

2.4.2. Training

There is clear qualitative and quantitative evidence of many cases where ICB supported workshop training and one-on-one mentoring “enhanced ARC staff technical knowledge base” in the key areas that ARC was targeting under IRI. However, with rare exception (such as the IPP trainings at the NHQ and in Sri Lanka and Indonesia), the lack of a clear system for documenting how many people were trained at different levels (particular NS and HQ staff in different technical units, and IFRC staff) is a clear constraint that is likely to detract from the long-term sustainability of the initial investment in developing training materials and organizing formal or informal training sessions. This information on who is trained, the training topics, and any evidence of impact are critical to assessing donor investments in capacity building. Another constraint is that many of the materials that staff acquired during their ICB sponsored participation in various workshops outside ARC have been lost. This, in turn, has short-circuited some of the longer-term capacity building that could have resulted from these workshops and special training sessions.

2.4.3. Web-Based Posting of Materials

There is little evidence (quantitative or qualitative) that web-based posting by itself is an effective mechanism to promote tools or to improve institutional or technical capacity. Far more effective appears to be on-site training by the right person, in the right program, which has the right need, with the right tool. It is at this point that the “right person’s” access to the right tool is critically important. ARC clearly needs to develop a simple two to three page “cheat sheet” that shows how specific ARC and non-ARC tools can be used to address specific issues in ARC’s food programs and where to find these tools, if and when they are needed.

2.4.4. Partnerships

When the ICB was written it was expected that the process of creating Title II partnerships would provide the forum for ARC to expand its mode of thinking about risk mitigation and post-disaster recovery. To support this, both the ISA and ICB funded new staff positions, tools development, networking and training.

Many of the same ICB funded, or co-funded and trained staff; tools; and training helped ARC negotiate and sustain its first large-scale food programming partnership with WFP and to develop a new type of livelihoods, post-Tsunami partnership with FAO and WWF. In the process of reviewing lessons learned about the WFP partnership and how to improve it, WFP and ARC are writing a generic template for partnerships that can be activated in response to future emergencies. A similar analysis down the road of the ARC/FAO/WWF collaboration could be very useful. More than any tools, training, or networking, these partnerships improve ARC’s “institutional and technical capacity to design and manage food aid and nutrition interventions as an effective response to emergencies” (IRI).

3.0. Intermediate Result 2: Red Cross/Crescent Movement Partners Develop the Capacity to Design and Manage Food Aid and Nutrition Interventions as an Effective Response to Emergencies

The genius of the original design of the ARC ICB proposal was its attempt to link new tools development, training, and pilot testing at the HQ level with improved programming in two pilot countries before scaling up. The same pilot programs were expected to help ARC better understand the types of capacity building that would be needed for informed partnerships with National Societies.

3.1. Outputs

The revised version of the IPTT that was produced after mid-term envisioned two outputs for this IR:

- **Output 2.1:** Improved knowledge base in national Red Cross societies to design and manage food aid and nutrition interventions as an effective response to emergencies and longer term development; and
- **Output 2.2:** Enhanced coordination between National Red Cross societies and local institution in food security intervention.

At the time of the final evaluation the activities can be viewed in two distinct timeframes: FY04 to FY06 and FY07 to the present.

3.1.1. FY04-FY06

ARC originally considered Ethiopia, Cambodia, and El Salvador for participation as pilot countries because of their fit with the ARC criteria for the pilot (Box 3.1). During this period ARC provided extensive case-by-case technical assistance for emergency and non emergency food programs in Asia and Africa using tools developed under the ICB (Annex II). In addition, the food program advisor provided technical backstopping for a highly innovative school feeding program in Viet Nam.

3.1.2. FY07-Present

During the third year, ARC recommitted itself to the concept of the concept of “pilot projects” in three countries (Mozambique, Ethiopia, and Lesotho), which were slated to start in FY07. It was expected that ARC would help train staff and develop new tools in conjunction with the execution of specific community based activities. The indicators and targets were revised a mid-term to reflect this new orientation. The same strategy was expected to strengthen the capacity of the African National Societies by developing training modules that could be used in RDRT training.

To execute the revised strategy, the ICB funded a new position, the ARC regional delegate for food security. Although posted to Lesotho, the regional delegate was expected to help choose and execute the other two pilot country projects and other ARC

capacity building efforts throughout southern Africa as part of the ARC/ICB Plan of Action for Southern Africa (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Expected Activities in ARC/ICB Plan of Action for Southern Africa (FY07-FY08) being Executed by the Regional Food Security Delegate

Outputs
Activity 1.0. Food Security Strategy for Southern Africa prepared (at request of IFRC/Harare)
Activity 2.0. Adaptation of module linking vulnerability/hazard capacity assessment and food security response (community based disaster management or CBDM) for ERU and RDRT (southern Africa) training
Activity 3.0. Case studies and promotion of integrated programming of HIV/AIDS with food security (Lesotho and Mozambique)
Activity 4.0. Development of disaster management plan and PNS coordination mechanism (Lesotho)
Activity 5.0. Conservation based agricultural development (CBAD) through asset formation (Lesotho)
Activity 6.0. Support regional disaster response team in southern Africa (southern Africa)
Activity 7.0. Represent ARC in southern Africa related to ICB (southern Africa) and seek opportunities to develop operational alliances (southern Africa)

Source: Source: Woldemichael Negusse, Progress Reports and Work Plans. 2006-2007. Note: the activities in this table were referred to as “outputs” in the original table.

For a variety of internal reasons, the Ethiopian Red Cross National Society was not in a position to participate. Mozambique was chosen as the second pilot country in Sub-Saharan Africa. Indonesia was chosen as the third because it highlighted the critical lessons learned during the ARC collaboration with WFP for Tsunami relief and recovery. Instead of adopting a third pilot country, ARC requested and received permission from USAID/WFP to use Indonesia as the third pilot country program, as the objectives of that program aligned precisely with ICB learning objectives and ARC is committed to learning from its support of integrated food security/health programming. Indonesia was also chosen in order to highlight the many lessons learned from the national program’s extensive collaboration with ARC and WFP during the post Tsunami relief and recovery programs.

