



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MEPP II COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM III (CAP III) INTERIM MONITORING IN ANBAR

FINAL REPORT

June 17, 2009

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by John Roscoe, Dr. Mary Hayden and Harvey Herr of International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc., Baghdad, Iraq.

MEPP II COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM III (CAP III) INTERIM MONITORING IN ANBAR

FINAL REPORT



International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc.
8614 Westwood Center Drive
Suite 400
Vienna, VA 22182

Contracted under 267-C-00-05-00508-00

Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Program, Phase II (MEPP II)

DISCLAIMER

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

LIST OF ACRONYMS	II
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	III
FINDINGS	III
RECOMMENDATIONS	VI
CONCLUSION.....	VII
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PURPOSE OF THE CHF CAP III ANBAR MONITORING	2
STUDY QUESTIONS FROM THE SOW	2
III. MONITORING METHODS	3
ANALYSIS.....	3
PROCEDURES	3
IV. FINDINGS.....	4
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES STATUS AND PROGRESS TOWARDS ANNUAL TARGETS:.....	4
ENGAGEMENT OF COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT:.....	6
MONITORING OF PROGRAM:	12
CHF INTERACTION WITH EPRTS	13
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	13
VI. CONCLUSION	15
ANNEX I. SCOPE OF WORK (SOW) FOR COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM III (CAP III) INTERIM MONITORING REPORT, ANBAR, APRIL 29, 2009	16
ANNEX II. LIST OF REVIEWED CAP III DOCUMENTS	19
ANNEX III. IRAQI STAKEHOLDER KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDES (ENGLISH)	20

List of Acronyms

API	Annual Implementation Plan
CAP III	Community Action Program, Phase III
CERP	Commander's Emergency Response Program
CHF	Cooperative Housing Foundation
CoAg	Cooperative Agreement
COTR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
ePRT	Embedded Provincial Reconstruction Team
EU	Engineering Unit
GOI	Government of Iraq
HQ	Headquarters
IBTCI	International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc.
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEPP II	Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Program, Phase II
PDT	Performance Data Table
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PRA	Participatory Rapid assessment
PRT	Provincial Reconstruction Team
QRF	Quick Reaction Force
SOW	Scope of Work
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On April 29, 2009, International Business and Technical Consultants Inc.'s (IBTCI) Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Program, Phase II (MEPP II) team received a Scope of Work (SOW) from USAID/Iraq's Focused Stabilization Office (FSO) to conduct an interim monitoring of the Community Action Program, Phase III (CAP III) implemented by Cooperative Housing Foundation International (CHF) in Anbar. The purpose of this monitoring was to analyze the progress made in the activities under the following objectives:

Objective 1: Communities better articulate their needs and mobilize resources within and outside the community to solve common problems and

Objective 2: Local executive and representative Government in CAP communities better meet the articulated needs of the community as described in their implementation plan, implementation plan timeframe and Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP).

The SOW required the study to answer a variety of questions related to: the status of CHF's activities in Anbar; the processes CHF is following to engage the community and local government (LG); how CHF is monitoring the program; and, how CHF is interacting with Embedded Provincial Reconstruction Teams (ePRTs). The specific areas of focus under each question were negotiated in a series of meetings with FSO staff. The findings are noted below organized by question.

Findings

1. What is the status of CHF activities in Anbar?

- There are 85 Community Action Groups (CAGs) (Program Target: 158 (CHF International CAP III Performance Management Plan (PMP))). 50 CAGs are "existing" CAGs from CAP II (PMP indicates a total of 43 or 44) while 35 "new" CAGs have been created under CAP III (PMP program target of 114 or 115).
- 82 CAGs have received Participatory Rapid Assessment (PRA) Training (PMP Q3 Target: 60 and Q4 Target: 85).
- CHF has not conducted specific advocacy training for CAGs though 31 CAG members from six Nahia (sub-districts) did participate in advocacy training as part of the LG Training activity.
- Four CAP III projects have been implemented (Target 60: Annual Implementation Plan (AIP)), eleven approved, ten underway, and 16 in the tendering process.
- 81 LG members have received LG Core Training, including members from nine LGs (seven Nahia councils and two Qada councils) (no Targets for Anbar are provided in the PMP or AIP).

Reasons for delays:

- *Lack of Expat Staffing, Guidance and Support*
- *Confusion over CAP III's Objectives Versus Those of CAPs I and II*
- *Poor Coordination of CAG PRA and LG Training*
- *Expansion of Program into Western Anbar*
- *Local Councils Viewed as Illegitimate.*

2. What processes is CHF using to engage the community and local government?

a) Community engagement

- *Selection of target communities:* Community identification is driven by economic need, rather than a studied consideration of the community's ability to implement and meet CAP III objectives, including: sub-district and district council representations; demonstrated commitment to program objectives and CDD framework; and, LG willingness to invest in capacity-building, infrastructure and service-delivery.
- *Identification of new CAG members:* CHF Community Facilitators organize a "White Meeting" that is open to all local citizens and leaders. At that meeting eight to twelve CAG members are selected by attendees.
- *Capacity Building and Training of CHF Community Facilitators:* Many received prior training under CAPs I and II. CAP III has only provided PRA training to trainers (Community Facilitators) in the form of a written guide/manual. No courses or workshops have been held. Community Facilitators receive intermittent guidance from the Provincial Senior Manager.
- *Training of CAGs:* PRA Trainings last three-days and train participants in community social mapping, project assessment and selection, and site visits but not in LG relations, the development of LG engagement plans or advocacy. Three days in a row was difficult for some members while others felt the volume of information required a less intensive approach, perhaps spending more time to impart the information by spreading the training over a longer period or more CHF/CAP III-supported projects. Two local council members from the area are invited to attend the training. Retention of PRA processes is poor.
- *Frequency of CAG meetings:* CAGs usually hold meetings at least once a week.
- *Local Project Selection and Design:* During PRA training CAGs select one project that is considered feasible, sustainable and will have significant impact on the community as their first, CHF/CAP III-supported project. At the same time they select another three projects according to priority based on community needs.
- *Whether Projects are Meeting Community Needs:* Communities report that the projects meet the needs of the community because they are selected by the community and not imposed on them by remote authorities.

b) Local government engagement

- *Local Council Knowledge of CAP III:* Many LG officials are not aware that the program's focus is on getting communities to better articulate their needs and mobilize resources while they are supposed to focus on the skills and processes required to better meet those articulated needs.
- *Local Council engagement processes, participation and support:* Contrary to the intended CAG-centered LG engagement process, CHF's local staff are primarily responsible for identifying, making contact with and encouraging LG participation and advocacy. LGs have participated in many aspects of CAP III projects, attending trainings, meeting with CAGs, performing site visits, performing project follow-ups, and applying for government technical assistance and the necessary permits and approvals. To date, however, local councils have not successfully taken a leadership role in project

implementation and advocating for funds and resources at the Government Directorate and Provincial Council level. CHF staff has led this effort.

- *Training of Local Government Members:* LG Core Training is preceded by visits to the participating local councils by CHF staff. They introduce the program, describe the training, and invite the council to nominate members to attend. Trainees stated that each day involved three hours of “lectures, lessons and doing tests” with breaks in between. They also did practical exercises to reinforce what had been covered in the lectures and were given the opportunity to discuss issues and air their views. They learned how to assess proposed projects, budgeting, basic advocacy at the provincial level, and how to follow-up projects.

