out with USAID/RTI Funds]. Draft report prepared for USAID/El Salvador. [Methodological Guide to processing grants for projects funded by USAID/RTI.] <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4NDUz>.

RTI. (2012e). *Una Mirada Ponderativa a los Esfuerzos de Prevención Social de la Violencia en los Barrios San Juan y Santa Cruz y en las colonias Las Palmeras y Santa Emilia, Municipio de Izalco* [A Balanced Assessment of Social Prevention of Violence in the San Juan and Santa Cruz neighborhoods and in the Las Palmeras and Santa Emilia Neighborhoods of the Municipality of Izalco]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI. (2012f). *Evaluación Intermedia del Comportamiento de la Violencia y la Delincuencia en los 4 Asentamientos Poblacionales de Intervención en el Municipio de Armenia* [Midterm Evaluation of Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in 4 Population Settlements in the Municipality of Armenia]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MjY5>.

RTI. (2012g). *Principales Hallazgos de la Evaluación del Comportamiento de la Violencia y la Delincuencia en el Residencial Altavista* [Principal Findings from the Evaluation of Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in the Municipality of Altavista]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI. (2012i). *Línea Base Zaragoza* [Zaragoza Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzIx>.

RTI and CECI. n.d. *Building Social Peace with Peace and Happiness*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI and CECI. (2009a). *Manual de Capacitación sobre Cultura de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana* [Training Manual on Peaceful Coexistence and Peace Culture]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI and CECI. (2009c). *Principales Hallazgos del Estudio de Línea Base en Cuatro Comunidades del Distrito 6 Municipio de San Salvador, Departamento de San Salvador* [Principal Findings of the Baseline Study in Four Communities of District 6 of San Salvador, Department of San Salvador]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI and CECI. (2010). *Cómo Trabajar, de Forma Participativa, en la Prevención de la Violencia y la Delincuencia a Nivel Local* [How to Work in a Participatory Manner on the Prevention of Violence and Delinquency at the Local Level]. CVPP manual prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

RTI and CECI. 2011a. *Guide to Local Communication*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. [CVPP Manual on Communication strategies and techniques for local CVP councils.]

RTI and CECI. 2011b. *Evaluación Intermedia de la Evolución en la Seguridad Ciudadana en Cuatro Comunidades del Distrito Seis de San Salvador (Intermediate Evaluation of Citizen Security in Four Communities of District 6, San Salvador)*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

United States Department of State. *Partnership for Growth. El Salvador–United States Joint Country Action Plan 2011–2015*. Issued November 2011.

[http://photos.state.gov/libraries/elsavador/92891/octubre2011/Joint\\_Country\\_Action\\_Plan.pdf](http://photos.state.gov/libraries/elsavador/92891/octubre2011/Joint_Country_Action_Plan.pdf).

World Bank. (2010). *Crime and Violence in Central America: Volume II*. Report No. 56781-LAC.

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLAC/Resources/Eng\\_Volume\\_II\\_Crime\\_and\\_Violence\\_Central\\_America.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLAC/Resources/Eng_Volume_II_Crime_and_Violence_Central_America.pdf).