3.2. Evidence of Impact

3.2.1. IPTT Indicators

A comparison of targets against achievements for the revised mid-term indicators and indicator targets shows that the ARC ICB grant is “on target” to achieve many of its revised mid-term targets for training and pilot program execution by the final year (Annex I.A). An exclusive focus on these indicators, however, can overlook the wider institutional impacts of the pilot country activities for the host national society and ARC.

3.2.2. Other Quantitative and Qualitative Evidence of Impact

3.2.2.1. Major Impact of Execution of the IFRC Regional Food Security Strategy for Southern Africa. One major impact of posting the ARC regional food security delegate to southern Africa was to provide some much needed manpower for the regional food security strategy (Table 3.2). The IFRC’s food security program was a direct outgrowth

of the Ouagadougou Declaration,¹⁷ which was formalized at the Fifth Pan African Conference of the Red Cross in 2000 and reiterated at the Sixth Pan African Conference in 2004.

One direct impact of Title II support under the ICB was to build the capacity of eight of the 10 Red Cross National Societies (NS) to develop national food security strategies (Table 3.2).

- The ICB supported ARC's participation in a five-person team that assessed the country response to the food security goals identified in the 2000 Ouagadougou Declaration. This assessment was the crucial first step in formulating the five-year plan that is being offered to a more general appeal (for external donor support) in mid-December 2007.
- With ICB support, the ARC regional food security delegate provided:
 - A detailed written feedback on each of the eight food security strategies produced in 2006 and presented (in final form) at the recent regional food security meeting in November 2006;
 - Informal training of RDRT volunteers in Botswana (August-September 2007) that helped volunteers (who are key Red Cross volunteer leaders in their home countries) better understand the concept of "food security" and the need for their local societies to develop food security strategies that are compatible with national initiatives for development and emergency preparedness and response; and
 - The first draft of the regional southern Africa strategy based on the national strategies.¹⁸ Although the regional strategy



Malawi, where Regional Food Security Advisor, W. Negusse assisted national Society develop a food security strategy. Photo Credit Kiflemariam Amdemariam.

¹⁷ At the Ouagadougou conference, the African National Societies committed to: (1) making a major difference to the health of vulnerable people in Africa by adopting and implementing the ARCHI 2010 (African Red Cross/Red Crescent Health Initiative until 2010) strategy; (2) responding to the HIV/AIDS pandemic as an unprecedented humanitarian and development disaster in Africa, by massively scaling up their response in terms of advocacy, prevention, care and mitigation; (3) making food security a strategic priority for this decade, recognizing that food security is directly linked to a number of root causes, including poverty, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, the worsening debt crisis and armed conflict; and (4) building up National Societies capacities for improved management, coaching and support of their volunteers and branch networks.

¹⁸ The food security strategy for Southern Africa has five parts: (1) *Part one* presents the rationale for food security strategy; (2) *Part two* deals with food insecurity context in Southern Africa, sketching out major factors contributing to food insecurity in the region and categorizes the most food insecure groups; (3) *Part three* briefly narrates National Societies' response to food insecurity in the region; (4) *Part four* is the heart of the strategy, which discusses the framework, cross-cutting issues, outlining the strategic objectives and key activities to achieve the food security strategy; (5) *Part five* sets food security indicators and organizational coordination to achieve the food security objectives.

is not finalized, it has enjoyed high levels of ownership by National Societies and has helped articulate if and how National Societies expect to collaborate with one another.

Table 3.2. Evolution of ARC ICB-Supported Activities under SO2 in Relation to the IFRC Federation Food Security Initiative (2000-Present)

Year	IFRC Food Security Activities in Southern Africa	ARC/ICB activities which Contributed to Output	Impact/Output
2000 September	5 th Pan African Conference in Ouagadougou		Delegates endorse the Ouagadougou Declaration, which makes food security and risk mitigation a top priority for Red Cross National Societies in Africa
2001	Senior food security advisor IFRC (Geneva) position created and staffed (Hisham Khogali)		Gives IFRC a focal point for helping build national capacity to execute the declaration
2003	IFRC/RCS develop a global food security and nutrition policy		Provides guidance and direction on further development of food security interventions
2004	6 th Pan African Conference in Algiers		Delegates confirm their commitment to new paradigm for Red Cross National Societies in Africa
2004	Senior Officer, Food Security and Nutrition, Disaster Policy and Preparedness Dept. IFRC (Geneva) position re-staffed (Mija Ververs)		Gives IFRC a focal point for helping build national capacity to execute the declaration
2005 - 2007	IFRC Food Security Officer (Geneva)		Food Security Assessment Methodology (IFRC/Geneva) created and training programs offered
2005-2006	IFRC/Regional DM (Harare, Dakar, Nairobi)		-3 regional food security strategies created and disseminated (IFRC/Harare, Dakar, Nairobi) - Most South African NS produce draft strategies that follow the IFRC guidance
2005-2006 October	IFRC food security & nutrition officer (Mija Ververs) focuses on West and central Africa (24 countries) and East Africa (10 countries) as there is now FS delegate in SA	-A. Tingbo attends regional food security meeting in Johannesburg (facilitated J. Roche) -W. Negusse arrives in Lesotho to begin serving as regional ARC food security delegate	Gives ARC a focal point for country programs being helped under ICB and releases IFRC FS advisor to work in West and Central Africa (a region with tremendous FS problems, but little attention)

