

The grant has been implemented under rigorous budget controls. Only a small percentage of the budget has been used for staff positions since three of the four positions that were identified for support were never filled or were only filled for short periods.<sup>25</sup> Certain training programs and text revisions (like the first revision of the ERU training manual) were not paid for with ICB funds. Thus the grant was under-spent at mid-term. Based on many of the management changes made during mid-term the food security advisor was able to accelerate execution of several key activities, especially those under IR2.

#### 4.2.2. Cost-Share

The issue of meeting cost-share was complicated by the fact that ARC did not move forward with the Title II programs that it thought it would develop under the project. This issue has been solved, however, by USAID granting ARC permission to count at least part of the private donor money that was donated to the Indonesia post-Tsunami recovery program as “cost-share.” ARC’s request to count these funds as cost-share was justified based on ARC’s decisions to add Indonesia as the third pilot country (which was approved by USAID/FFP) which was justified in terms of the need:

- To provide an excellent way to reach the ICB learning objectives 2 and 3;<sup>26</sup> and
- To extrapolate the important lessons learned from building PMI capacity to partner with WFP.

#### 4.2.3. Reporting

ARC was very careful to document the shifts in grant activity and budget over the life cycle of the project. The chief challenge to this was the difficulty ARC had in getting written authorization from USAID to use ICB resources to strengthen its activities with WFP. The project documentation files are full of repeated requests for written permission. This permission was not granted until July-August 2007.

Based on interviews with USAID/FFP, it is clear that ARC should have prepared a contract amendment and a revised IPTT as soon as it became clear (at the start of the second year) that they were not going to be executing any MYAPs. This type of contract revision would have facilitated reporting. Future guidance from USAID for MYAPs should emphasize that while contract amendments are not to be encouraged they can and should be invoked when a shift in circumstances cause a major shift in project activities and budgets.

---

<sup>25</sup> The ICB proposal anticipated four positions: program manager/food aid manager; nutritionist (with an M&E background), financial manager, and a second food aid manager. Only the food aid manager position has been staffed consistently. In lieu of new positions, several staff (including the senior M&E advisor and the TAU director [who was formerly in the TAU M&E unit]) have charged time to the grant. With the addition of the new regional food program advisor, two of the four positions in the proposal were filled.

<sup>26</sup> ICB Learning Objective 2: Strengthen NS capacity to target, distribute, report on, and in general manage relief (including food); ICB Learning Objective 2: Strengthen ONS capacity to access, use and report on food and food security interventions in longer-term programs, especially HIV/AIDS-related strategies.

### **4.3. Conclusions: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Risks of the Current Management Structures and Systems**

#### **4.3.1. Conclusions (SWOT)**

*4.3.1.1. Strengths.* A major strength of ARC's execution of the ICB grant is its internal systems for tracking project documentation, budgets, reports and the project's reporting data. Another strength is ARC's commitment to using ICB funds to strengthen the impact of existing funds for emergency and non-emergency programming, training (such as the ERU training), and tools development. Another strength has been the use of ICB funds to strengthen the training and tools being used by Federation initiatives—such as the development of the LOGIC software and the use of ICB funds to help eight southern African National Societies develop food security strategies. This type of “leveraging” of ICB support has resulted in a much larger impact of USAID's funds than could have been had from strengthening a few isolated Title II initiatives as was originally intended.

*4.3.1.2. Weakness.* The chief weakness of the program's management model has been ARC's inconsistent posting of a food programming advisor/ICB manager. Between October 2003 and February 2006, the grant had four project managers only one of whom (Mark Smith who served for 10 months) was not acting as an interim. To date, the longest period of time someone has spent in the position was Ange Tingbo who was in the position from February 2006 to August 2007 (18 months). The grant has had a full time, confirmed grant manager, who was also the ARC food program Advisor, for only 20 of the 50 months (56%) of the grant. This lack of recognized, solid funding for and support for a food programming advisor is less of a problem while the grant is funded given ARC's firm commitment to completing its obligations under the grant. It becomes a problem when one considers the key factors that are likely to contribute to or detract from the ability of the organization to sustain the impacts of the grant once project funding ends.

*4.3.1.3. Opportunities.* To date, the issue of funding a position that would serve as a focal point for food security reflection within ARC's emergency and non-emergency programs has been directly linked to internal debates about whether or not ARC will develop or manage food programming. Although the new ISD Strategic Plan (FY2008-2010)<sup>27</sup> excludes ISD's direct participation in design and execution of food security programs or any type of food programming that involves direct distribution of commodities or Food for Work, it does NOT appear to preclude:

- ISD overseeing contracts with agencies such as WFP or FAO to execute either emergency or recovery programs that take into account food security concerns;
- ISD staff helping to build the capacity of National Societies affected by these contracts in order to promote good monitoring and reporting, targeting distribution on relief items in emergency response, and or on food as part of disaster risk reduction);

---

<sup>27</sup> ARC. 2007. International Services Strategic Plan FY2008-2010. Summary Statement of Strategic Direction. September 2007. Washington, DC: International Services, American Red Cross.

- Staff associated with the ISD department assisting the RC/RC Movement to define its approach to “chronic” food security disasters such as recurrent drought or drought/flood cycles;
- ARC partnering with other organizations (e.g, FAO and WWF) that are experts in the design and execution of innovative non-food based livelihood programs, such as the highly innovative joint initiative that ARC has embarked on with FAO regarding sustainable livelihoods; or
- ARC working more closely with IFRC and National Societies to build the types of capacity that these societies (183) want to build, especially in areas where disasters are recurrent.