## List of CVPP Publications: Manuals, Guides, and Resource Materials

- Citizen Participation Office of the Santa Tecla Mayor's Office (GMP-Santa Tecla). n.d. *Santa Tecla Modelo de Cambio. Manual de Descripción del proceso de Transferencia de Fondos* [Santa Tecla Change Model. Manual for Describing the Process of Funds Transfer]. San Salvador, El Salvador: GMP-Santa Tecla. [Manual on transfers from Santa Tecla municipality of small grant funds to local CVP organizations. Procedures approved by the National Court of Accounts.]
- Fe y Alegría. (2011). *Sistematización de Familias Fuertes: Proyecto Educativo Integral para la Prevención de la Violencia en la Zona de la Chacra, Marzo 2008 a Agosto 2011* [Systematization of Strong Families: Integral Education Project for Violence Prevention in the La Chacra Area, March 2008 to August 2011]. San Salvador, El Salvador: Fe y Alegría.
- FIECA. (2011). *Diagnostico Municipal de Seguridad Ciudadana en Zaragoza* [Municipal Diagnostic Study on Citizen Security in Zaragoza]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador, May 2011.
- FIECA. *Plan Estratégico 2011–2015, Consejo Municipal de Prevención Zaragoza, departamento de La Libertad* [2011–2015 Strategic Plan, Municipal Prevention Council Zaragoza, Department of La Libertad]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- FUNDAUNGO. (2009). *Caminos hacia la Prevención: Inventario de Políticas de Prevención de la Violencia y del Crimen in Centroamérica* [Pathways to Prevention: Inventory of Violence and Crime Prevention Policies in Central America]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. [CVPP tool for national CVP policy development.]
- Galdámez, E. (2012). *Sistematización del Proyecto en La Chacra* [Systematization of the La Chacra Project]. Prepared by RTI for USAID/El Salvador.
- Gómez, M. (2012). *Resultados de la Encuesta de Opinión Individual de los CMPV de Izalco, La Chacra y Armenia* [Results of the Individual Opinion Surveys of the CMPVs in Izalco, La Chacra, and Armenia]. Prepared by RTI for USAID/El Salvador.
- Iniciativa Social para la Democracia (ISD). (2011a). *Manual para los Comités y Consejos Municipales de Prevención y Convivencia Social. Una Guía de Orientación Teórica y Práctica para el Buen Desempeño de los Comités y Consejos Municipales de Prevención y Convivencia Social, desde un Enfoque de Seguridad Ciudadana* [Manual for Municipal Committees and Councils on Prevention and Social Co-existence. A Theoretical and Practical Guidebook for Proper Functioning of the Municipal Committees and Councils on Prevention and Social Co-existence from a Citizen Security Outlook]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. September 2011.
- ISD. (2011b). *Plan Estratégico Municipal de Prevención Social de San Juan Opico* [San Juan Opico Municipal Social Prevention Strategic Plan]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador. September 2011.
- Instituto de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Centroamericana “José Simeón Cañas” (IDHUCA). (2009). *Elementos para el Fortalecimiento del Observatorio de Prevención de la Violencia en el Municipio de Santa Tecla* [Elements for Strengthening the Santa Tecla Violence Prevention Observatory]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.

[CVPP manual for organization of a municipal CVP observatory, now superseded in part by IDHUCA, 2011c and 2011d.]

- IDHUCA. (2011a). *Manual de Organización y Funcionamiento del Consejo Interinstitucional para la Prevención de la Violencia* [Inter-institutional Council for the Prevention of Violence and Crime Organizational and Functional Manual]. Prepared by G. M. Garzona (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.
- IDHUCA. (2011b). *Manual de Doctrina del Agente Municipal Comunitario del Municipio de Santa Tecla* [Santa Tecla Municipal Community Policing Instructional Manual]. Prepared by J. A. Chinchilla Valdez (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador. [Manual on doctrine for community municipal (police) agents of the Santa Tecla Municipality.]
- IDHUCA. (2011c). *Manual de Organización y Funcionamiento del Observatorio Municipal para la Prevención de la Violencia de Santa Tecla* [Manual on Organization and Functioning of the Santa Tecla Municipal Observatory for Violence Prevention]. Prepared by G. C. Corleto Carballo (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.
- IDHUCA. (2011d). *Sistema de Monitoreo y Evaluación del Observatorio Municipal y del Consejo Interinstitucional de Prevención de la Violencia (CIPV) de Santa Tecla* [Monitoring and Evaluation System for the Santa Tecla Municipal Observatory and Inter-institutional Council for Violence Prevention (CIPV)]. Prepared by M. Góchez Rebollo (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.
- IDHUCA. (2011e). *Mediación de Conflictos: una Alternativa para Prevención de la Violencia. Sistematización de la Propuesta de la Procuraduría General de la Republica* [Conflict Mediation: A Violence Prevention Alternative. Systematization of the Attorney General's Office Proposal]. Prepared by C. Melara Ramírez Rebollo (CVPP consultant, implemented by RTI and CECI) for USAID/El Salvador.
- Municipality of Zaragoza. (2012). *Política Municipal de Niñez y Adolescencia* [Municipal Policy for Children and Adolescents].
- Plan International. (2011a). *Promoción del Liderazgo Juvenil. Guía para Facilitadores y Facilitadoras* [Promotion of Youth Literacy. Guide for Facilitators]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011b). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 1: Derechos y Género* [Work Notebook No. 1: Gender and Rights]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011c). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 2: Identidad y Autoestima* [Work Notebook No. 2: Self Esteem and Identity]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011d). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 3: Ley de Protección Integral de la Niñez y Adolescencia (LEPINA)* [Work Notebook No. 3: Integral Protection of Children and Adolescents Law (LEPINA)]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011e). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 4: Liderazgo* [Work Notebook No. 4: Leadership]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.