Year	IFRC Food Security Activities in Southern Africa	ARC/ICB activities which Contributed to Output	Impact/Output
		W. Negusse helps Lesotho program develop proposal for ICB funded community based activities	-Lesotho strategy developed - Initial needs assessment and design of the ICB funded pilot program in Lesotho
Nov/Dec 2006	Historic review on all FS programs done by IFRC and NS in Africa since 1980s Initiative from PACT (Pan African Coordination Team)	Done by external consultant paid by British RCS	Historic analysis on FS performance within Federation in Africa
January 2007 meeting	Regional IFRC Food Security Meeting in Nairobi (IFRC)	--A. Tingbo participates and presents ARC food security activities and plans for southern Africa	More consensus among actors about terms and objectives of IFRC food security strategy, increased partnership and collaboration
June-July 2007	IFRC-sponsored assessment of NS responses to the Ouagadougou Declaration (5 person team) Initiative from PACT	-ARC FS advisor (A. Tingbo) participated on team that conducted assessment -ARC FS advisor (A. Tingbo) attended debriefing at IFRC/Geneva)	Six countries and two regional IFRC offices visited (DKR, NBO, Malawi, Zambia, Mali, Kenya, Rwanda, DRC)
July 24, 2007		ARC regional food security delegate at request of IFRC (Iiarare) and with permission of ARC prepares first draft of southern Africa regional strategy based on NS strategies	Draft of food security strategy adjusted for southern Africa (not adopted; being revised)
August 6-8 2007	Uganda IFRC workshop on draft "five year strategic framework on food security for Africa" (goal was to scale up FS action after Ouagadougou and Algiers, the review highly contributed to this) Initiative from PACT	-ARC regional FS delegate (W. Negusse) attended	Presentation and discussion of five-year strategic framework on food security for Africa 2008-2012
2007 August	Regional RDRT (regional disaster response team) training in Botswana (1 st in 2 years)	-W. Negusse delivered informal presentation on basic principles of food security -W. Negusse met with individuals and groups of volunteers from southern African countries	First discussion of general food security concepts and risk mitigation strategies with regional volunteers

Year	IFRC Food Security Activities in Southern Africa	ARC/ICB activities which Contributed to Output	Impact/Output
2007 August- September		ARC/ICB Mozambique Pilot project: (a) P. McLaughlin TA FS proposal; (b) Mozambique proposal for community based food security activities to be pilot tested under ICB grant approved (for ARC)	-ICB funded Mozambique pilot country program approved -Mozambique FS strategy strengthened
2007 November 26-28	S. Africa Regional Meeting	W. Negusse: -Reviewed successive drafts of the 8 country strategies -Helped draft and revise southern Africa regional strategy -Collaborated with IFRC regional DM on SOW and presentations for meeting	-8 national Red Cross societies present their food security country strategies for review and discussion -Discussion of regional southern Africa strategy -Countries agree on a draft 3 year action plan
2007 December 12, 2007	IFRC Food Security Secretariat GVA	TBD	IFRC Food Security Appeal Jan. 21 st 2008: “five year strategic framework on food security for Africa 2008-2012” (\$42 million for 5 years in 15 countries) Launch planned for April 8-10 2008 With 15 ANS, approx 15 PNS (incl ACVM), partners, SGs, Secretariat/Zones, PACT et al We will finalize there the technical and management protocols

3.2.2.2. *Early Impact of the ICB Funded Community Based Initiatives in the Pilot Countries (Lesotho, Mozambique).* ICB funds were also used to fund specific community based initiatives in two of the three pilot countries.



Lesotho pilot project backyard garden activities are part of it new focus on risk reduction rather than just emergency relief and health. Photo credit: Graham Betts.

Lesotho: The ICB funded regional food security delegate played a critical role in developing the food security strategy for Lesotho (Table 3.3). This participatory process is widely regarded within the sub-region as an example of “best practice” that other southern Africa Red Cross National Societies would like to replicate.

Although small in scope (\$215,000 total) and focused on only two provinces, the

Lesotho pilot study is helping build LCRS capacity at several levels. It is the first example of LCRS focusing on risk reduction rather than emergency relief or health. Additionally, methods used to design the project have helped LCRS develop key skills they need to develop more holistic programming. One of the main risks for the pilot project is that given the delays in design and implementation in Lesotho and the fact that after this final year of the ICB grant ARC will no longer be able to fund the pilot activities.

Table 3.3. Critical ICB Facilitated Activities that Contributed to Design and Execution of Lesotho Food Security Strategy and ICB/LCRS Pilot Program

Date/Year	ICB Facilitated Activity	Output
10/06	Field visit Mafeteng and Thabo Bosiu	Data that fed into food security design and CBAD activities
12/06	Food security strategy outline developed and discussed	Draft outline
1/07	Baseline survey Mafeting and Quthing disaster risk reduction study	Data compiled by project staff was used as input in designing conservation based agricultural development section of strategy
1/07	Workshop to review draft food security strategy	-Draft revised -Implementation Plan 2007 developed -Staffing plan developed
07	-Site visits, coaching, and mentoring -Assistance in developing training and training materials	Quality assurance on-going CBAD activities
8-9/ 07	Assist LCRS with preparation of the Lesotho Appeal (through IFRC)	Draft Appeal prepared and sent to IFRC for consideration for funding
9/07	Finalize follow-on proposal to expand Mafeting-Quthing program to additional beneficiaries in support of the LRCS drought Appeal recovery objectives	Proposal completed and approved by ARC

Source: Woldemichael Negusse, Progress Reports and Work Plans. 2006-2007.