At this juncture, it would be very useful if ARC could dissociate any discussion of some sort of follow-up focal point for its food security or livelihoods activities from the discussion of the new ISD strategic framework and look at what types of focused technical advising they are likely to need for their programs within the new policy context. This is a context in which the following are assumed.

- ARC is not expecting another Tsunami size donation of money that would allow them to fund a separate WFP program. In case it does, ARC is better prepared to deal with it than they were in 2004.
- In the “normal” course of emergency events, WFP is probably much more interested in the Federation and National Societies than in the ARC, except as a potential donor.
- WFP aside, ARC is interested in partnering with agencies that have food/livelihood expertise because this is a good way to respond to priority needs in recovery.
- The issues of building NS capacity to address some of the causes of recurrent crises are likely to become increasingly urgent as a result of climate change and other factors.

#### 4.3.2. Recommendations (ARC): Consider Various Options for Sustaining the Early Impact of the ICB’s Capacity Building Activities in Southern Africa

Due to the late start of the ICB’s activities in southern Africa, very few of these activities will be sustainable by the end of the grant and IFRC does not yet have either the staff or funds to pick up the slack. Therefore, ARC needs to evaluate various options for determining different ways of engaging with the new regional IFRC strategy. These options should include talking to USAID about what, if any, interest it has in strengthening the southern African portion of its Title II and non-Title II regional portfolio. The various options for this are discussed in the previous chapter and the conclusion of this report.

#### 4.3.3. Lessons Learned (USAID): Strengthen CS Understanding of Contract Amendments for ICB Grants

One of the chief administrative challenges that ARC faced in getting approval for this grant was getting written authorization to shift the focus of the grant to ARC’s

partnerships with the World Food Programme. This challenge could have been avoided had ARC known that it had the option of developing a contract amendment. Since many of the staff associated with the grant at the beginning—when an amendment would have been most useful—were new to Title II administration, they were unfamiliar with this mechanism.

The new guidance needs to be clear about when and how to apply for a contract amendment if a grantee is required to make major changes in the activities or geographical focus of an ICB grant. This administrative mechanism, which is often evoked for Title II MYAPs, is less often evoked, if ever, for ICB grants. Making Title II programs apply for contract amendments and/or making sure that the FFP officer is authorized to make major changes without a contract amendment can help a grant manager move forward with legitimate shifts. Major delays in approving such changes can encourage grant managers to continue executing activities that are no longer useful, or even relevant, simply because they are in the approved grant.

## 5.0. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Relevance and Recommendations

### 5.1. Summary Impact ICB on ARC's Core Capacity as Defined by the Four Specific Learning Objectives

#### 5.1.1. ICB Learning Objective 1: Strengthen ARC Capacity to Understand the Basic Elements of Food (In)Security Especially as these Related to What we Need to be Aware of in Undertaking Emergency Needs Assessments and to Train Others in Targeting, Distribution, and Reporting.

Several of the ICB activities, formal and informal training activities have had major institutional impact on ARC's institutional capacity to design and manage food aid, nutrition and livelihood interventions as an effective response to food insecure populations in emergency and post-emergency recovery situations. Some of these activities were directly funded by the ICB; others were just facilitated by the ICB or benefited from the use of ICB tools or training. The prospects for sustaining these positive results are strengthened by:

- The continued use and updating of three tools: the IPP handbook, Emergency Response Unit (ERU) Relief Manual, and the Logistics Software;
- Major improvements in the core food security and M&E training that many HQ and regional staff received under the ICB;
- The strong partnership with WFP –the first of its kind—which benefited indirectly (through ISA and ICB trained staff, training, and technical backstopping which the ARC has taken steps to mainstream; and
- Other partnerships—likely the highly innovative partnership with USDA in Viet Nam and with FAO and WWF in Indonesia—are convincing many inside the ARC about the need for ARC to continue to support the Federation's efforts to develop a more inclusive model of risk mitigation and recovery.

#### 5.1.2. ICB Learning Objectives 2-4:

- Learning Objective 2: Strengthen NS capacity to target, distribute, report on and in general manage relief (including food).
- Learning Objective 3: Strengthen NS capacity to access, use and report on food and food security interventions in longer-term programs, especially HIV/AIDS related strategies.
- Learning Objective 4: Assist the RC/RC Movement to define its approach to "chronic" food security disasters such as recurrent drought or drought/flood cycles.

One major and extremely important output of the ICB has been to increase ARC's understanding of what types of capacity building and support will be needed to bring about sustainable long-term changes in ONS capacity. The concept of capacity building has always a part of ARC's international programs. What was missing and very much in demand at the start of the ICB was a realistic model of how to do this. ARC's initial proposal focused on the creation of "pilot programs" and the use of classic training programs and TA to build the capacity of staff to execute these programs. Over the course of the grant ARC's capacity building model evolved:

- *From* its initial focus on the use of ICB funds to develop specific capacities to address food security and nutrition issues within the context of emergency response and developmental relief;
- *To* the use of ICB funds to build capacity to address food security and HIV/AIDS within the context of a broader strategy and coalition of partners (including the IFRC, other international Red Cross societies from developed countries, the UN and local government).

By shifting the focus of its training funds, the ICB is helping to leverage a “process” not a specific program or project with specific outputs. This revised strategy—which is in the early stages of execution in southern Africa—is revolutionary in its potential implications for IFRC since it helps structure and focus the input from the wealthier societies into this IFRC wide initiative.