- Plan International. (2011f). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 5: Prevención de la Violencia* [Work Notebook No. 5: Violence Prevention]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011g). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 6: Gestión de Proyectos* [Work Notebook No. 6: Project Management]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011h). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 7: Orientación Socio Ocupacional* [Work Notebook No. 7: Social and Occupational Orientation]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- Plan International. (2011i). *Cuaderno de Trabajo No. 8: Proyecto de Vida* [Work Notebook No. 8: Life Project]. Prepared under a CVPP grant for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2008). *Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (CVPP). First Annual Report, January–December 2008*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2009). *Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (CVPP). Second Annual Report, January–December 2009*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2010a). *Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (CVPP). Third Annual Report, October 2009–September 2010*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2011a). *Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (CVPP). Fourth Annual Report, October 2010–September 2011*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012a). *Una Mirada Ponderativa a los Esfuerzos de la Prevención Social de la Violencia y de la Percepción de la Seguridad en las Comunidades Francisco Morazán, La Chacra, Quiñonez I* [A Balanced Assessment of Social Prevention of Violence and Perceptions of Security in the Communities of Francisco Morazán, La Chacra, and Quiñonez I]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012b). *Estudio de Línea Base de la Intervención del Proyecto de Prevención de la Violencia y del Crimen a Nivel Comunitario en 7 Asentamientos Poblacionales del Municipio de Nahuizalco, Departamento de Sonsonate* [Baseline Study for Intervention for the Community-Based Violence and Crime Prevention Project in 7 Population Settlements in the Municipality of Nahuizalco, Sonsonate Department]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012c). *Community-based Crime and Violence Prevention Project (CVPP). Fifth Annual Report, October 2011–September 2012*. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012d). *Guía Metodológico del Proceso de Convenios para Proyectos Que Se Ejecutan con Fondos de USAID/RTI* [Methodological Guide for the Project Contract Process for Projects Carried Out with USAID/RTI Funds]. Draft report prepared for USAID/El Salvador. [Methodological Guide to processing grants for projects funded by USAID/RTI.]
- RTI. (2012e). *Una Mirada Ponderativa a los Esfuerzos de Prevención Social de la Violencia en los Barrios San Juan y Santa Cruz y en las Colonias Las Palmeras y Santa Emilia, Municipio de Izalco* [A Balanced Assessment of Social Prevention of Violence in the San Juan and Santa Cruz Neighborhoods and in the Las Palmeras and Santa Emilia Neighborhoods of the Municipality of Izalco]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.

- RTI. (2012f). *Evaluación Intermedia del Comportamiento de la Violencia y la Delincuencia en los 4 Asentamientos Poblacionales de Intervención en el Municipio de Armenia* [Midterm Evaluation of Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in 4 Population Settlements in the Municipality of Armenia]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012g). *Principales Hallazgos de la Evaluación del Comportamiento de la Violencia y la Delincuencia en el Residencial Altavista* [Principal Findings from the Evaluation of Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in the Municipality of Altavista]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012h). *Línea Base San Martín* [San Martin Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzI3>.
- RTI. (2012i). *Línea Base Opico* [Opico Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012j). *Línea Base Ahuachapán* [Ahuachapán Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MjY3>.
- RTI. (2012k). *Línea Base Ciudad Arce* [Ciudad Arce Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MjU1>.
- RTI. (2012l). *Línea Base Zaragoza* [Zaragoza Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzMx>.
- RTI. (2012m). *Línea Base Nejapa* [Nejapa Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzIx>.
- RTI. (2012n). *Línea Base San Antonio del Monte* [San Antonio del Monte Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzIz>.
- RTI. (2012o). *Línea Base San Martín (Fase III)* [San Martín Baseline Study (Phase 3)]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI. (2012p). *Línea Base Soyapango* [Soyapango Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4MzI3>.
- RTI. (2012q). *Línea Base Ilopango* [Ilopango Baseline Study]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.  
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MzI4Mjcy>.