Mozambique: Due to a host of political constraints the ICB funded community based activities (\$279,000) were not finalized until FY07. It is anticipated that the pilot project will widen the scope of food security interventions in Mozambique. The pilot is designed to address National Societies' staff capacity to plan and implement food security initiatives in different settings and to teach communities new technologies for food conservation (preservation), improved farming techniques (in cooperation with Ministry of Agriculture), and small livestock. It has been designed and redesigned (which has been part of the delay) to focus more on horticulture and nutrition, but will be implemented with the already up and running HIV/AIDS program. It is anticipated that the Mozambique Red Cross Society (CVM) will continue to provide assistance to communities; therefore the project is not designed to building community capacity to achieve food security activities autonomously, rather to improve knowledge and skills and access to inputs that will allow the beneficiaries to improve their diet. Already there

is evidence of great efforts being made to bring food security and HIV/AIDS staff together within the Mozambique Red Cross Society.

One strength of these ICB supported community based activities is that they build on an already established HIV/AIDS program; therefore, efforts on learning can focus on the food security elements. The chief weakness is that the substantial delays in execution leave very little time for implementation and to make an impact. Another weakness has been the imposed, strict USAID/FFP regulations for financial reporting that required a substantial amount of proactive training for the Mozambique Red Cross staff to understand, which has contributed to the delay. Despite the fact that food security is not in the ARC 2008-2010 strategy, the need to address food security and HIV/AIDS (together) is apparent in southern Africa and this project provides an opportunity to learn from the attempt to integrate these two issues. The chief risk is the lack of focused technical assistance. Since there is no ARC food security delegate on the ground, the Mozambique project is backstopped by the ARC regional food security advisor based in Lesotho who visits once a quarter. Furthermore, the short-time frame (one year) also threatens sustainability of activities within the communities after the project ends and leaves little room for delays due to natural disasters, which are common to the area.

One of the potential opportunities that may result from the pilot projects in southern Africa is development of an African policy for ARC.

3.2.2.3. Major Impact on the Indonesian Society's Capacity through ARC's Collaboration with WFP. The ARC partnership with WFP in Indonesia is the largest, most extensive effort of ARC partnership for food security programming to date. The program has trained 75 staff associated with the National Society in logistics and is feeding 258,000 people. The sustainability of the results is the project's strong collaboration with the Ministry of Education for training.

3.2.2.4. Major Impact on the Viet Nam National Society's Capacity through ARC's Collaboration with USDA. The Viet Nam Red Cross manages a school feeding program, the Education and Child Nutrition Project, funded by USDA that provides health and nutrition interventions to approximately 60,000 children at 187 schools in six provinces and water and sanitation for 166 schools. The Viet Nam Red Cross staff who work with the school feeding program in Viet Nam feel that there have been several positive results from the technical support to the Viet Nam Red Cross from ARC in the areas of M&E, monetization (training in country), warehouse management, and IPP (training in country). These positive impacts reportedly include increased knowledge of commodity receiving, distribution, and warehouse management, as well as increased capacity to do budget planning and monitor and report on project activities and impacts. The training that VRC staff have received has been incorporated into the school feeding project and has resulted in improved monitoring, including documentation of delivery, receipt, loss, and damage; stock controls; and school consumption data. In addition, monthly reports are submitted to the ARC food monitors (FMs) and these FMs visit each school twice a month to monitor stock cards and distribution lists. The capacity of the Vietnamese Red Cross at central to provincial and district levels has been built by ICB-supported trainings and TA

provided by Regis Chapman, Mark Smith, Ange Tingbo, and Alice Willard to develop projects, build operation plans based on targets and financial plans, monitor and evaluate achievements, and report on activities.

One continuing issue within the school feeding program is that ships are often offloaded during the weekends and NHQ staff are not available during this time, and when they are involved they are not sensitive to the cultural mores and protocol. ARC staff in Viet Nam need more guidance in this regard. One important reason reported for the overwhelming success of this program and its excellent positive impact is the dedication and buy-in of three government ministries. The Ministry of Health conducts routine visits to the schools to do anthropometric measurements and de-worming, the Ministry of Education includes basic health messages in the curriculum upon which students are tested, and the Ministry of Finance places new teachers in schools enrolled in the programs to the extent possible.

3.3. Conclusions and Recommendations

3.3.1. Conclusions

Response to emergencies is the Red Cross's *forte*—in Africa and worldwide. There is emerging awareness in all African National Societies that traditional Red Cross response to emergencies is not enough. It is now recognized that building systems to reduce the recurrent negative impacts of known and expected hazards that continually batter the sub-region (including HIV/AIDS and massive soil erosion) is critical. This is the core focus of the IFRC strategy for National Society capacity building to address chronic food insecurity and ARC's attempts to bolster it under the ICB (through the ICB pilot country programs, as well as post-Tsunami recovery and transitional programs).

A major strength of the ICB strategy for National Society capacity building is that it builds on an existing pan-African strategy of the IFRC (out of the IFRC Geneva office) and a strong regional IFRC strategy for southern Africa. A second strength is the fact that the ICB funds have usually been used to catalyze investment that other Participating National Societies (PNS)—often from North America and Europe-- have already given to the national Red Cross Societies that were chosen to be ICB pilot country programs.¹⁹ This pattern of Participating National Societies (PNS) collaborating on supporting the execution of a National Society (NS) strategy is typical of the Red Cross Movement and one of its tremendous strengths.

The chief threat to sustaining the results of ARC's ICB activities on the ground is the overall weakness of the current IFRC support for food security in Africa. Both the IFRC, African National Societies and ARC capacity building strategies suffer from a critical lack of trained personnel.

¹⁹ In Mozambique, for example, the Spanish Red Cross and IFRC are contributing funds to the same initiative as the ARC and the regional IFRC has \$15 million dollars for programming for HIV/AIDS which includes food security support as part of the official HBC and OVC strategy.