### 5.1.3. Critical Risks to Sustaining the Results of the ICB for the Four Learning Objectives

These results achieved under each of the ICB’s learning objectives are real but they are far from institutionalized and they are difficult to quantify.

- These results are difficult to quantify because ARC never implemented any of program capacity index that was recommended at mid-term. There are numerous models for this type of capacity building both from within USAID and within the Title II world.<sup>28</sup>
- The most immediate institutional threats to sustaining the results are the systems in place for sustaining a basic level of understanding of food security basics and the more technical elements of integrating food security concerns into emergency and post-disaster programs at two levels—one level is ARC; the other level is the IFRC (Geneva).

Based on recent policy decisions, ARC is not replacing and or planning to continue the position of Senior Food Programming Advisor. Instead they are going to rely on a more diffuse set of specialists within the organization and the Regional Food Delegate. This new organizational structure makes sense within the current context where ARC has reaffirmed its commitment to focusing on emergencies. At the same time it raises real issues about how the different specialists will stay in touch, how they will deal with outside food security partners and specialists (WFP, FAO, USAID), and how they will maintain a certain core institutional knowledge about basic tools and “lessons learned” from previous and ongoing programs (like the South Africa initiative).

Many staff members argue that this role can be passed on to the IFRC Food Security Unit in Geneva. While this is ideal, that unit is currently very weak. It has one staff member and very little budget to cover the entire world. At present almost all the food security

---

<sup>28</sup> The Food Security Advisor made several presentations on community capacity indices (most notably the Food Security Capacity Index [FSCCI]. This is different from a program capacity index like the IDF (Institutional Development Framework) that USAID helped develop through MSI (Management Systems International) or the Africare Food Security Program Capacity Index (FSPCI).

focal persons in Africa (in specific societies) and most of the IFRC regional food security delegates are people whose main positions are defined as “Disaster Management” or “Health.” This means that they are pulled off the food security programming issues any time there is a disaster.

If the IFRC (Geneva) appeal for the “Five-year strategic framework on food security for Africa, 2008-2010” is successful, the capacity of the IFRC to execute this type of technical backstopping will be much greater. Even then, however, ARC will need someone on its staff to be designated as the “Food Security Point Person.” ARC is currently recommending that the ARC regional food security delegate in southern Africa be that person. If he moves to another region or leaves ARC, it is not at all clear who would replace him as the “food security focal point.”

## **5.2. Relevance of the ICB Objectives and Impact<sup>29</sup> to ARC’s Current International Strategy**

When this grant started, food security was one of five priorities being developed under the International Services strategy that was announced in 2000 (Box 5.1). By the end of this grant, ARC’s International Services department had adopted a new strategic plan in which food security was no longer a priority (Box 5.2). Despite these major changes in agency policy between the baseline, mid-term, and final evaluation of this grant (Annex III.C), the core objectives of the grant were and continued to be highly relevant.

### **5.2.1. Continued Need for Informed Development and Supervision of Emergency Response and Recovery Contracts**

Even though the ARC has stated its intent not to execute food programming, it cannot avoid supervising emergency and non-emergency food contracts that respond to large international crises for which it becomes a major donor like in the Tsunami. ARC will never accept being a simple “pass through” for food security contracts.

The agency has some of the highest reporting standards in the industry which can delay the ability to respond in a crisis. ARC knows this and is taking steps to avoid some of the problems that emerged during the WFP partnership. The new contract template being developed by WFP is an example of best practice for emergency food programming. ARC’s new partnership with FAO is likely to set a new standard in post-recovery programming. While all of these are contracts, they require informed insight and supervision. The two people (Regis Chapman, Ilisa Gertner) who played a critical role in making these partnerships happen were trained under the ICB. Both have

---

<sup>29</sup> ICB Final Evaluation SOW:

6. Given changes in the ARC strategic direction, assess the relevance to ARC of the objectives and of the capacities promoted through the ICB grant? Assess their relevance to the Movement, especially in Africa?  
7. Have changes in the ICB implementation strategies resulted in more relevance to ARC and Movement partners over time?

### **Box 5.1: Conception of Food Security in the ARC International Services 2000 Strategic Plan**

“American Red Cross international emergency response will focus on **providing food**, shelter, water sanitation, emergency medical and health care, family linking, raising public awareness of an emergency, and undertaking assessments to guide decisions on medium and long-term response. Increasing vulnerability and threats demand that we build and improve our international disaster response capabilities in each of these areas.

...To augment and increase the capacity of sister societies, the American Red Cross provides humanitarian assistance bilaterally and with other appropriate local partners. These activities will address needs following emergency response (short-term recovery), needs due to chronic vulnerability (health and **food security**), and when requested to bolster sister society capacity (institutional development and long-term partnerships).