There appears to be confusion between the LG Trainers and the newly arrived expatriate LG Advisor with regard to the required level of training. The LG Advisor stated he was worried the core course is “too elementary.” An Intermediate Training curriculum is in development. Training of Trainers (TOT) on Intermediate Training is scheduled for July. Advanced Training and On-Job-Training is planned for the future. CHF has started to extend technical assistance to local councils.

The training of local councils has not been coordinated with the PRA Training of corresponding CAGs.

- *Level of Local Commitment/Contribution to Project Support:* CAGs reported that they devote considerable attention to community contribution. One CAG had a separate committee for this purpose. Community contribution includes such things as equipment, vehicles and drivers, security and logistics support.

3. How is CHF monitoring their program in Anbar?

- M&E has only just started in Anbar. Until recently Anbar staff were unable to complete a Performance Data Tables (PDT). The problem was resolved in April when the Program Officer from CHF HQ showed them how to collect and report the data.
- CHF’s M&E Manager in Anbar does not have the authority or the capacity to perform project site or training session visits and interviews with staff. He relies on Community Facilitators and CHF Engineers to provide him with reports on the trainings and site visits they conduct.
- PRA Trainings of CAGs are mostly unmonitored¹, however Community Facilitators prepare Training Reports on all PRA Trainings.
- LG Trainings are not monitored by CHF.
- *Quality Controls – Contractor Bids and Selection:* CHF employs a centralized bidding process. While tenders are placed out in the Anbar community by the local office, the Engineering Unit (EU) processes the bids back at CHF’s Iraq HQ in Hilla.
- *Site visits:* CHF Community Facilitators and Engineers perform regular site visits to CHF/CAP III-supported projects. CHF engineers collect samples of materials such as concrete, sand and blocks that are sent to local labs for quality testing. CHF engineers also assess project progress. Site reports are prepared and sent to the Project

¹ The Provincial Senior Manager and Anbar M&E Manager do try to attend some trainings.

Managers who compile them in a project tracking report and summarize them in a weekly report that goes to the Anbar M&E Manager and Provincial Senior Manager. The Anbar M&E Manager said that CHF HQ had not yet approved this reporting system. At project closeout the project tracking sheet, site visit reports, lab tests, and all related documentation are compiled in a file that is sent to Hilla for archiving.

- Channels of Communication with Local Staff are not monitored by CHF.
- *Professionalism of Local Staff and Mentoring*: There does not appear to be a systematic process for monitoring staff professionalism and performance or for mentoring.

4. How is CHF interacting with ePRTs?

- The current ePRTs are mostly new to their positions. However, the Provincial Senior Manager has made many visits to the ePRTs to inform them of CHF's work. The PRT requested that CHF expand their geographic areas to include Rutbah, Rawah, and Anah in Western Anbar. CHF is providing training to CAGs in these three areas. There are no plans to extend LG Training to these areas.

Recommendations

- *Management*: CHF should review its resident Anbar management levels, managers' roles, and their authority to make decisions. Managers need to be clear about their roles and authority while local staff needs to be sure about who are their line managers and better understand the management hierarchy.
- *Staffing Levels*: CHF should review its current field staffing levels in Anbar. There is a need to increase the number of Community Facilitators, CHF Engineers and LG Trainers, and develop an independent M&E staff under the Anbar M&E Manager.
- *Logistics Support*: CHF needs to provide more vehicles, better communications, and logistics and finance support to field personnel.
- *Program Fidelity*: CHF staff and participating councils need to be realigned with the program objectives so that CAP III is not viewed primarily as a program to implement projects but rather as a program to train Local Councils and new CAGs in the skills and processes required to develop, implement and advocate for approvals and funds to support community based initiatives at the Directorate and Provincial Council level.
- *LG Training Coordination*: CHF needs to better coordinate LG Training with its other activities. CHF has allowed its subcontractor for LG Training to operate its activity in parallel rather than in lockstep with CHF's other activities.
- *LG Training Timing and Intensity*: CHF needs to consider whether LG core-training should be lengthened or modularized. CHF also needs to consider coordinating LG Training so that it dovetails with the development of new local CAGs. Timing LG Trainings so they precede the submission of CHF/CAP III-supported projects in their area would provide structured opportunities for council members to apply the skills and processes imparted in training and make them better able to retain and replicate these to future project submissions.
- *PRA Training*: CHF should improve its PRA and advocacy training for CAGs and LG members by including LG relations and advocacy in its curriculum. The participation of LG members in PRA Training should be formalized.

- *Support for More than One CHF/CAP III-supported project per CAG/LG:* USAID and CHF should consider supporting more “seed capital” projects per CAG/LG.
- *Mentoring interventions:* CHF should formalize the role already being played by the Provincial Senior Manager and her staff in mentoring CAGs and local councils on post-CAP III funded projects, particularly with regard to advocacy at the Directorate and Provincial Council level.
- *Overcoming the Issue of Local Councils’ Perceived Illegitimacy by Partnering Them with Influential Political Actors:* CHF should formalize the practice employed by the Provincial Senior Manager and her staff in partnering local councils with elected Mayors and policy makers to bolster their clout with Directorates and the Provincial Council.
- *CHF Needs to Consider Ways to Transfer Advocacy and Funding Work Currently Being Performed by CHF Staff to CAGs and Local Councils.* While the active engagement of local staff members is essential to the success of CAP III’s approach, the program is premised on the goal of having LG and local citizens take responsibility for meeting their needs per Intermediate Results 9.2.2.1, 9.2.2.3, and 9.2.2.5 in the CHF CAP III PMP.
- *CHF Needs to Establish a Proper M&E Office, Staff and System in Anbar:* A proper M&E system and independent M&E Office for Anbar needs to be established with an M&E staff, budget and logistics support, including vehicles to enable visits to training sessions and project sites. M&E data and findings should be reported directly to the Deputy Director for Anbar and not to the Provincial Senior Manager. LG Training should fall under the M&E Office’s review and proper baselines established in line with the requirements of the CHF CAP III PMP.
- *USAID and CHF Should Assess Sufficient Staff and Resources are Available to Continue its Expansion into Western Anbar:* USAID and CHF should explore the possibility of accessing Quick Reaction Force QRF or Commander’s Emergency Response Program (CERP) funds to support this expansion.

Conclusion

CHF CAP III in Anbar is implementing its program with varying degrees of success depending on activity. Satisfactory progress towards meeting Objectives 1 and 2 is being made across all activities with the exception of those dedicated to the development and training of LGs to better meet the needs of the community and mobilize resources. LG Training is lagging behind the program’s other activities. This is unfortunate as this activity is CAP III’s primary point of departure from the efforts made under CAP I and CAP II, that focused on the development of CAGs for the prioritization, implementation, and oversight of development projects. Staff and program beneficiaries have not fully adjusted to this new strategic shift of focus in programmatic effort. Issues with the absence of expatriate management in Anbar, staffing levels, poor logistics support, the expansion of the program into Western Anbar, and poor coordination between CHF and its subcontractor for LG Training have all contributed to this problem.