- Since Negusse’s deployment the IFRC food security advisor focused her activities on West and Central Africa (25 countries) As a result, the ICB funded position is the only regional food security position within the Red Cross Movement in southern Africa; it is still the most senior position.
- To date, almost none of the national focal points for food security in southern Africa are focused 100% on food security. Most often, the role of being the food security focal point is added on to an existing position for health or (more often) disaster management specialists. As a result, these focal points are only intermittently focused on food security. As soon as a crisis strikes they are pulled off task for emergency relief.

Another threat to sustaining these results is that, to-date, the ICB regional food security officer has focused most of his activities on Lesotho where he is posted. While this type of capacity building was indeed one of the goals of his being posted there, it has restricted his ability to backstop other programs in southern Africa.

A cross-cutting problem that affects of the ICB activities in southern Africa is that they are just getting started. The fear (from many respondents) is that many of the activities—despite other donor funding—are not sustainable within the current policy context. The principal risk is that when the ARC funding for southern Africa is cut off in September 08, it will disrupt the momentum that is now underway in executing these programs. To quote the regional IFRC disaster management coordinator, the capacity building under the ICB has: “...taken us from one level to another level. He [the ARC regional FS delegate] has now understood the region. The next step is to really operationalize the strategy...to yield results...from all this labor” (Farid Alywar, Regional DM Coordinator, interview, 2007).

Another cross-cutting problem is inadequate documentation. Due to the need for speed (with scarcely two years to program from the day he was first posted), the ARC regional food security delegate has focused his activities on getting results. To date, his activities and role in the broader strategy are not well known either within IFRC or the Red Cross Movement outside of southern Africa.

3.3.2. Short-Term Recommendations for the Remaining Eight Months of the ICB Grant

3.3.2.1. Southern Africa. The progressive establishment of the ICB funded Lesotho program opens the door to greater involvement of the regional food security delegate in other countries. The stage for greater engagement and involvement was successfully laid by his extensive support to finalization of different country strategies during FY07 and by his support (formal and informal) to RDRT training in 2007. In the short-term, the activities in southern Africa should focus on additional training and capacity building for the ICB sponsored pilot program in Mozambique. The successful implementation of the ICB funded community based activities in Mozambique and Lesotho combined with the broader development of the country strategies being supported by the IFRC regional office is very promising even in the one year that is remaining on the grant. However, for these activities to be sustainable they need to be strongly integrated with IFRC’s broader

regional initiatives. For this reason, the ARC regional food security advisor's activities should focus on the following.

- The successful execution of the pilot studies and ensuring their sustainability within the wider IFRC initiative during the remaining eight months of the grant.
- Better joint reporting by the ARC regional food delegate and the IFRC regional DM for southern Africa to the IFRC regional food security advisor on the two agencies' collaboration with various NSs in the preparation and execution of the various national food security strategies, as well as the regional strategy for southern Africa.
- The preparation of at least one joint briefing paper (IFRC and ARC) on how they have collaborated on preparation of NS food security strategies and preparation of a regional food security strategy for southern Africa. This is an example of best practice for local partner capacity building for the Title II CS community, as well as for the Federation.

The respondents made the following recommendations for the Mozambique pilot project that is just getting started.

- Provide basic FS training to provisional staff (as was originally planned) prior to implementation of project activities so that provincial staff do not ignore district technician's requests due to unfamiliarity with the food security situation in the field. This does not appear to have happened yet at the time interviews were conducted.
- Develop a detailed technical assistance plan between ARC and CVM, including timelines for quarterly visits and expectations for both ARC and CVM regarding preparation for these visits in order to make the most of the time with the food security specialist.
- Given that this is the first US government funding for CVM and that the reporting requirements will be unfamiliar to CVM staff, continue providing the types of guidance (from ICB Coordinator Pat McLaughlin) that are necessary to help them comply.²⁰

3.3.2.2. *Indonesia and Viet Nam.* ARC plans to use the final evaluation of the Indonesia ARC/WFP/PMI collaboration on school feeding and nutrition (SPMI project) and the IFEN II project in Viet Nam to extrapolate lessons learned about the partnerships.²¹ A brief paper summarizing lessons learned from the collaboration between the National Society, ARC, and the principal food partner (WFP in the case of Indonesia; USDA in Viet Nam) would be a very useful tool for both ARC and its Movement partners. Currently the lessons learned are only shared internally through informal channels (e.g., debriefings and executive summaries).

²⁰ The early impact of this training seems to have been very good. The first financial reports have come through from Mozambique and are reportedly in order. The time sheets are also appropriately completed. The need for this type of capacity building on reporting is a major lesson learned from ARC's pilot programs that USAID/FFP should support in future ICB grants.

²¹ No ICB funds will be used for the final evaluation of the Indonesia SPMI project. ARC plans to support (with non-ICB funds) the costs of the senior M&E advisor or the ICB coordinator (who has an extensive background in food security and M&E) in the final evaluation of the Vietnamese IFEN II project.

Since food aid and food programming are essential parts of many emergency responses and recovery programs, and ARC is shifting away from food programming, it is necessary to develop a mechanism with which to respond to this need. The solution may be relying on the Federation or hiring short-term consultants on an as-needed basis. Based on this recommendation (which came from several ARC and NS respondents), the evaluators recommend that the recommended Viet Nam briefing paper described above address this issue since it is an important tool that various Movement partners (including ARC) will definitely need to employ at some time in the future.