...In addition to rapid response, the American Red Cross has developed core competencies in the following areas, which provide the foundation of our international assistance;

- Health Promotion including psychosocial assistance
- **Food Security (feeding/nutrition)**
- Water Sanitation
- Organizational Development including Disaster Preparedness
- Family Linking - Tracing
- Dissemination and Application of International Humanitarian Law”

**Source:** ISD-ARC. 2000. American Red Cross - International Doctrine. Washington, DC: International Services Department, ARC. **Note:** Bold lettering added for emphasis.

emphasized over and over the critical role that this background training played in their ability to coordinate these complex contracts that included food security components

#### 5.2.2. Continued need for Internal Capacity Building of ARC Staff and Partner on Critical Themes

In the absence of consistent of “pot stirring” through continuous training of staff and TA staff knowledge of the internal and external tools that they need to address food security in the ARC programs or sub-contracts that they manage is very weak. Unless this knowledge is continually updated and renewed—as has been done with the IPP Handbook—it can wash out of the institution memory. Given the high rates of staff turnover, this doesn’t take long. Some of our best evidence for this is the relatively large number of ARC international staff and even HQ staff who either didn’t know what the IPP handbook was or how to use it. Once this knowledge washes out, ARC will be forced to retrain and (if no one is familiar with the materials) retrain and/or hire trainers and the cost of retraining rehiring and reconnecting will be much more expensive than the cost of maintaining what they have.

ARC has consistent programs for training and retraining volunteers and emergency workers. It needs to move consistent programs for insuring a certain degree of core training and capacity in the types of innovative programming that it is likely to continue to be involved in through as a donor.



**Box 5.2. Excerpts from the International Services Strategic Plan FY2008-2010. Summary Statement of Strategic Direction (September 2007)**

...The American Red Cross International Services Department's (ISD) Fiscal Year 2008-2010 Strategic Plan seeks to define ISD's role, align its efforts, maximize its effectiveness, and provide clarity of focus. The Plan will strengthen the international services and operations by focusing on three thematic areas: Program Effectiveness, Organizational Effectiveness and Financial Sustainability.

Program Effectiveness—...ISD will focus its programs by building on its comparative advantages and proven strengths in order to scale-up the delivery of **Disaster Management and Disease Prevention** programs....

The American Red Cross will seek out partnerships that best complement these comparative advantages rather than attempt to replicate the important competencies and assets of other organizations. Existing programs that do not utilize these comparative advantages will be concluded at the earliest possible time with the objective of minimizing disruption to beneficiaries and partners.

...In working multilaterally and collaboratively with the Movement and collaboratively with other partners, ISD will:

- Institute annual dialogue with the Secretariat of the International Federation and the ICRC for determining the relationship of the American Red Cross with these two Movement components;
- Be proactive when funds are available, to support National Societies' priorities in alignment with the ISD Strategic Plan; and
- Collaborate with the International Federation and the ICRC to deliver humanitarian assistance globally, while creating opportunities for staff to work with or in the International Federation and the ICRC.

...Given the complexity and highly dynamic nature of disasters, ISD will pursue a holistic Disaster Management (DM) strategy that spans a disaster cycle: Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Response, and Early Recovery. When resources allow, ISD will also support Long-Term Recovery Efforts.

...Early recovery represents the period immediately following an emergency phase, typically lasting 6-12 months, which focuses on restoring livelihoods, building community resilience, reducing the future shock of disasters, and **stabilizes the environment to lay a foundation for longer-term rebuilding and recovery.**

... **While the organization will not actively pursue long term recovery funding, in these situations [when large and highly visible international disasters result in a significant outpouring of public generosity which allows the American Red Cross to support activities beyond the relief and early recovery phases] the American Red Cross will, as required and appropriate, support activities to help communities rebound from the effects of a large disaster."**

**Source:** ARC. 2007. International Services Strategic Plan FY2008-2010. Summary Statement of Strategic Direction. September 2007. Washington, DC: International Services, ARC.

**Note:** Bold added for emphasis.

### 5.2.3. Continued Need for Supporting the IFRC Efforts to redefine the Movement's Approach to Chronic food security Disasters

There is wide spread agreement among all the IFRC personnel in Africa interviewed that the ARC strategy fits front and center with the “new think” for Africa. IFRC sees its principal challenge over next five years as helping build the capacity—the basic systems—for disaster risk mitigation...not just response to disaster. Response to disasters is the Red Cross's forte—in Africa and world wide. There is emerging awareness throughout the Movement that this traditional response to risk not enough but that building systems to counter act long-term risks is critical. This is the core focus of the IFRC strategy and ARC attempts to bolster it. In the absence of this new paradigm the world is likely to see a progressive deepening of the food crises as the local systems for coping with risk continue to erode.

To date, however, the capacity of the Federation to train the operating national societies in this new way of thinking has been critically constrained due to lack of funds and staff. ARC's contribution of support through the activities of the ARC Food Security Advisor and the regional food security delegate for southern Africa has helped “move” the strategy in southern Africa. This is a critical new development that ARC needs to continue to support before it is sustainable.

## **5.3. Lessons Learned and Recommendations for ARC**

### 5.3.1. Recommendations for Revising and Distributing Tools (during the next 8 months)

*Observation:* The ICB has created a number of cutting edged tools. They have also posted these tools on their website and distributed the tools directly to many field offices and individuals within the field offices who are likely to benefit from using the tools. In spite of this issue, many staff members still stated that they were either unaware of the tools or how to access them.