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 29, 2006, USAID/Iraq awarded Cooperative Agreement No. 267-A-00-08-00503-00 to Cooperative Housing Foundation International (CHF) in Anbar Province as part of the Community Action Program, Phase III (CAP III). The primary objective of CAP III is to empower local councils and citizens to jointly participate in a more effective, responsive and transparent community development process that meets communities' articulated needs and begins to mobilize Iraqi resources to fulfill local government (LG) responsibilities. CAP III falls within USAID/Iraq's Mission Strategic Objective 9 "Effective Local Government Strengthened."

CAP I & II used Community Actions Groups (CAGs) as the vehicle for the prioritization, implementation, and oversight of development projects, leaving a relatively limited role to LG whose capacity at that time was extremely limited. Through a targeted set of trainings and rigorous hands-on experience gained through working with existing CAGs, CAP III partners are expected to support processes that create empowered local councils and engaged citizens jointly addressing community needs, thus strengthening the role and the legitimacy of LGs throughout Iraq.

The CAP III project is based on the premise that local community needs are best met by ensuring the active partnership of all community groups: citizens, LG, and business and social leaders, in identifying priorities and designing interventions. CAP I and II focused primarily on building the capacity of community action groups (CAGs) to fill the gap of LG and exercise true grassroots democracy by implementing projects on their own where necessary and in partnership with LG where possible to meet community needs. CAP III will focus on furthering the evolution of community-centered development by building the capacity of LG to take on its proper governance role as the locus of community needs assessment, prioritization, project design, funding and implementation.

CAP III's three program objectives are:

- *Objective 1:* Communities better articulate their needs and mobilize resources within and outside the community to solve common problems.
- *Objective 2:* Local executive and representative Government in CAP communities better meet the articulated needs of the community.
- *Objective 3:* Civilian Victims of Conflict Assisted.

CAP III partners are expected to deliver the program's objectives by providing high-quality technical assistance, training, and targeted funding with both CAGs and LG. By doing so successfully, CAP III will help the nascent Iraqi democracy move to the next level of organizational development and bring much needed local development to Iraq's citizenry.

This monitoring focuses on the program's first two objectives. The assessment is specifically concerned with the progress CHF has made in Anbar under these two objectives and the processes it is applying to deliver the program.

II. PURPOSE OF THE CHF CAP III ANBAR MONITORING

On April 29, 2009, International Business and Technical Consultants Inc.'s (IBTCI) Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Program, Phase II (MEPP II) team received a Scope of Work (SOW) from USAID/Iraq's Focused Stabilization Office (FSO) to conduct an interim monitoring of the CAP III program implemented by CHF in Anbar. The purpose of this monitoring was to analyze the progress made in the activities under the following objectives:

Objective 1: Communities better articulate their needs and mobilize resources within and outside the community to solve common problems.

Objective 2: Local executive and representative Government in CAP communities better meet the articulated needs of the community as described in their implementation plan, implementation plan timeframe and PMP.

The SOW required the study to answer a variety of questions related to: the status of CHF activities; the processes CHF is following to engage the community and LG; how CHF is monitoring the program; and, how CHF is interacting with ePRTs. The specific areas of focus under each question were negotiated in a series of meetings with FSO staff.

Study Questions from the SOW

1. What is the status of CHF's activities under Objectives 1 and 2:
 - Are activities being conducted as per the identified timeframe? If there are delays, what are the reasons behind the delays?
 - What is the progress towards annual targets?
2. What is the process CHF is following to engage the community and local government?

Community Engagement

- How are CAGs members identified?
- What training have they received?
- How many meetings have they had as a group?
- What is the process for project selection and are the projects meeting community needs?

Local Government Engagement

- How well do the local councils know about the program?
- What is the process of local government engagement?
- What is the extent of LG participation in the program?
- What training has LG received so far?
- What is the level of LG commitment/contribution to project support?

3. How is CHF monitoring their program in Anbar? This should include such issues as quality controls, frequency of site visits, channels of communication with local staff, professionalism of local staff and mentoring, etc.
4. How is CHF interacting with ePRTs and how is their input utilized in program implementation?

III. MONITORING METHODS

The monitoring involved collecting data from the following sources: 1) desk review of USAID and CHF documents and reports, and 2) key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus groups (FGs). In order to preserve the proximity to the subject required in a monitoring exercise, all KIIs and FGs were performed in the field at participants' places of work or nearby within the community.

Analysis

The following qualitative methods were employed to collect data related to CHF's CAP III activities in Anbar.

1. A desk review of the literature related to the program's activities under Objectives 1 and 2.
2. A desk review of CHF documents and reports.
3. KIIs and FGs with CHF expatriate and TCN managers, CHF local senior staff, CHF local field staff, ePRT members, CAG members, and local council members.

Desk Review of CHF Documents and Reports. Expatriate MEPP II staff requested and reviewed all relevant documents and reports from USAID and CHF.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Groups. Discussion guides were developed for the KIIs and the FGs (See Annex II). The guides were developed based on questions developed in a series of meetings with FSO for the SOW (see Section II above).

Procedures

Who conducted the KIIs and FGs: IBTCI expatriate staff conducted KIIs with CHF expatriate and Third Country National managers, CHF local senior staff, and ePRT members. Q2, a local Iraqi public opinion research firm subcontracted by IBTCI, conducted KIIs and FGs with CAG members, LG members, and CHF local field staff. These data were collected from May 18, 2009 to June 1, 2009.

Number and Location of KIIs and FGs: Seven KIIs with CHF expatriate and TCN managers were conducted at Hilla and two were held in Ramadii. Two KII's with CHF local senior staff were conducted in Ramadi. Three FGs with ePRT members (USAID reps and other interested members) were conducted in Ramadi, Fallujah and Heet. Twelve KIIs and FGs with CHF local field staff, CAG members and LG members were conducted by Q2 in and around Ramadi, Heet and Fallujah. This often required fieldwork staff to travel to remote villages and meet with persons in their homes or the home of the local sheikh. With one exception the fieldwork went

to schedule as planned. One KII had to be rescheduled because the respondent could not make it to the first scheduled KII.

Logistics: IBTCI would like to acknowledge CHF's outstanding assistance and cooperation in the scheduling, arranging of venues, and organizing peoples' attendance. The districts monitored cover large areas that complicate logistics but CHF's local staff performed without a hitch.

Data reduction and synthesis: Due to the short time available in which to complete fieldwork and prepare this report, IBTCI compressed the analysis process into three steps.

1. MEPP III staff and Q2 prepared "Summary Reports" from the taped KIIs and FGs. These Summary Reports reduced responses for each question asked into summarized paragraphs and provided only key quotes to help illustrate findings.
2. Staff brainstormed to review and transform the data systematically so that it answered the research questions in the SOW.
3. Staff synthesized the answers with the relevant desk research to arrive at findings and draw the report's recommendations.