3.3.3. Long-Term Recommendations for Follow-on Funding

While the two pilot projects funded by the ICB are important (and were mandated by the ICB grant) their importance pales in comparison with the bigger food security strategy and opportunities for realizing this strategy that the USAID/FFP supports under the ARC/ICB. On December 12, IFRC anticipates finalizing the draft job descriptions for the new food security appeal (Five Year Strategic Framework on Food Security for Africa, 2008-2012). After this the IFRC food security office will launch an official appeal to support the anticipated costs (\$42 million). The new strategy expects to fund four regional IFRC food security delegates and one food security focus person in each African country for five years, as well as a series of baseline studies and stronger, better harmonized M&E systems for food security in emergency and non-emergency programming. This strategy –in contrast to previous strategies—provides a clear direction and organizational model for moving ahead with the types of regional capacity building that were envisioned in the 2000 Ouagadougou Declaration. The chief weakness that was noted by the NS staff who reviewed it was that the strategy was less explicit than it should be (and will need to be) in recognizing the existing strategies that each country has formulated, as well as the broader regional strategy to which they have all contributed. As ARC’s experience under the ICB clearly demonstrates, the potential impact of feeding into and strengthening this type of ongoing regional initiative is far greater than any sort of isolated support to a particular country.

The ARC has committed itself, however, to not developing any traditional MYAPs and in restricting its direct involvement in food programming of any sort. This macro policy shift does not preclude ARC from supporting disaster risk reduction and preparedness strategies that take into account food (in) security – given that drought and floods are the main hazards in southern Africa. Considerations relating to mitigating potential impact of disasters (such as HIV/AIDS, soil erosion, flooding, and drought) on livelihood systems are appropriate. The evaluators feel that this is a “window of opportunity” that ARC should seriously discuss with USAID/FFP. ARC has the following options for determining different ways for engaging with the new regional IFRC strategy.

- One option would be to work with USAID/FFP to develop some sort of regional MYAP (either on its own or with another Title II CS that is active in the region) that would build the capacity of National Red Cross Societies in southern Africa to program cash and food to rebuild household assets of people living with

HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). Two of the 10 Red Cross programs are Title II FFP priority countries; the southern Africa region is a top priority for USAID.

- A second option would be to execute singly or in collaboration with another major Title II CS—such as CRS—an ICB grant (as opposed to a MYAP) that would develop cutting-edge models for building National Societies' (a national NGO) capacity for emergency preparedness and model national NGO capacity building. Were ARC to opt for this alternative, its activities would focus on additional strengthening of National Societies' strategies that were developed under the ICB and possibly on helping CRS (or another Title II CSs in Southern Africa) develop similar strategies for the national NGO(e.g., local Catholic charities) with whom it works. This type of collaboration between ARC (whose historic expertise in southern Africa has been in emergency preparedness and response) and CRS (whose historic expertise has been on livelihoods and traditional maternal health programs) could help USAID/FFP develop more realistic models for building better systems for emergency preparedness and response to routine risks and major shocks into its strategic plan.
- A third option would be to continue providing the type of regional capacity building support that it has provided since October 2007 through a separate grant from USAID or another donor.
- A fourth option would be for ARC to help the IFRC attain its goal of raising \$42 million to support the first phase of its Long-Term Food Security Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa. The strength of this assistance model is its cohesion and opportunity for synergy with other Partnering National Societies (from Europe and North America, for example) to develop the capacity of the National Societies and to reduce their vulnerability to long-term risk. In the absence of this type of approach, the Red Cross strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa is going to continue to focus on emergency relief as the depth and seriousness of the problems that are causing the need for relief progress.

4.0. Management Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness

4.1. Management History

The ICB's management and implementation history can be classified into five broad periods. Each period was characterized by a different management and staffing model, a different set of priorities in terms of existing and potential food security partners, and different Title II cooperating sponsor partnerships (Annex III.E):

- Period one: September 3 - December, 25, 2004;
- Period two: December 26, 2004 - September 30, 2005;
- Period three: October 1, 2005 – September 2007;
- Period four: October 2007 (post-mid-term) –August 2007; and
- Period five: September 2007-present.

4.1.1 Period One: September 3 - December 25, 2004

In contrast to many of the other Title II cooperating sponsors' ICB grants, ARC's proposal did not layout a specific management plan or system. All activities were coordinated by the grant manager who was usually the senior food program advisor (or senior food program administrator) depending upon the time period. The grant manager worked in close association with a Food Programming Working Group during FY04. This working group included members of the different operational units in the International Services Department (ISD). This was a highly productive time during which the working group and advisor focused on:

- Increasing ARC HQ staff's core understanding of food security and food management;
- Developing proposals and initial monitoring and evaluation systems for two Title II projects—Tajikistan and Malawi—and the associated consortia;
- Revising and updating the IPP training modules and tools that were developed under the ISA; and
- Developing the partnership and plans for the ARC/CRS M&E series, including the first two draft modules.

4.1.2. Period Two: December 26, 2004 – September 30, 2005

What was a promising start to this period was dramatically altered by the Tsunami (December 24, 2004) and by major financial constraints within ARC's international programs prior to the Tsunami. Once the Tsunami hit, almost all key staff associated with the grant were pulled off for short-term assignments and technical assistance associated with the disaster. Especially important is the fact that ARC did not nominate a replacement for the food security advisor position (who was also the project manager). One reason for this was that they hoped that the staff member seconded to WFP during the Tsunami relief effort would return to occupy that position. Instead they relied on existing staff or fellows to serve as interim personnel. This meant there was no confirmed, long term official head of the project from August 2004, when Mark Smith

(the former project supervisor) was promoted to head of the Africa unit, until March 2006 when Ange Tingbo²² started his position as food program advisor.

The Technical Assistance Unit staff that remained at headquarters were focused on backstopping the relief work. During this time period the activities of the Food Security Working Group, which had been so active in FY04, appear to have been absorbed into the more broad-based relief programming committees and working groups (since many of the key people who wrote the grant had left ARC). The associated staff and management changes slowed the development of some of the specific products that were envisioned by the grant, except those that were envisioned as part of the ARC/CRS M&E module series.²³ ARC's extensive involvement in the Tsunami relief effort did not, however, halt grant activities. If anything, the grant's impact became amplified because many of the products that were developed under the previous ISA grant (FY99-FY01) and refined during FY04 were suddenly scaled up (Annex I). In sum, the ICB continued to address the original grant IRs, but the focus shifted to:

- Strengthening the capacity of WFP, which was now ARC's principal partner for food programming during the relief and
- Revising some of the existing proposal development and reporting tools that had been developed under the earlier ISA and during FY04 of the current grant for use during the Tsunami relief effort.