- RTI and CECI. n.d. *Construyendo la Paz Social con Feliz y Pax* [Building Social Peace with Peace and Happiness]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2009a). *Manual de Capacitación sobre Cultura de Paz y Convivencia Ciudadana* [Training Manual on Peaceful Coexistence and Peace Culture]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2009b). *Principales Hallazgos de la Evaluación del Comportamiento de la Violencia y la Delincuencia en el Residencial Altavista* [Principal Findings from the Evaluation of Violence and Delinquency Tendencies in the Altavista Housing Development]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2009c). *Principales Hallazgos del Estudio de Línea Base en Cuatro Comunidades del Distrito 6 Municipio de San Salvador, Departamento de San Salvador* [Principal Findings of the Baseline Study in Four Communities of District 6 of San Salvador, Department of San Salvador]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2009d). *Principales Hallazgos del Estudio de Línea Base en Cuatro Asentamientos Poblacionales del Municipio de Armenia, Departamento de Sonsonate* [Principal Findings of the Baseline Study in Four Population Settlements in the Municipality of Armenia, Department of Sonsonate]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2009e). *Principales Hallazgos del Estudio de Línea Base en Cuatro Asentamientos Poblacionales del Municipio de Izalco, Departamento de Sonsonate* [Principal Findings of the Baseline Study in Four Population Settlements in the Municipality of Izalco, Department of Sonsonate]. Prepared by E. Galdámez (CVPP consultant) for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2010). *Cómo Trabajar, de Forma Participativa, en la Prevención de la Violencia y la Delincuencia a Nivel Local* [How to Work in a Participatory Manner on the Prevention of Violence and Delinquency at the Local Level]. CVPP manual prepared for USAID/El Salvador.
- RTI and CECI. (2011). *Guía de Comunicación Local* [Guide to Local Communication]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. [CVPP manual on communication strategies and techniques for local CVP councils.]

### **CVPP Bulletins**

- RTI. (2010b). Volumen 3. *No. 1 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 1 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. January 2010.
- RTI. (2010c). Volumen 3. *No. 2 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 2 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. February 2010.
- RTI. (2010d). Volumen 3. *No. 3 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 3 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. March 2010.

- RTI. (2010e). Volumen 3. *No. 4 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 4 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. April 2010.
- RTI. (2010f). Volumen 3. *No. 5 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 5 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. May 2010.
- RTI. (2010g). Volumen 3. *No. 6 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 6 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. June 2010.
- RTI. (2010h). Volumen 3. *No. 7 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 7 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. October 2010.
- RTI. (2011b). Volumen 3. *No. 8 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 8 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. January 2011.
- RTI. (2011c). Volumen 3. *No. 8 Boletín informativo Proyecto de Prevención de la violencia y del crimen a nivel comunitario* [Volume 3. News Bulletin No. 8 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. February 2011.
- RTI. (2011d). *Boletín Informativo No.9 Estrategia de Prevención de la Violencia Intrafamiliar y Promoción de la Equidad de Género* [News Bulletin No. 9 Domestic Violence Prevention and Gender Equity Strategy Promotion]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. March 2011.
- RTI. (2011e). *Boletín informativo No.10 Proyecto de Prevención de la Violencia y del Crimen a Nivel Comunitario* [News Bulletin No. 10 Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. June 2011.
- RTI. (2012r). *Boletín informativo Enero–Junio 2012. Promoviendo y Fortaleciendo mecanismos e iniciativas de participación ciudadana a nivel local que trabajan en pro de la prevención de la violencia social y criminalidad* [News Bulletin, January–June 2012. Promoting and Strengthening Citizen Participation Initiatives and Mechanisms at the Local Level that Promote the Prevention of Social Violence and Criminality]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. August 2012.
- RTI. (2012s). *Boletín informativo Julio–Octubre 2012. Pensá Diferente .... Poné Arte en tu Mente* [News Bulletin, July–October 2012. Think Differently....Put Art in Your Mind]. Prepared for USAID/El Salvador. October 2012.