IV. FINDINGS

Program Activities Status and Progress Towards Annual Targets:

- *Number of Established CAGs:* Midway through the third quarter of the first year, CHF has established or worked with 85 Community Action Groups (CAGs) (Program Target: 158 (CHF International CAP III Performance Management Plan (PMP))).
- *Number of Holdover CAGs from CAP II and new CAGs:* Of the 85 communities in which CAGs have been established, 50 are "existing" CAGs from CAP II (the PMP indicates the program should include a total of 43 or 44 CAGs established under CAPs I and II) while 35 "new" CAGs have been created under CAP III (PMP program target of 114 or 115).
- *Number of CAGs who have Received PRA Training:* 82 CAGs have received training (PMP Q3 Target: 60 and Q4 Target: 85) in participatory rapid assessment (PRA).
- *Advocacy Training for CAGs:* CHF has not conducted specific advocacy training for CAGs though 31 CAG members from six Nahia did participate in advocacy training as part of the LG Training activity. The PMP does not provide specific targets for advocacy training of CAG members though the Annual Implementation Plan for Year 1 (AIP) does set a target of 25 CAGs by the end of Year 1.
- *Number of Implemented CAP III Projects:* CHF has implemented four projects (the PMP does not state project implementation targets for Anbar. Instead, it provides a target for Anbar and South Central of 200 completed projects. The AIP provides a year 1 target for South Central and Anbar of 170 implemented projects and breaks this out as 110 in South Central and 60 in Al Anbar), has 11 more projects approved, 10 underway, and another 16 in the tendering process.
- *Number of LG Members who have Received CHF LG Training:* CHF reports it has provided core training to 81 LG participants, including members from nine LGs (seven Nahia and two Qada councils) (no Targets for Anbar are provided in the PMP or AIP).

Reasons for delays:

- *Lack of Expat Staffing, Guidance and Support:* CHF has had a series of interim Country Directors. There has been either no or only short-term Deputy Directors, one LG Advisor for both regions, and no in-country M&E Manager. Local staff complained about the lack of a clear chain of command and strategic guidance. They unanimously referred to the Provincial Senior Manager as the Regional Director since, until recently, she had been leading the CAP effort in Anbar since May 2007. In fact, the new expatriate Deputy Director for Anbar now holds this position. Community Facilitators in Fallujah complained that office expenses are not timely reimbursed and that they pay communications expenses out of their own pockets. They also complained that there are not enough vehicles or staff (Community Facilitators and Engineers) to adequately cover their districts, particularly in Ramadi, which is the largest district in Anbar, and Heet, which is also servicing communities in Western Anbar. Community Facilitators also stated that despite the long hours they work they have received no mention of appreciation from anyone at CHF except the Provincial Senior Manager. Moreover, they complained their salaries were low compared to government workers. The LG Trainers reported that despite repeated emails to their expatriate managers they had not received office space, office supplies and equipment, or budgetary and logistics support. They did not know who was in charge of them.
- *Confusion Over CAP III's Objectives Versus Those of CAPs I and II:* The program focus should be to emphasize the training of Local Councils in the skills and processes required to develop and support community based initiatives rather than the implementation of specific projects.

Provincial Senior Manager: "The objective of CAP III is to train CAGs how to determine the community's needs.... We have a program to train local governments how to listen to these CAGs and accept the needs asked by the people and how these CAGs can get [resources for these] projects from the government."

- *Poor Coordination of CAG PRA and LG Training:* Due to uncertainty over the timing of local council elections, CHF postponed rollout of LG Trainings until the last week in May. The training of council members has not been coordinated to coincide and the skills and processes required to process CHF/CAP III-sponsored projects. IBTCI selected four completed projects and asked to interview the CAG and local council members from each project area. The local council members from Garmah, however, although having received LG Training, claimed that no CAG operated in their area and that there were no CHF/CAP III-sponsored projects in their area.
- *Expansion of Program into Western Anbar:* CAP III has expanded its activities into Western Anbar (Rawah, Anna, and Rutbah). Community Facilitators complained about a lack of management, budget and logistics (transportation and lodging) in support of this expansion. Anbar is by far Iraq's largest province. Travel to and from its Western communities can take a full day or require an overnight stay.
- *Local Councils Viewed as Illegitimate:* Many District Councils, Provincial Councilors and Directorate officials do not recognize the legitimacy of the US Government appointed local councils and refuse to deal with them. This is especially the case in Ramadi where the District Council holds to the belief that government directorates and the Provincial Council should be setting development priorities for Anbar and projects should be selected and budgeted accordingly. The Anbar M&E Manager noted that, apart from the CHF/CAP III-supported projects, CAGs had submitted and had 55 other projects

approved by local councils. However, when the CAGs and local councils submitted them to the Provincial Council only two were approved. He stated that, apart from the illegitimacy issue, this could be because the Provincial Council has already allocated its annual budget for development projects.

Engagement of Communities and Local Government:

Communities

- *Selection of Target Communities:* CHF Community Facilitators are not applying all of the first and second round criteria to select communities. Community identification is driven primarily by economic need, rather than a studied consideration of the community's ability to implement and meet CAP III objectives, including: sub-district and district council representations; demonstrated commitment to program objectives and CDD framework; and, LG willingness to invest in capacity-building, infrastructure and service-delivery. It is not clear how much information on each community is collected or what type of LG feasibility analysis, if any, is performed before selecting a target community. The M&E Manager for Anbar indicated that to date there has been no monitoring of this process beyond the general information that Community Facilitators include in their weekly reports to the Provincial Senior Manager and himself.

Community Facilitator: "When we go to an area we apply certain criteria that we studied with CHF...we take the following into consideration: Is the population above 1,000 persons; Is the community in need of services; Is the community ready to help and cooperate.... Sometimes...the council decides which area deserves help more because they know the areas better and have a good idea about the Regional Development Program."

- *Identification of New CAG Members:* In each target community CHF Community Facilitators organize a "White Meeting" that is open to all local citizens and leaders. At that meeting eight to twelve CAG members are selected by attendees. CAGs typically comprise a number of local citizens, local council members, people with particular skills and training, and persons with local and/or regional influence, e.g., the local Mukhtar, well regarded sheikhs or wealthy individuals. Monitors reported that although eight to twelve members are selected, usually only five or six end up playing an active role, attending training and performing regular site visits. These are usually the most prominent members such as sheikhs, the Mukhtar, council members, persons with relevant expertise and/or wealthy members of the community.
- *Capacity Building and Training of CHF Community Facilitators:* According to the Anbar M&E Manager, some Community Facilitators received basic PRA training in Amman, Jordan under CAP II. That training was conducted by Philadelphia University using professors from the United States. Upon their return to Iraq, those Facilitators attended four or five workshops in Baghdad and Anbar that rehearsed PRA Trainings. Since CAP III started, CHF has only provided PRA training to trainers (Community Facilitators) through a written guide/manual. No courses or workshops have been held. Community Facilitators do receive intermittent guidance from the Provincial Senior Manager.

Community Facilitator: "We received PRA training by CHF through a guide, not a course. [The Provincial Senior Manager] provided a one-day curriculum that we read ourselves."

Community Facilitators: “[The training] was useful but needed to be more...the training needed to be explained more.”

Community Facilitators also received one day’s training from the Anbar M&E Manager and in project implementation.

Community Facilitator: “CHF arranged a course for us in the CHF office about the cycle of the project: how it starts and how it ends.”