*Recommendation:* To strengthen staff awareness of and use of the tools by staff within ARC, the Red Cross Movement and the other Title II CS's, ARC should develop over the next eight months:

- 1) A series of short briefing papers that summarize the major tools developed or revised under the ICB (including the ARC/CRS M&E Series), how they can be used to solve particular types of programming issues, and where to find the tools (in the FY08 work plan and tasked to the Senior Advisor M&E);
- 2) A briefing paper in this series that summarizes the “lessons learned” from this collaboration between the Indonesia national society (SPMI), ARC, and WFP that will be based on the case study/evaluation of the SPMI (WFP/ARC/PMI) that is in the FY08 work plan;
- 3) A briefing paper in this series that summarizes lessons learned from the highly innovative food for education model that was used on the ARC/USDA project in Viet Nam;

- 4) A briefing paper in this series that describes the LOGIC software and the RFP guidance and how projects can use these tools or similar tools to enhance project impact;
- 5) A briefing paper in this series that summarizes the major lessons learned from the WFP-ARC partnership should be developed based on the results of the partnership assessment that was conducted in 2006;
- 6) A short 2-3 page “cheat sheet” that staff can use to identify documents and “tools” that can help them solve common problems related to emergency needs assessment and training staff in targeting, distribution, and reporting on food security interventions in emergency and longer term programs, especially HIV/AIDS related strategies; and
- 7) To insure that the briefing paper and “cheat sheet” are user friendly, ARC should ask ARC field staff and NS staff with whom ARC works to review the briefing papers and “cheat sheet” and to suggest ways that it can be made more field friendly.

Given the critical importance of the ERU Training Manual and strengthening the sections of this manual dealing with targeting, managing emergency rations, and incorporating short and long-term food considerations into emergency and non-food programming, ARC should consider:

- 8) (if funds allow) Supporting or co-supporting the cost of some additional revision of the ERU manual dealing with food security concerns that would make the manual more relevant to southern Africa; and
- 9) Encouraging the ICB funded food security delegate to revise the presentation he gave at the ERU training workshop into a “canned” training module that future training programs can use to train staff.

Given the critical importance of keeping a certain level of capacity within the institution about the IPP handbook, ARC should consider:

- 10) (a) Revisiting the training models that were used in 2006 for HQ and field staff (if funds and staff commitment allow) and determining what types of models are likely to be most useful for different categories of HQ staff, ARC field staff and ONS with whom ARC is collaborating; and based on this, (b) developing a better and more efficient system for training and retraining HQ and field staff (to ensure institutional learning); and
- 11) Revising (if funds and staff commitments allow) some of the outdated language of the log frame and updating the text to consider beneficiary accountability issues.

#### 5.3.2. Continue to Strengthen ARC’s Support for the Two Pilot Programs in Southern Africa (Lesotho and Mozambique)

*Observation:* 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 the finalization of the different country strategies during FY07 and by his support (formal and informal) to the RDRT training in 2007.

*Recommendations:* 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. For these activities to be sustainable, however, they need to be strongly integrated with the IFRC's broader regional initiatives, particularly the HIV/AIDS initiative which is relatively well funded. For this reason, the ARC Regional Food Security Advisor's activities should probably focus on

- The successful execution of the pilot studies and insuring their sustainability and/or sharing lessons learned from these experiences within the wider IFRC initiative during the remaining eight months of the grant;
- Better reporting on ARC's regional activities and contribution to the regional IFRC initiatives to the IFRC food security office in Geneva; and
- Producing several papers on "lessons learned" from the experience as part of the briefing paper series described above

Some of the short-term recommendations for the Mozambique pilot projects that respondents put forth in the course of the final evaluation interviews include:

- Accelerate the basic FS training that the project planned to offer to provisional staff prior to implementation of project activities so that provincial staff do not ignore district technician's requests due to unfamiliarity of food security situation in the field (This type of training has always been planned as part of Output 1 and 2; at the time of the interview it just hadn't been executed, but is now scheduled for February.)
- Develop a detailed technical assistance plan between ARC and CVM including timeline for quarterly visits and expectation for both ARC and CVM for 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 that the reporting requirements will be unfamiliar to MRCS staff continue providing the types of guidance (from the ICB Coordinator Pat McLaughlin) that is necessary to help them comply.<sup>30</sup>

### 5.3.3. Continue to Assist the RC/RC Movement to Define its Approach to "Chronic" Food Security Disasters such as Recurrent Drought or Drought Flood Cycles (Learning Objective 4)

*Observation:* While the two pilot projects funded by ICB are important (and were mandated by the ICB grant) their importance pales in comparison with the bigger strategy and opportunities for realizing these strategies that the USAID/FFP supports under the ARC/ICB has helped to shape. On December 12, IFRC anticipates finalizing job descriptions for new food security positions connected with the new Five-year strategic framework on food security for Africa 2008-2012. The appeal is for 42 million dollars

---

<sup>30</sup> 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.

and expects to fund: four regional delegates and one focus person in each country for five years as well as a series of baseline studies and stronger better harmonized M&E systems.

This strategy—in contrast to previous strategies—provides a clear strategy 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 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 that they have all contributed to.

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.

ARC has committed itself to a true focus on disaster management and disease prevention that builds on Red Cross Red Crescent comparative advantages, and are sectors for which ARC believes it can raise money for consistently and allow them to partner with National Societies (NS) more effectively. This macro policy shift, however, does NOT preclude ARC from using food to support programs that HIV/AIDS "emergency" response and recovery programs in southern Africa or to consider food security from the lens of disaster risk reduction and recovery. The evaluators feel that this is a "window of opportunity" that ARC should seriously discuss with the USAID/FFP.

*Recommendations:* ARC has several 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 the household assets of 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—to develop a follow-on ICB grant (as opposed to a MYAP) that would focus on developing cutting edged models for building national societies (an national NGO) capacity for emergency preparedness and national NGO capacity building.
- 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 Red Cross societies 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 progressively gets worse and worse.