At the same time, the rate and velocity of turning out new products, training new and existing staff, and revising other products that the grant had envisioned slowed down due to the fact that many of the key staff were pulled off the grant for Tsunami relief.

4.1.3. Period Three: October 1, 2005 – September 2007

The dawn of a new fiscal year (October 1, 2005) was associated with a shift from shorter term emergency efforts to more long term Tsunami recovery programs. This period was also associated with a series of internal meetings to reflect on future directions of the ICB grant, given that some of the key assumptions that went into its design (e.g., the prospects of having new Title II country programs) were no longer valid due to certain shifts in USAID's funding priorities and budgets. Although a high percentage of



Transitional housing built as part of Tsunami relief by ARC in Aceh Besar District, Indonesia.
Photo source: The IDP Assistance Project: Meeting Needs in Tsunami-Affected Aceh.

²² Mark Smith's successor, Regis Chapman, only served four months (Annex III.E and III.D). Ilisa Gertner, a Congressional Hunger Center Fellow, was acting project director for six months. Pat McLaughlin was interim grants coordinator for six months between July 2005 and February 2006 with only 25% of her time budgeted to the grant.

²³ The process of contracting, reviewing, and producing the M&E module series continued as planned during FY05 under the joint guidance of the ARC senior M&E advisor (Alice Willard) and the CRS senior M&E advisor (Guy Sharrock).

the International Services Department staff was involved with the design and execution of relief efforts for Hurricane Katrina, this relief effort did not derail the grant's management structure or slow product execution like the Tsunami had. This period coincides with ARC's attempt to absorb many of the lessons learned from the Tsunami both in terms of programming and philosophy in the following three major areas.

- *IDR's new focus:* The ARC IDR department recommitted itself to focusing on areas for which it has a competitive advantage, which resulted in not executing food programming directly as part of its emergency programs as was being considered when the grant began.²⁴ Any food programming would be administered through sub-contracts or partnerships with other organizations or units within ARC.
- *The creation of new operational units with direct or indirect involvement in food programming:* Given the complexity of shifting from emergency relief to longer term transition programs (especially in the Tsunami area) ARC:
 - Created a separate technical unit to coordinate the Tsunami recovery programs that "bridged" the transition from IDR-managed disaster relief to longer term recovery programs and
 - Separated the Technical Assistance Unit (which coordinates the ICB grant) from the International Program unit (which oversees longer term transitional and development programming) in order to give it more latitude for providing backup technical support to all the units.
- *Renewed emphasis on building national partner capacity, especially in Africa (for ARC and IFRC):* Simultaneous with these changes, there has been a Movement-wide renewed interest in building and tracking national partner capacity and ARC has committed itself to focusing a high percentage of these efforts on Africa. Given the strong link between slow onset disasters (c.g., drought and HIV/AIDS) many of the National Societies have expressed their interest in building their capacity for longer term programming.

4.1.4. Period Four: October 2007-August 2007

Based on the recommendations from the mid-term, the ICB manager requested and received permission to rework the ICB IPTT to make it better tie into the revised program. At the same time ARC's FY07 activity plan:

- Requested and received permission to rework certain budget categories in order to support the new position of the regional food security delegate in southern Africa who started in October 2006 (this position was not in the original proposal); and
- Accelerated the execution of activities under the grant, particularly the activities in southern Africa. Especially important was the posting of the new food security delegate to southern Africa, which brought an immediate acceleration of activity in that region that is discussed in greater detail in section three.

²⁴ This decision was heavily influenced by a financial crisis that hit the International Services Department in early 2005 combined with a shift in the more limited prospects for getting Title II MYAPs.

The same reorganization coincided with the third major institutional reorganization of the International Services Department since the grant started that resulted from a departmental strategic planning process (Annex III.C). Based on this strategic planning process (February-June 2007), ARC re-confirmed (a) its strategic focus on disaster management and health and (b) its decision to support expertise within a few niches in these fields, not including food security (see also Box 5.2 in section 5).

Even with these constraints, the project has already followed up on, or is planning to follow up, on most (85%) of the mid-term recommendations that are relevant to the revised activity list (Table 4.1). As a result of the management and financial changes made at mid-term, the execution of the project's IR2 activities—which were virtually nonexistent at mid-term—moved forward dramatically and became more effective and efficient.

4.1.5. Period Five: September 2007- Present

The fifth period of the grant coincides with the conclusion of an intensive seven month strategic planning process during which the ARC ISD sought to better define “ISD’s role, align its efforts, maximize its effectiveness, and provide clarity of focus” (ARC/ISD 2007: 1). The output of the exercise was a new three year strategic plan (FY08-FY10).

The senior food program officer left the project in August 2007. At this time the decision was made not to replace this position, but to reallocate the responsibility to the head of the TAU (Pat McLaughlin, 50% time allocation). Based on lessons learned over the last five years, ARC has decided not to replace the position of the food program advisor/food security advisor. In its place, the decision has been made to support a core group of positions to backstop these programs, including:

- A new position of senior relief advisor with a food security and livelihoods background that ARC is in the process of hiring someone to fill (Box 4.1);
- Two M&E specialist positions including at least one with background in emergencies and/or food security/livelihoods (position descriptions being revised); and
- A regional food security delegate in southern Africa to continue supporting its activities in southern Africa (position description scheduled to expire in May 2007 and will be extended through the life of the grant).