- *Training of CAGs:* The dates for the training are decided at the White Meeting after CAG members are selected. Community Facilitators have trained members from 82 CAGs in PRA. These courses last three-days and train participants in community social mapping, project assessment and selection, and site visits but not in LG relations, the development of LG engagement plans or advocacy. Two local council members from the area are also invited to attend the training. Community Facilitators provide the training and are widely praised by trainees for their dedication and commitment to the communities they serve. A CHF engineer is also present to assist in the social mapping component and guiding discussion on the technical details of proposed projects. The Provincial Senior Manager and Anbar M&E Manager try to attend trainings so they can provide feedback to the Community Facilitators. Due to the distances and time involved they only make it to a few trainings. The M&E Manager noted however, noted that there is *“always a report with a photo from the Community Facilitator about the results of this [training].”*

CAG Member: We received training...for three days on the project work (CAP III) and its nature, [project] preferences and priorities. It was about knowing the nature of the region, the population, which project is most necessary, and studying project cost. After that....we prepared three projects and chose the most important.”

CAG Member: “The first day was about the way a project is chosen by the program organization. The second day was devoted to choosing a project.... On the third day we were taken to the location of the project. The purpose behind the training was to specify the needs and priorities of the area the project was to serve.

Provincial Senior Manager: “The first day of training participants draw a social map of the city they are living in.... On the second day of training there is a field assessment for the CAGs, engineering team from CHF, community facilitators and the local council. They go out to the field to do an assessment of [the community’s] needs. On the third day of training the local council CAGs and CHF team will divide into two groups: One group will analyze the social needs according to the social data; the second group will attend to technical needs. The social group will be attended by the Community Facilitator while the technical group will be attended by the engineer. They also invite engineers from the government director generals’ offices. After these two groups have done their work they put both [groups work] on a piece of paper and the CAGs will start voting on the needs and according to the calculation of the votes...we will select a project.”

Focus group participants stated that the PRA training was very useful, however some complained about the three-day length. Three days in a row was difficult for some members while others felt the volume of information required a less intensive approach,

perhaps spending more time to impart the information by spreading the training over a longer period or more CHF/CAP III-supported projects.

CAG Member: "The training was useful and positive. People welcomed it and didn't object to anything.... CHF was very responsive and did a great job. The governmental bodies never did anything like this before. They have never responded to our needs. However, we still need more things."

CAG Member: "The training was 100% useful because it was specialized and relevant. CHF worked on two projects in one year. This won people's trust because they taught us how to work out good and successful projects that serve the region."

CAG Member: "Training was very good but it lasted three days and was too long for us because many of us are working."

CAG Member: "Since we have other responsibilities, we did not have enough time."

CAG Member: "The length of training was very short and the PRA was taught too fast."

When asked to explain the PRA process it was clear that PRA retention was poor. Participants remembered most of the subjects in which they had been trained and how the training was delivered but, when probed, could not describe or explain the PRA processes in more than general terms.

CAG Member: "It was about knowing the nature of the region, number of the population, which project is most necessary, and studying project cost."

CAG Member: "The training included: a) Identifying needs, how to solve them and how to draw a chart for this purpose. b) Finding solutions to those needs. c) Addressing those directorates that are concerned with those needs. d) Setting a schedule for solving those needs and for the work to be performed."

- *Frequency of CAG Meetings:* CAGs hold regular meetings. Frequency varies depending on whether they are engaged in an ongoing project. IBTCI's Monitors reported that CAGs engaged on projects typically meet at least once a week. One CAG stated that they were so active they decided to divide work between two committees: One for project follow-up and the other to seek contributions from the community. The Follow-up Committee pays visits to the project sites to monitor the work being done and approaches government officials to gain the relevant approvals. The Contributions Committee solicits support from the wider community in the form of equipment, vehicles, security and logistics. The committees comprise CAG members and report and organize their activities at CAG meetings that are held at least once a week.
- *Local Project Selection and Design:* CAGs hold meetings to identify and prioritize community projects. During PRA training they select one project that is considered feasible, sustainable and will have significant impact on the community as their first, CHF/CAP III-supported project. At the same time they select another three projects according to priority based on community needs. CHF described the first CHF/CAP III-supported project as a "seed capital" project, with 75% of funds provided through a CAP

III grant and a 25% community contribution (including in-kind contributions). Focus group participants indicated that once the first project had been selected and an implementation schedule agreed, CHF staff then took the lead in the design, implementation, advocacy, and monitoring of the project.²

- *Whether Projects are Meeting Community Needs:* Communities are overwhelmingly delighted with the project work being performed and the support of the CHF staff. They report that the projects reflect the needs of the community because they are selected by the community and not imposed on them by remote authorities.

CAG Member: "We were offered many other projects but those projects were not important to us. People told them "even if you build a tower like the International Trade Tower we don't want it, we want a water project because the old pipe installed in 1975 is broken and passing water under a garbage storage center that pollutes the water and causes disease"."

Local Government:

- *Local Council Knowledge of CAP III:* Several local council members interviewed described the program as designed to implement community infrastructure and essential services projects, citing IRD and/or CSP as an example. Many LG officials are not aware that the program's focus is on getting communities to better articulate their needs and mobilize resources while they are supposed to focus on the skills and processes required to better meet those articulated needs.

Local Council Member: "Our work as a council is to supervise and make sure the work being done is legitimate."

- *Local Council Engagement Processes, Participation and Support:* Contrary to the intended CAG-centered LG engagement process, CHF's local staff are primarily responsible for identifying, making contact with and encouraging LG participation and advocacy. LGs have participated in many aspects of CAP III projects, attending trainings, meeting with CAGs, performing site visits, performing project follow-ups, and applying for government technical assistance and the necessary permits and approvals.

To date, however, local councils have not successfully taken a leadership role in project implementation and advocating for funds and resources at the Government Directorate and Provincial Council level. CHF's Provincial Senior Manager and her assistants perform most of that work. The Provincial Senior Manager indicated that once a project is approved, local councils and CHF Community Facilitators prepare submissions to the relevant Directorates and Provincial Council but do not take a leading role in advocating for the projects' approval and support because such activities are too new to them. Instead, she and her CHF assistants use their relationships with the various Directorates, Provincial Council and Governor's Office to de-conflict the projects and

² It should be noted that some CAGs were actively involved in these tasks while others appeared to leave them mostly to CHF staff to perform. As a result, the capacity of many CAGs to later employ these tasks on their own is diminished. To date CAGs have not generally been successful in advocating for subsequent projects without the further assistance of CHF Community Facilitators.

advocate for their approval and support. The Anbar M&E Manager reported that, apart from CHF/CAP III supported projects local councils have submitted 55 other CAG proposed projects to the Provincial Council, only two of which were approved by the following CHF's intervention. That intervention involved getting the local Mayor and Governor's office to advocate in support of the projects alongside the local councils.

- *Training of Local Government Members:* CHF has conducted only one four-day LG Training. That training took place in Fallujah at the end of May. It provided core training to 81 LG participants, including members from seven Nahia councils (64) and two Qada councils (17).

The LG Advisor described the purpose of CAP III as:

"[E]xclusively to get the CAGs together with the local authorities to put together project proposals, caste it in the proper mould that is required by the local, provincial, central government structures....to initiate, to motivate for, to get finances for projects.... This whole drive is towards getting the local councils...up to speed, to develop the ability to come up with proper motivations for projects in their communities and to get the money from the central government."