## Annex G. CVPP Participant Communities per Phase, Municipality, and Activity

Municipality	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
<b>ACTIVITY 1</b>			
Armenia	Barrio Nuevo	Barrio Nuevo	
	Barrio San Juan	Barrio San Juan	
	Barrio San Sebastián	Barrio San Sebastián	
	Colonia San Damián	Colonia San Damián	
	Colonia Sigüenza	Colonia Sigüenza	
	Colonia Divina Providencia	Colonia Divina Providencia	
	Colonia San Fernando II	Colonia San Fernando II	
Ahuachapán		Comunidad El Triunfo	
		Comunidad Getsemani	
		Comunidad Los Girasoles I	
		Comunidad Los Girasoles II	
		Comunidad La Labor	
		Comunidad Los Ausoles	
		Comunidad Los Cocos	
		Comunidad Los Rodríguez	
	Comunidad Santa Lucía		
Izalco	Colonia Las Palmeras	Colonia Las Palmeras	
	Colonia Santa Emilia	Colonia Santa Emilia	
	Colonia Lourdes	Colonia Lourdes	
	Colonia San José	Colonia San José	
	Colonia Barrios San Juan	Colonia Barrios San Juan	
	Colonia Santa Cruz	Colonia Santa Cruz	
	Colonia Galana	Colonia Galana	
San Salvador	Comunidad Francisco Morazán	Comunidad Francisco Morazán	
	Comunidad la Chacra	Comunidad la Chacra	
	Comunidad Quiñonez I	Comunidad Quiñonez I	
	Comunidad Quiñonez II	Comunidad Quiñonez II	
	Comunidad San Luis I	Comunidad San Luis I	
	Comunidad San Martín Municipal	Comunidad San Martín Municipal	
Tonacatepeque	4 communities in Altavista	4 communities in Altavista	Los Henríquez Comunidad Los Naranjos La Ermita
Ilopango			Colonia San Bartolo 9a etapa Colonia Bosque de la Paz Sector Santa Lucía Comunidad Dolores de Apulo Comunidad Banco Hipotecario
San Martín		Comunidad Tierra Virgen	
		Comunidad Los Olivos Centro	
		Comunidad Los Olivos Oriente	
		Comunidad Los Olivos Poniente	
			Colonia Santa Gertrudis Lotificación San Andrés Valle las Delicias Proyecto Santa Teresa

Municipality	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
<b>Activity 3</b>			
Ciudad Arce		Comunidad Santa Rosa	Comunidad Santa Rosa
		Comunidad Santa Lucía zona 1	Comunidad Santa Lucía zona 1
		Comunidad Santa Lucía zona 2	Comunidad Santa Lucía zona 2
		Comunidad San Andrés	Comunidad San Andrés
		Urbanización San Francisco	Urbanización San Francisco
Nahuizalco		Caserío Centro de canton Pushtán	Caserío Centro de canton Pushtán
		Caserío Centro de canton Sisimitepec	Caserío Centro de canton Sisimitepec
		Comunidad Milagrosa II	Comunidad Milagrosa II
		Comunidad Xochilt-Ixtatec	Comunidad Xochilt-Ixtatec
		Barrio Las Mercedes	Barrio Las Mercedes
		Barrio La Trinidad	Barrio La Trinidad
San Juan Opico		Barrio San Juan	Barrio San Juan
		Comunidad El Papayal	Comunidad El Papayal
		Comunidad Las Flores	Comunidad Las Flores
		Comunidad Jabalincito	Comunidad Jabalincito
		Comunidad Buenos Aires	Comunidad Buenos Aires
Zaragoza		Comunidad Nueva Candelaria	Comunidad Nueva Candelaria
		Comunidad Sitio El Grande	Comunidad Sitio El Grande
		Comunidad Esmeraldita II	Comunidad Esmeraldita II
		Comunidad Los Cedros	Comunidad Los Cedros
		Comunidad El Corralito	Comunidad El Corralito
Nejapa		Comunidad El Zaité II	Comunidad El Zaité II
		Colonia San Antonio I	Colonia San Antonio I
		Colonia San Antonio II	Colonia San Antonio II
		Colonia Miramar	Colonia Miramar
			Colonia Nuevo Ferrocarril
San Antonio del Monte			Colonia Nueva Esperanza
			Comunidad Bonete
			Comunidad Cedral-Rosario
			Colonia El Mirador
Soyapango			Colonia El Carmen
			Residencial San Antonio
			Urbanización Lomas de San Antonio II etapa
			Colonia San Fernando
		Colonia Los Santos 1	
		Colonia Bosques de Prusia	
		Colonia San José	

**Total by Phase**  
**86 Communities**  
**Participated**

**24**

**38**

**24**

Please note that the communities shaded green are the same. CVPP continued working with the same communities during our phased implementation to maximize technical assistance and ensure impact