#### 5.3.4. Strengthen ARC's internal Systems for Integrating Food Security and Livelihood Perspectives into Emergency Relief and Response Programs

*Observation:* Based on lessons learned over the last five years, ARC has decided to neither create a stand alone food security unit, nor 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:

- *Senior Relief Advisor:* A senior Relief Advisor with a food security and livelihoods background (Position description creating and in the course of being hired);
- *M&E Specialist:* An additional M&E specialist position with background in food security/livelihoods (Position description being revised); and
- *Regional Delegate:* A regional food security delegate in southern Africa to continue supporting its activities in southern Africa (Position description scheduled to expire in May 2007).
- *Partnership Coordinator:* These activities would be reinforced by the existing position in international programs of "Partnership Coordinator." The current person in this position is one of ARC's most experienced food security specialists (Ilisa Gertner).
- *Coordination with IFRC Food Security Unit:* Given the focus of its ongoing activities in southern Africa, ARC feels that the Regional Food Security Delegate in southern Africa is most appropriate person to represent it in dealings with the IFRC's food security unit in Geneva and in future collaborations on the five year strategic framework on food security for Africa 2008-2012.
- *Consultants:* The current plan is that this basic structure could be strengthened on fairly short notice by hiring trained consultants with extensive and very current experience in food security. ARC feels that in contrast to many areas where the ARC intervenes (like health in emergency) 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.

While this structure may be well adapted to the current strategy it is not at all adapted to maintaining a certain core capacity in ARC. In the short-run it can work because the people in these positions and/or supervising them have a great deal of experience on various ICB and ISA activities. In the long-run, when these individuals leave, there will be no established system or person in charge who will be responsible for retraining or reorienting.

*Recommendation:* ARC has two options for strengthening this system in simple ways that will not require hiring new staff or at most hiring one staff.

*Option one* would involve creating a new position of a livelihoods advisor or to ask an existing person on staff with covering these functions. This position would serve as a

lightening rod for Federation communication and NS for capacity building on food security considerations in short-term and chronic long-term programming. This person would be responsible for: (a) overseeing the regular updating of core food security tools for ARC in connection with ARC's ongoing programming; (b) overseeing a highly flexible system of internal and external (i.e. IFRC or other agency sponsored) training for new and existing staff; and (c) tracking core capacity and knowledge of key staff of useful tools.

*Option two*, which doesn't preclude option one involves creating an informal "South Africa Food security /risk management working group." The primary purpose of this working group could be to provide some sort of structured "backup" and feedback to ARC's pilot initiative working with IFRC southern Africa. In the absence of creating this group, the institutional learning from the ICB funded activities in southern Africa is likely to be minimal. Despite his having presented two brown bag lunch presentations at ARC HQ, only a fraction of the ARC staff could articulate what the regional food delegate was doing or what if any impact it could have on the national societies or ARC's conceptual model for building national society capacity.

This type of informal "working group" fits well within the institutional culture of the ARC and could be scaled up or down as needed. A separate "learning group" has already been tasked with reviewing the bigger issues of extrapolating lessons learned from the major Tsunami partnerships and revising the text and training for the IPP, and standardizing M&E systems.

#### **5.4. Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Future ICB Grants**

ARC's ICB grant shows how a capacity building grant can help emergency programs incorporate a wider food security perspective into their design and execution. While the ARC's focus on emergencies is unique it is not without precedent since most of the larger Title II PVOs have emergency wings that are similar to ARC in structure and focus. Many of ARC's "lessons learned" in trying to expand the focus of its emergency programs can be usefully applied to these programs as well.

##### **5.4.1. Require NGOs to Produce Simple Tool Checklists that help HQ and Field Staff Better Use Tools.**

- *Observations:* Website postings of ARC developed and co-developed tools (in internal and external websites) were far less effective in reaching national society and Red Cross clients than TA from HQ staff who were conversant with the tools they had helped develop. The current ICB emphasizes tools development with very little attention focused on either building or recognizing NGO's building sustainable systems for insuring that their staff are aware of and use the tools or monitoring use and impact of the tools. The ARC/ICB provides clear evidence that it is the personal touch (right person presenting the right tool at the right time) that will improve use, not the tools themselves.

- *Recommendation:* Given the high rates of HQ staff turnover (as staff rotate in and out of positions and in and out of programming), future capacity building grants should require all CS's to develop (and track the use of and utility of) clear simple systems (like checklists) for describing tools and how ICB tools can be used to improve program design, execution and evaluation.

5.4.2. Require NGOs to Show Quantitative or Qualitative Evidence of Field Demand and an Institutional Commitment to Using the Tools for Core Training and Retraining or Key functions.

- *Observation:* Certain tools that were developed under the ICB grant had a much bigger impact than others. The two most widely used ARC tools (the pre-evaluation training module and the IPP proposal guidelines, and the logistics software) were tools that responded to specific day to day programming issues (proposal development, warehouse management, evaluation). These same tools, because they were mainstreamed into core training and planning got a great deal of focused Technical Assistance (TA). One of the best examples of this is the IPP which was used to design 77 post-Tsunami recovery programs. ARC's experience is that it was this type of focused TA—not formal training—that had the greatest institutional impact.
- *Recommendation:* Future grants would require Title II CS's:
  - To show evidence of field input into the identification of the tools being developed by the grant to avoid tools being “supply” rather than “demand driven; and
  - To develop better systems for integrating staff feedback on the tools that will make them more user friendly; and
  - To develop better systems for linking tools development and training to indicators that track staff capacity in the areas being targeted.