LG Training is typically preceded by visits to the participating local councils by CHF staff. They introduce the program, describe the training, and invite the council to nominate members to attend. Trainees reported that the training was largely administrative and lasted four days. The LG Advisor was worried that this might be too long and noted that between days one and two of the first LG Training numbers had dropped from 50 to 44 attendees. Trainees stated that each day involved three hours of "lectures, lessons and doing tests" with breaks in between. They also did practical exercises to reinforce what had been covered in the lectures and were given the opportunity to discuss issues and air their views. They learned how to assess proposed projects, budgeting, basic advocacy at the provincial level, and how to follow-up projects. Participants found the interactive training useful and informative. They believed however, that four days did not allow enough time to take in the skills and breadth of information provided.

CHF LG Trainer: "We train the local councils and local committees on how to run a project and then propose it to decision-makers so they can estimate the budget and monitor the work. In other words it is a process of planning a particular project, how to choose it from a list of projects that serve the community, determining how to demand it, and also how the local council can support it."

Local Council Member: "[We] learned how to balance things related to the projects and follow-up in the field. We also learned things related to the council and the way projects are submitted to the Provincial Council for getting approvals."

Local Council Member: "By the end of the course we learned a lot about the budget and the future projects that will occur and the way the executive and legislative powers deal with each other."

Local Council Member: "The training was very good for our work but lacked enough time...[We] wish that the coming courses will have more time and training and include fieldwork too."

There appears to be confusion between the LG Trainers and the newly arrived expatriate LG Advisor with regard to the required level of training. While the LG Advisor did not take part in the compilation of the core-training curriculum and had not witnessed a training session he stated that he did “know what is going on” and described the course as:

“Very elementary...so much so that I am worried it is too elementary.... The people don't want to come to courses anymore because it is too simple. The engineers and the DGs want a bit more, they don't want to hear about advocating, they want to learn about the technical aspects of running a [unknown].”

Council members expect future training to deal more specifically with advocacy at the executive/directorate level and processes for project implementation and follow-up.

The LG Advisor stated that an Intermediate Training curriculum is in development. TOT on Intermediate Training is scheduled for July. Advanced Training and On-Job-Training is planned for the future.

CHF has started to extend technical assistance to local councils. Sometimes CHF staff responded to individual council needs by providing separate courses taught by the LG Trainers over two or three visits.

The training of local councils has not been coordinated with the PRA training of corresponding CAGs. IBTCI conducted four data collection sessions with LG members from Fallujah and Ramadi – three KIIs and one FG with three participants. Each LG selected for interview was supposed to be located in an area where CAG projects had either been completed or underway for several months. Three interviewees reported having received CHF's LG core training within the last two weeks. The respondents from Garmah however, stated that there was no CAG in their area and that no projects had been performed in the area by CHF or anyone else for two years. One district council member from Ramadi had not received any CHF LG training. He stated that CHF had introduced the training to the council and that the council members had completed questionnaires as requested but after ten days these had not been collected.³

- *Level of Local Commitment/Contribution to Project Support:* CAGs reported that they devote considerable attention to community contribution. One CAG had a separate committee for this purpose. Community contribution includes such things as equipment, vehicles and drivers, security and logistics support.

³ This District Councilor was very opposed to the idea of CAGs and said his District Council refused to deal with them. He also claimed that the local councils were illegitimate because they had not been elected and claimed, “they will sign on any amount of money because they are not legally responsible for what they sign.” He further claimed that 90% of organizations chosen to work on projects by the American Forces were counterfeit and that other US programs were also being ripped-off to the tune of millions of dollars. He asserted that projects be prioritized by specialist directorates under a unified system and budget but what organizations like CHF are doing is based on personal relationships and serve the interests of two or three persons instead of the greater community. He also said that the only purpose of the Business Centers where CHF conducts much of its training and was to steal.

Monitoring of Program:

- *Monitoring for the PDT:* The Anbar M&E Manager stated that he tried many times to figure out how to collect data for the PDT but could not do it until the Program Officer from CHF HQ showed the staff how to collect and report the data in April in Baghdad. Until then they had not completed a PDT.
- *Site Visits and Interviews with CHF Employees:* CHF's M&E Manager in Anbar does not have the authority or the capacity to perform project site or training session visits and interviews with staff. The Anbar M&E Manager relies on Community Facilitators and CHF Engineers to provide him with reports of the trainings they have conducted and the visits they make to project sites.
- *PRA Trainings:* PRA Trainings of CAGs are mostly unmonitored⁴, however Community Facilitators prepare Training Reports on all PRA Trainings. These include details about the participants and what was covered. They are relayed to the Provincial Senior Manager and Anbar M&E Manager.
- *LG Trainings:* These are not monitored by CHF. Trainers are supposed to have trainees complete a spreadsheet at the end of the course however this is not being done.
- *Quality Controls – Contractor Bids and Selection:* CHF employs a centralized bidding process. While tenders are placed out in the Anbar community by the local office, the bids are processed back at CHF's Iraq HQ in Hilla. The Engineering Unit (EU) and staff in Hilla process all bids received. The EU independently costs the equipment and materials. When there is a 20%+ discrepancy between the bid amount and EU's estimate the bid is typically discarded. Contracts are awarded from Hilla.

CHF Community Facilitators and Engineers together with CAG members and sometimes LG engineers and engineers from the relevant Directorates perform regular site visits to CHF/CAP III-supported projects. They assess labor levels and the quality of materials being used. If materials are substandard to contract requirements payment deductions are imposed. The CHF engineers also assess project progress. This is important because contractors are paid in four installments based on project progress towards completion: 10%, 40%, 80% and 100% (project closeout). The engineers collect samples of materials such as concrete, sand and blocks that are sent to local labs for quality testing. They also prepare site reports and send them to the project managers who compile them in a project tracking report and summarize them in a weekly report that goes to the Anbar M&E Manager and Provincial Senior Manager. The Anbar M&E Manager said that CHF HQ had not yet approved this reporting system. He said he had no authority to act on reported information and could not send a Project Manager to inform a contractor of any problems uncovered. His role is simply to give his opinion to the Provincial Senior Manager. She then decides whether to address uncovered issues. At project closeout the project tracking sheet, site visit reports, lab tests, and all related documentation are compiled in a file that is sent to Hilla for archiving.

⁴ The Provincial Senior Manager and Anbar M&E Manager do try to attend some trainings.

- *Channels of Communication with Local Staff:* These are not monitored by CHF. LG Trainers and other staff members complained about not knowing who were their immediate reports and a lack of responsiveness by expatriate managers based in Hilla.
- *Professionalism of Local Staff and Mentoring:* Until now there does not appear to have been a systematic process for monitoring staff professionalism and performance or for mentoring. From the information IBTCI was able to gather, CHF is fortunate to have very professional local staff. Virtually all KII and FG respondents commented on the professionalism and dedication of local staff, even those respondents who had reservations about the program.