Given the focus of its ongoing activities in southern Africa, ARC feels that the regional food security delegate in southern Africa is the most appropriate person to represent it in dealings with the Senior Officer, Food Security and Nutrition, Disaster Policy and Preparedness department, IFRC (Geneva) and in future collaborations on the Five Year Strategic Framework on Food Security for Africa 2008-2012.

The current plan is that this basic structure could be strengthened on fairly short notice by hiring trained consultants with extensive and current experience in food security. ARC feels that in contrast to many areas where ARC intervenes (e.g., health in emergencies)

Table 4.1. ARC Follow-Up on Mid-Term Recommendations

Mid-Term Recommendations	FY07	FY08
1. Develop self-assessment tools needed to track capacity in the major ISD operational units (IDR, TRP, IP)	No	No
2. Create a food security (food programming) seminar series (including at least one in-house training on “food security basics”) and associated modules	Partial	
3. Develop a pre and post test for the food security/programming seminar series and food security basics course as a tool for monitoring staff comprehension of key issues	No	
4. Set priorities for tools development and completion	Yes	Yes
5. Assign clear responsibility for completing tools	Yes	Yes
6. Prepare bibliographies that situate tools within a broader internal and external context	no	Yes
7. Facilitate CS-wide distribution of appropriate completed tools	Yes	Yes
8. Facilitate internal RC and external CS access to ARC/CRS M&E module series	Yes	Yes
9. Strengthen existing “food programming” and/or “food security” checklist form	No	No
10. Participate actively in quarterly reviews of projects in International Services Department (ISD)	Yes	Yes
11. Revise sub-output statement	Yes	Yes
12. Revise indicators	Partial	
13. Determine whether indicators should continue to focus on nutrition or general assessment	n/a	n/a
14. Consolidate information on ARC and IFRC existing experiences with emergency indicators	n/a	n/a
15. Identify other valuable experiences and indicators from other Title II cooperating sponsors	n/a	n/a
16. Identify a reduced number of “core indicators” that can be pilot tested	n/a	n/a
17. Revise output text to reflect expanded universe of partners	Yes	Yes
18. Revise performance indicators for this sub-output to reflect expanded universe of partners	Yes	Yes
19. Rework phrasing of output text (to reflect the deletion of advocacy as a goal for activities)	Yes	Yes
20. Create a web-based technical paper series and web page	Yes	Yes
21. Design and execute pilot programs (3 planned) and RDRT training in southern Africa	Yes	Yes
22. Create self-assessment capacity index that national RC societies can use to identify and track their needs and progress	No	Not enough time
23. Add two new indicators that track impact of better partnerships, as well as number and content of partnerships	Yes	Yes
24. Ensure continuous staffing of senior food program advisor position	Yes	Yes
25. Ensure that the senior food program advisor has access to necessary staff and consultancy support needed to conduct the job	Yes	Yes
26. Create food programming committee and use committee to oversee clear tracking and planning for project activities	Yes	No
27. Revise ICB budget so that it is in line with revised priorities and activities of grant	Yes	Yes
28. Develop flexible annual training plans	Yes (for S. Africa IR2)	
29. Develop better systems for tracking who is trained, in what, and when	No	Yes
30. Revise PITT indicators and targets based on review of recommendations made in mid-term	Yes	

N/A: No longer applicable due to ARC’s decision not to support this recommendation or set of activities.

Box 4.1: New Position Description: Senior Relief Advisor, ARC International Disaster Response Unit (November 2007)

ARC International Disaster Response is committed to providing higher quality and more professional responses related to relief and early recovery. In order to achieve our goal, we must revisit and clarify our 'core programs' or types of interventions, focus on quality and accountability elements, and create a culture of learning them. Current 'relief' efforts have focused on pre-positioning stock and distribution of commodity; the link must be made with continuous assessment/monitoring and linking the stocks and distributions with beneficiary need. The paradigm must also focus on the quality of relief interventions, beyond the process to include beneficiary inclusion in assessments and feedback, continuous monitoring with common indicators, coordination, expanded options for emergency relief response, and links with early recovery programming. Technical support is required if we are to deliver on the core pillar of ARC expertise and reputation.

there is a large well-trained pool of consultant labor (many of them trained on and/or in association with Title II programs) that is available to supplement these positions.

4.2. Budget, Financial Systems, and Reporting to USAID/FFP

4.2.1. The ICB Budget

The total budget for the ICB is \$2,716,112, of which \$1,800,000 was awarded by USAID with a commitment from the American Red Cross (ARC) of \$916,112 (33% of the grant total) in matching funds that was modified to 34% in 2007. Another strength of ARC (beyond its unparalleled capacity for mass mobilization both in the US and abroad through its active system of local chapters, strong brand recognition, and ground-level Movement partners) is its extremely solid, well-developed, harmonized systems for management of project funds (Box 4.2).

Box 4.2: The ARC ICB Project Budget and Financial Systems

At ARC, the project manager manages the project budget. An independent unit based in Charlotte, N.C. does the financial reporting and ensures compliance with ARC and US rules and regulations. The main principles are as follows.

- Activity for each federal award is tracked in a separate restricted Action Program (AP) code, intended to only be used for that one specific program activity.
- Any expense activity incurred against the ICB award is allowable against the program as outlined by the grant agreement; expenses are made and recorded according to guidelines specified in ARC/expense/procurement/contracting policies.
- Expense activity for the grant is monitored against the project budget (which was developed according to provisions specified in the approved grant proposal) on a monthly basis by NHQ [National Headquarters] analyst; detailed expense activity is also monitored via review of a detailed "NHQ Report," which provides description of any expense line item that was recorded on the GL [General Ledger] for the program.
- All salary expenses and related benefits to the ICB grant are supported by monthly time sheets.
- All external reporting is completed by the SSC [Shared Services Center] Restricted Funds Group.

Source: Ange Tingbo. September 2006 in McMillan and Tingbo 2006: 35.