5.4.3. Encourage Title II CS's to Build their Capacity to Develop Realistic Partnerships with a Wide Range of Title II and non-Title II Partners as Part of their Early Warning and Response Systems.

- *Observation:* Any emergency response and/or emergency preparedness effort requires working with a variety of food and non-food partners. If USAID/FFP is to achieve its goal of building local capacity to anticipate and manage shocks, then the future ICB grants must encourage the Title II CS's to work with World Food Program and other donors as well as Title II FFP programs. ARC's extensive work with WFP under the ICB shows some of the potential challenges and constraints that this type of collaboration can involve.
- *Recommendation:* Future ICB grants should require Title II CS's to better analyze the wider network of emergency food partners that they have collaborated with in the past and plan to collaborate with in the future and how any ICB capacity activities might be expected to affect these partners as well as the Title II funded programs.

5.4.4. Give Priority to CS Programs that Use ICB Funds to Revise Core Emergency Training Curricula.



- *Observation:* Any organization that works in emergency preparedness and response has training programs to train HQ and field staff. Any long-term attempt to develop a more holistic approach to emergency preparedness will require revising these core training materials. ARC's experiences under the ICB show how this type of institutional change is slower but in many ways more sustainable (over the long-run) than simply producing new and better tools.
- *Recommendation:* Future ICB grants should give priority to organizations that plan to use ICB funds: (a) to generate the demand for and actual revision of training manuals and training programs that the organization will always offer to train new and existing staff; (b) provide clear evidence of how they will use the revised manuals to train and retrain staff over several years so the curricula changes get mainstreamed; and (c) are willing to track simple internal systems for tracking feedback on training programs and manuals and incorporating this information into future revisions and training programs.

#### 5.4.5. Link Workshops to Promote National Capacity Building to Follow-up Technical Assistance.

- *Observation:* ARC's use of ICB funds to help seven of the National Operating Societies in southern Africa to create national food security action plans appears to be an example of best practice. Prior to this assistance, not one of the societies had had the capacity to develop the types of national action plans that the International Federation of the Red Cross mandated at its annual meeting in 2000 in Ouagadougou.
- *Recommendation:* Future ICB initiatives should encourage Title II CS's to support small sub-regional capacity building efforts that link smaller workshops with follow-up TA to address key food security issues like developing and executing food security action plans and bridging the emergency-development link.

**Annex I: ARCICB IPTT**

SO/IR/Output/ Sub-Output	Baseline	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		LOP A/P
		Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	
<b>Strategic Objective: To develop the capacity of ARC and the International Red Cross Movement to protect and reduce vulnerability of food insecure populations including people affected by emergencies</b>												
<b>Intermediate Result 1: ARC improves its institutional and technical capacity to design and manage food aid and nutrition interventions as an effective response to food insecure populations including people affected by emergencies</b>												
<b>Output 1.1: Enhanced ARC Staff Technical Knowledge Base</b>												
<b>1.1.1: Improved tools for needs assessment, nutritional surveillance, and planning (e.g., food basket calculator) for emergency and longer-term development interventions</b>												
# assessment, management and m&e tools developed (including self-assessment food security capacity index)	2	2	1	0	0	9	3	4	4	1		
% tools/products disseminated (e.g., to Movement partners, USAID, PVOs, etc.)	1	0	1	0	0	75%	100%	50%	50%	50%		
# ARC projects using new M&E tools in emergency or longer term development programming	0	1	0	1	0	4	1	10	12			

<sup>31</sup> Preparing for Evaluation used by ICB, Child Survival grant, VCT<sup>1</sup> project in Honduras and IDR; Capacity Building used by Indonesia and Sri Lanka

SO/IR/Output/ Sub-Output	Baseline	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		LOP A/P
		Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	
# people trained in Integrated Planning Process (whole and sub-components) by:	130 <sup>32</sup>											
TAU		2	0		Tsunami led to cancellation of plans	15	15	20	2	10		
IDR		2	0			20	20	20		10		
IP		2	0			10	10	10	19	10		
TRP		2	0			15	15	10	31 <sup>33</sup>	10		
# Food Security Seminar series modules produced	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	One module produced for ERU refresher training	2		
# Pilot Country Case Studies Produced	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	Not yet, due in FY 08	3		

**1.1.2: Enhanced emergency response planning that integrates food and nutrition with water/sanitation and other public health interventions**

Score of self-assessment food security capacity index (tracks cross unit knowledge in food security/M&E basics)												
# Food Security-related brown bags held at HQ	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4	4	4		
# participating staff	0	0	0					12	15	12		
# formal FS-related meetings for debriefing or minutes presentation held for	0	0	0	2				4	3 <sup>34</sup>	4		

<sup>32</sup> 130 people were trained in the IPP process but the structure of LSD changed as so they weren't separated by the same units

<sup>33</sup> Not ICB grant or cost-share funded, more an outcome of past IPP training and TAU guidance to Sri Lanka m&e advisor.

<sup>34</sup> ICB grant manager dc-brief of Food Security Review and Nairobi meetings, as well as WFP consultant briefing on Partnership Review.

ARC ICB Final Evaluation, December 20, 2007, Annex I.