CHF Interaction with ePRTs

- The current ePRTs are mostly new to their positions. However, the Provincial Senior Manager has made many visits to the ePRTs to inform them of CHF's work. The ePRT requested that CHF expand their geographic areas to include Rutbah, Rawah, and Anah in Western Anbar and CHF is providing training to CAGs in these three areas. There are no plans to extend LG Training to these areas.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

- *Management:* CHF should review its resident Anbar management levels, managers' roles, and their authority to make decisions. Managers need to be clear about their roles and authority while local staff needs to be sure about who are their line managers and better understand the management hierarchy. The Deputy Director for Anbar could be assisted by the addition of a dedicated Finance and Administrative Manager to handle day-to-day operations. This would free him to concentrate on program strategy and focus with his local program managers.
- *Staffing Levels:* CHF should review its current field staffing levels in Anbar. There is a need to increase the number of Community Facilitators, CHF Engineers and LG Trainers, and develop an independent M&E staff under the Anbar M&E Manager.
- *Logistics Support:* Anbar province is the largest province in Iraq. Ramadi district is the largest district in Anbar and the Heet office also serves Western Anbar. There is a need for more vehicles, better communications, and logistics and finance support to field personnel. Support for LG Trainers requires particular attention. The LG Advisor noted he had just hired a Logistics Manager for this purpose.
- *Program Fidelity:* CHF staff and participating councils need to be realigned with the program objectives so that CAP III is not viewed primarily as a program to implement projects but rather as a program to train Local Councils and new CAGs in the skills and processes required to develop, implement and advocate for approvals and funds to support community based initiatives at the Directorate and Provincial Council level. This would include paying more attention to performing LG feasibility analyses before new CAGs are created and placing greater emphasis on local council advocacy training.
- *LG Training Coordination:* CHF needs to get better coordinate LG Training with its other activities. CHF has allowed its subcontractor for LG Training to operate its activity in parallel rather than in lockstep with CHF's other activities. This has resulted in a lack of synchronicity between project activities that require a high degree of coordination.

- *LG Training Timing and Intensity:* Due to the volume of skills and information imparted, CHF needs to consider whether LG core-training should be lengthened or modularized. CHF also needs to consider coordinating LG Training so that it dovetails with the development of new CAGs. Timing LG Trainings so they precede the submission of CHF/CAP III-supported projects in their area would provide structured opportunities for council members to apply the skills and processes imparted in training and make them better able to retain and replicate these on future project submissions.
- *PRA Training:* CHF should improve its PRA and advocacy training for CAGs and LG members. CHF needs to include LG relations and advocacy in its PRA Training curriculum. These skills and processes should be imparted at the same time projects are created by the CAGs for submission to local councils. The participation of LG members in PRA Training should be formalized.
- *Support for More than One CHF/CAP III-Supported Project per CAG/LG:* One CHF project does not appear to offer enough on-the-job experience for CAGs and LGs to become sufficiently familiar with the selection, advocacy and implementation processes to be able to replicate them. USAID and CHF should consider supporting more “seed capital” projects per CAG/LG.
- *Mentoring Interventions:* CHF should formalize the role already being played by the Provincial Senior Manager and her staff in mentoring CAGs and local councils on post-CAP III funded projects, particularly with regard to advocacy at the Directorate and Provincial Council level.
- *Overcoming the Issue of Local Councils’ Perceived Illegitimacy by Partnering with Influential Political Actors:* CHF should formalize the practice employed by the Provincial Senior Manager and her staff of partnering local councils with elected Mayors and policy makers to improve their clout with Directorates and the Provincial Council.
- *Transferring Advocacy and Funds Sourcing from CHF Staff to LG and CAGs:* CHF Needs to consider ways to better transfer advocacy and funding work currently being performed by CHF staff to LG and CAGs. While the active engagement of local staff members is essential to the success of CAP III’s approach, the program is premised on the goal of having LG and local citizens take responsibility for meeting their needs per Intermediate Results 9.2.2.1, 9.2.2.3, and 9.2.2.5 in the CHF CAP III PMP.
- *CHF Needs to Establish a Proper M&E Office, Staff and System in Anbar:* A proper M&E system and independent M&E Office for Anbar needs to be established with an M&E staff, budget and logistics support, including vehicles to enable visits to training sessions and project sites. M&E should not be reliant on a reporting system that depends on reports drafted by Community Facilitators and CHF Engineers, some of the very people whose work is being monitored. Monitoring of LG Training should also fall under the M&E Office’s purview and proper baselines established for activities in line with the requirements of the CHF CAP III PMP. This issue should be further addressed when IBTCI performs a Data Quality Assessment (DQA) in the coming months. M&E data and findings should be reported directly to the Deputy Director for Anbar and not to the Provincial Senior Manager.
- *USAID and CHF Should Assess Sufficient Staff and Resources are Available to Continue its Expansion into Western Anbar:* Given that CHF is already straining at the seams to meet or catch up with many of its program targets and achieve its objectives in Anbar, USAID and CHF need to realistically assess whether CHF has the funding and logistics to support expansion into Western Anbar without compromising results in its five core areas of

operation (Fallujah, Ramadi, Heet, Baghdadi and Haditha). USAID and CHF should explore the possibility of accessing Quick Reaction Force (QRF) or Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) funds to support this expansion.

VI. CONCLUSION

CHF CAP III in Anbar is implementing its program with varying degrees of success depending on activity. Satisfactory progress towards meeting Objectives 1 and 2 is being made across all activities with the exception of those dedicated to the development and training of LGs to better meet the needs of the community and mobilize resources. LG Training is lagging behind the program's other activities. This is unfortunate as this activity is CAP III's primary point of departure from the efforts made under CAP I and CAP II, that focused on the development of CAGs for the prioritization, implementation, and oversight of development projects. Staff and program beneficiaries have not fully adjusted to this new strategic shift of focus in programmatic effort. Issues with the absence of expatriate management in Anbar, staffing levels, poor logistics support, the expansion of the program into Western Anbar, and poor coordination between CHF and its subcontractor for LG Training have all contributed to this problem.

Annex I. Scope of Work (SOW) for Community Action Program III (CAP III) Interim Monitoring Report, Anbar, April 29, 2009

I. Background

CAP III is a USAID-supported program that is implemented by four implementing partners, namely, MercyCorps, IRD, CHF and ACDI/VOCA. The goal of CAP III is to empower local councils and citizens to jointly participate in a more effective, responsive and transparent community development process that meets articulated needs and begins to mobilize Iraqi resources to fulfill local government responsibilities. CAP I & II used Community Actions Groups (CAGs) as the vehicle for the prioritization, implementation, and oversight of development projects, leaving a relatively limited role to local government whose capacity at that time was extremely limited. Through a targeted set of trainings and rigorous hands-on experience gained through working with existing CAGs, CAP III partners are expected to support processes that create empowered local councils and engaged citizens jointly addressing community needs, thus strengthening the role and the legitimacy of local governments throughout Iraq.

To accomplish this goal, CAP III focuses on the following objectives:

1. ***Improved capacity of communities to better identify their needs, articulate their role, and mobilize resources***
2. ***Improved capacity of district and sub-district councils to meet the articulated needs of the community and mobilize resources; and***
3. ***Increased assistance to civilian victims of conflict.***

II. Purpose

The purpose of this SOW is to conduct monitoring of the CAP III program implemented by CHF in Anbar. IBTCI shall analyze the progress made in the activities under the following objectives:

Objective 1: Communities better articulate their needs and mobilize resources within and outside the community to solve common problems and

Objective 2: Local executive and representative Government in CAP communities better meet the articulated needs of the community as described in their implementation plan, implementation plan timeframe and PMP.

1. More specifically, IBTCI should analyze the status of each of the CHF activities under each of these objectives by responding to the following questions:
 - Are activities being conducted as per the identified timeframe? If there are delays, what are the reasons behind the delays?
 - What is the progress towards annual targets?
2. What is the process CHF is following to engage the community and local government?

Community Engagement

- How are CAGs members identified?
- What training have they received?
- How many meetings have they had as a group?
- What is the process for project selection and are the projects meeting community needs?

Local Government Engagement

- How well do the local councils know about the program?
- What is the process of local government engagement?
- What is the extent of LG participation in the program?
- What training has LG received so far?
- What is the level of LG commitment/contribution to project support?

3. How is CHF monitoring their program in Anbar? This should include such issues as quality controls, frequency of site visits, channels of communication with local staff, professionalism of local staff and mentoring, etc.

4. How is CHF interacting with ePRTs and how is their input utilized in program implementation?

III. Methodology

The monitoring should include, but not be limited to, review of contractor database, reports from site visits, internal CHF M&E and quality assurance policies and directives, site visits of the grantees/projects, and interviews with CHF employees, CAG members and local government representatives.

IV. Reports

A final, full briefing and written report on findings and recommendations will be provided no later than June 14, 2009. The study report will be in the following format:

1. One page summary of report findings and recommendations
2. Executive summary of no more than 3 pages.
3. Main body of the report findings and recommendations of not more than 20 pages.
4. The report will be formatted in accordance with USAID publication, "Constructing an Evaluation Report" dated April 14, 2006.

The final report will be provided to USAID no later than seven working days after receipt of comments from USAID on the draft. It is anticipated that USAID review of the draft may require up to two weeks, with comments to be returned to the team for final editing of the report.

V. Deliverables:

1. Mid-cycle progress update to USAID. The MEPP II implementing partner is encouraged to provide additional updates as important findings come to light so that USAID/Iraq can take the appropriate measures;
2. Final briefing to USAID upon issuance of draft report; and
3. Written Final Report with findings and recommendations as they pertain to the questions outlined above.

VI. Schedule and Logistics

Tasks	Notional Duration
Pre-study research and planning: review background documentation, design data analysis, design survey instruments, prepare report template.	1 week
Train Field Monitors, field test survey instruments, conduct surveys.	2 weeks
Consolidate data and perform high-cut analysis.	1 week
Develop preliminary findings and provide briefing to USAID.	1 week
Draft report	1 weeks
Total LOE	6 weeks

VII. Field Implementation Timeline

- May 4th-15th: Prepare fieldwork (scheduling, logistics, development and testing of instruments, training of local Iraqi fieldworkers)
- May 12th-13th: Conduct fieldwork in Hilla (IBTCI M&E Specialist)
- May 16th-25th: Conduct fieldwork in Ramadi, Fallujah, and Heet (Two IBTCI M&E Specialists and one local national research team will be in the field)
- May 26th-June 2nd: Complete field reports with translation of relevant quotes. Conduct initial analysis of data.
- June 3rd: Present initial results to USAID (revised to 8 June)
- June 11th: Final Report will be submitted to USAID

Annex II. List of Reviewed CAP III Documents

- CHF CAP III Annual Implementation Plan
- CHF CAP III Performance Management Plan
- Cooperative Agreement No. 267-A-00-08-00503-00 (Attachment B)
- CHF CAP III Community selection Criteria
- CHF CAP III Training Manual for Community Action Groups: Needs Assessment and Community Planning
- LG Training Materials: Visioning, Advocacy, Citizen Participation, M&E, Budgeting
- Community Comprehensive Needs Evaluation Reports
- CHF Sub-Activity Contact Sheet – Anbar
- CAP III Project Site Reports

Annex III. Iraqi Stakeholder Key Informant Interview and Focus Group Discussion Guides (English)

Community Facilitators/PRA Trainers Focus Group Discussion Guide

1. What do Community Facilitators do? (what are your roles, responsibilities, etc.)
2. What is the purpose of CAP III?
3. What are the objectives of the CAP III program?
4. Who is in charge of your department?
5. What are his or her responsibilities?
6. How many Community Facilitators are there in Ramadi/Heet/Fallujah?
7. What training did you receive from CHF?
8. Did anybody have experience as a trainer before working with CAP? What experience?
9. Was the training you received from CHF/CAP III effective? Why was it effective/not effective?
10. Would you add or take away anything from the training you received?
11. How is a typical PRA training for the CAGs implemented? Please walk me through a typical CAG training, how are the people selected for training, how is the training organized, who does the training, what types of training are given, etc.
12. Please explain how you personally have used your training to do trainings of CAGs.
13. How have you worked with the CHF Training Coordinators, Mr. Yousef Qadi from Hillah and Mr. Mohammed Yassin?
14. Do you still work with Mr. Yousef Qadi? How?
15. Please explain how you have used your training to implement CAP III projects with the CAGs.
16. How are the CAP III projects implemented? Can you walk me through a typical project? How are they developed, then approved, and then performed?
17. Are you supervised in the field by anyone? Who? How are you supervised?
18. How do you work with Mr. Michael?
19. How do you work with the M&E Manager, Mr. Mohammed Majeed?
20. How do you work with the ICMA Local Government Advisor, Mr. Dirk?
21. How do you ensure good relations with CAGs and Local Councils?
22. What problems, if any, have you encountered when implementing projects?
23. Do you work with the other CAP offices? How?

Local Council Members Interview Guide

1. Who do you work with from CAP?
2. Can you describe the relationship you have with the CAP Community Facilitators?
3. How do you work together?
4. Please describe how you and the Council work with the CAGs in your area.
5. You are currently working on a CHF/CAP project. Can you please describe that project for me? What is it? Who developed it? Where did the idea come from? How was it approved? Who approved it? What is its current status? If finished, are you satisfied with the results? Why/ why not?
6. What, if anything, was different about this project from what the Council normally does?
7. How was the CHF/CAP staff involved in the project?
8. What resources did CHF/CAP provide for the project?
9. Did the CAG or Local Council provide any resources for the project?
10. Do you know if you will be receiving any training from CHF/ICMA?
11. If yes, do you know what type of training you will be receiving? Please describe.

CAG Members Focus Group Discussion Guide

1. What type of training, if any, have you received from CHF/CAP III?
2. Can you explain the PRA process?
3. What particular skills and knowledge did you receive from the training?
4. Do you think the training was culturally sensitive to the Iraqi way or doing things? Why/why not? Please give examples.
5. Do you feel the training was useful? How was it useful?
6. If you could improve the training, what would you keep in, what would you leave out, and what would you add?
7. Everyone here is currently working on a CAP III project. How did you use your training in these projects?
8. Can you walk me through the Cap project you are working on? How was it developed, what was the approval process, how is it implemented, what oversight and controls are there to ensure good quality and honesty?
9. Describe what your CAG has done so far. What is the current status of your project?
10. Do you have other projects you want to implement?
11. How will you go about implementing those projects?
12. How is CHF/CAP involved in your projects? (e.g., funding source, provides oversight, provides assistance in the implementation stage)
13. Do you work with CHF/CAP's Community Facilitators? How. Please give an example.
14. How do the Local Council and the CAG work with one another?