SO/IR/Output/ Sub-Output	Baseline	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		IOP A/P
		Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	
HQ staff												
# participating staff	0	0	0					12	15	12		
In-house training on “food security basics” using ARC’s tools and modules: emergency assessment, targeting, logistics, distribution related or longer-term food security related.	0	0	0					3 4 4	44 <sup>35</sup>	4 3 4		
# of HQ persons trained in: a) IDR b) TRP c) IP				2 2								
# integrated food security & other sector proposals developed	3	3	4		4	1	1	4	4 <sup>36</sup>	4		
# of emergency proposals reviewed using food programming checklist	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0		
# people assisted	474,852	0	No target	n/a		2,308,720 <sup>37</sup>		2,500,000 (cum ulativ	Indonesia: 258,417 Vietnam 57,306	Indonesia 258,417 Lesotho 3000		

<sup>35</sup> Includes ARC ERU roster participants, some of whom are from Chapters and others from the field

<sup>36</sup> Indonesia school feeding-health, Mozambique HIV-FS, Lesotho Food Security HIV, Sri Lanka health and nutrition.( The Sri Lanka program ahs since been handed over to the Canadian Red Cross to support).

<sup>37</sup> 2,100,000 tsunami and 208,720 Vietnam

SO/IR/Output/ Sub-Output	Baseline	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		LOP A/P
		Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	
								e)	Lesotho 1500 Cumulative e= 2,625,943	Mozambique 1440		
<b>1.1.3: Standardized monitoring and evaluation systems to measure the nutritional impact of food in emergencies and longer-term development situations</b>												
# Core emergency indicators identified and approved (IDR/TAU)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
# emergency projects using these indicators	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
<b>1.2: Enhanced collaboration between the ARC and other PVOs in the design and management of food and nutrition interventions in emergencies and risks mitigation environment</b>												
# of long-term food partners	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5
# of long-term (multiple occasion across > 2 years) M&E partners	0	5	19	10	16 <sup>39</sup>	10	16	5	9-10 EIG/EPE WG members and FFP partners	5	5	5
# of organizations represented at ARC-sponsored M&E	10	10	9	11	16	10	8	15	No longer a need	0 <sup>41</sup>	0 <sup>41</sup>	0 <sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> WFP, FAO, WWF, AED Movement partners and participants in AFA

<sup>39</sup> In addition to the 9-10 regular EIG and EPEWG participants (not all are PVOs), the ARC collaborated with WFP, FAO and WWF on food security and nutrition program design. We collaborate with other FFP partners, often organized through FANTA and/or FFP.

<sup>40</sup> Interaction's move to new facilities, and the reallocation of role between F-evaluation and Program Effectiveness Working Group and EIG, meant that the regular members of the ARC facilitate meetings became part of the EPEWG and the EIG still meets before the AEA annual meeting on general themes.

<sup>41</sup> The Evaluation Interest group has mutated and participation is now through the Evaluation for Program Effectiveness Working group at Interaction

SO/IR/Output/ Sub-Output	Baseline	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		LOP A/P
		Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	
meetings												
# of collaborations with research centers and/or individual researchers for applied research and training, etc	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	2 <sup>42</sup>	1		
<b>1.3 Established materials for promoting the importance and need of food in international emergency and vulnerability reduction responses</b>												
# of info pieces about food programming on the web or available at ARC/HQ	0	0	8	8	30	no specific target	2	6	7 <sup>43</sup>	6		
# Webpage visits	0	0	0	0	0	No target	3,766	3,800	83,948 general international 7,971 food related views	3,800		
<b>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 and longer term development</b>												
<b>Output 2.1: Improved knowledge base in national Red Cross societies to design and manage local food aid and nutrition interventions in emergencies and longer term development i.e. Ethiopia, Mozambique and Lesotho</b>												
# of pilot countries that develop new projects including food security components	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	3	3	2		
# of pilot country proposals with food	0	0	0	2	0	n/a	n/a	2	3 <sup>44</sup>	2		

<sup>42</sup> Both with AED, once WFP-ARC Partnership Review and one on Appreciative Inquiry for BCC (in nutrition)

<sup>43</sup> These are the 4 Action for Africa regional pieces, the Vietnam School Feeding clip, internationals services and the professional resources site

<sup>44</sup> Mozambique's first activity took place 26 September, 2007; Indonesia March 2007, and Lesotho Oct. 2006.

SO/IR/Output/ Sub-Output	Baseline	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		LOP A/P
		Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	
security components implemented												
<b>Self-Assessment Food Security Capacity Index Score</b>												
# of RDRT who have attended training in core modules Food security/beneficiary targeting/distribution/logistics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 Lesotho Red Cross staff trained as RDRT	60	60	
# of pilot country staff/volunteers trained in food security concepts/modules	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20 30 38	40	40	
A Lesotho												
B Mozambique												
C Indonesia												
D												
# non pilot RC/RC staff/volunteers trained in food security concepts/modules	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30 <sup>45</sup>	30	30	
# people assisted (in new projects design)	0	0	0	No pilot yet	0	No pilot yet	0	0	1500 0 258,417	1000	1000	
Lesotho												
Mozambique												
Indonesia												
<b>Output 2.2: Enhanced coordination between National Red Cross Societies and local institutions in food security interventions</b>												
# MoUs established	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	

<sup>45</sup> Includes Vietnam Red Cross staff who received refresher course in commodity management as well as 12 attendees at Nairobi food security conference where ICB manager presented on Food security capacity index (Africare) and 8 Red Cross Movement staff who attended ERU trainings