

Annex III.B. Formal Trainings, Workshops, and Meetings Related to the Title II ICB Grant (FY04-FY07)

Year	Types of Training	Themes	Participation	Location
FY04	ICB-Supported Formal Training: Institutionalized Learning and Professional Development in Title II food aid programs by Tufts University's International Feinsein Famine Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction to Food Programming ▪ IFRC's Strategy in Food and Nutrition ▪ Nutrition 101: Nutrition in Emergencies ▪ Port Discharge and Commodity Reception and Procedures 	ARC International services staff (incomplete records of staff who attended) ⁵⁵	ARC/HQ
FY05	Workshop Staff Attended: Therapeutic Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inter-Agency Community-Based Therapeutic Care 	Two food programming staff	ARC
FY05	Informal Training: Needs Assessments in Emergencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs Assessments in Emergencies 	Two HQ staff	ARC
FY05	Workshop Staff Attended: Food Aid Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USAID Rules and Regulations in Commodity Management ▪ Hearth/Positive Deviance Methodology 	One HQ programming staff	Kansas City
FY05	Partners Meeting: Evaluation Interest Group (EIG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improving/Standardization Design, M&E Practices ▪ Rolling up Institutional Impact Indicators 	Eight PVOs	ARC
FY05	Routine Title II Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FFP Strategies and Regulations ▪ FANTA: Household food Insecurity Index 	Various PVOs	FFP & AED
FY05	Chapter Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ International Food Programming 	80+ community, university, business and government officials from three states	Des Moines
FY05	Workshop Staff Attended: Commodities Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commodity Management System 	Eight ARC and Viet Nam Red Cross Society staff	Viet Nam
FY05	Partners Meeting: American Evaluation Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality Control ▪ Institutional Indicators 	CARE, CRS, Winrock, Mercy Corps, USAID and other Int'l PVOs	Toronto

⁵⁵ Through the website, some of the modules were promoted to more than 30,000 ARC Employees, Volunteers and nearly all the 879 domestic chapters.

Year	Types of Training	Themes	Participation	Location
FY05	General Awareness ARC HQ (Capacity Building Basic Food Security Concepts): World Food Day and United Against Hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General Awareness 	ARC/IHQ staff, chapters network and general public	ARC/HQ
FY05	ICB Supported Formal Training: Special Course for the Relief Delegates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targeting, Monitoring and Distribution 	Persons deployed	ARC/IHQ by IDR & TAU
FY05	ICB Supported Formal Training: HQ staff Capacity Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs Assessments ▪ Capacity Building in Food Programming in Large-Scale Disasters 	ICB Manager (Regis Chapman)	ARC/IHQ by Tufts Consultant
FY06	ICB Supported Formal Training: Integrated Planning Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Country Needs Assessments ▪ Strategic Planning ▪ Project Design & Proposal Development 	60+ field staff	Sri, Lanka, Indonesia, Maldives, etc.
FY06	Informal On-Site Training : Monetization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contract with Buyers 	HQ staff and one field staff	HQ and Viet Nam
FY06	Workshop Staff Attended: Food Aid Management Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USAID Food Commodity Management Principles ▪ MYAP & SYAP Design 	Two field staff and grant mgr	Tanzania
FY06	Workshop Staff Attended: Food Security Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risks & Vulnerability Reduction ▪ Relief and Development Continuum 	Grant mgr and 25+ field Red Cross staff	Johannesburg
FY07	Workshop Staff Attended: USAID grant negotiation and compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USAID Rules and Regulations 	IDR Africa Manager Southern Africa Food Security Delegate	DC/ Johannesburg
FY07	Workshop Staff Attended: RC food security programs in Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information exchange to improve quality and consistency of food security and livelihoods support in Africa 	ICB Grant Manager and 10 staff of Movement and other partners	Nairobi
FY07	Partners Meeting: EIG roundtable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tsunami experiences 	3 ARC staff, 1 field, 2 NHQ based	Portland, OR
FY07	Partners Meeting/Workshop Staff Attended: American Evaluation Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M&E : lessons learned in tsunami ▪ Workshops on evaluation technique 	3 staff (1 field and 2 NHQ based)	Portland, OR
FY07	Brown Bag: ICB Grant Manager/Food security Advisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vietnam monetization experience 	5 ARC NHQ staff	DC
FY07	Brown Bag: Sri Lanka M&E training review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M&E 101 training and Moving from Logframe to M&E Plan 	19 ARC NHQ staff	DC

Year	Types of Training	Themes	Participation	Location
FY07	Brown Bag: Southern Africa Regional Food Security Delegate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on Lesotho community-based agricultural development work with HBC and OVC 	15 ARC staff	DC
FY07	Briefing: WFP-ARC Partnership Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings from the review, facilitated by AED consultant 	7 ARC NHQ 3 WFP	DC
FY07	Debrief: Participation in Review of African National Societies Longer Term Interventions in Food Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings from review trip Appropriate options and potential recommendations 	6 ARC NHQ staff	DC
FY07	ERU Training Course: Emergency Response Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Response unit training 	20 ARC ERU roster members and 7 Movement partners	Panama
FY07	ERU Refresher Training ERU review with Food Security presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERU Refresher with food security component 	19 ERU roster members and 1 Turkish Red Crescent staff	Shenandoah Valley
FY07	Formal training course: Building capacity to support integrated food/health program:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logistics and Warehousing 	25 Indonesia Red Cross (PMI) staff trained in logistics and warehousing	Indonesia
FY07	Formal training course: Building capacity to support integrated food/health program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciative Inquiry Behavior Change Communication for Nutrition and Facilitation Skills 	9 local ARC staff in Indonesia who work on SPMI project; 13 Indonesia Red Cross staff and 2 WFP staff	Indonesia
FY07	Formal Training workshop: Building capacity to incorporate food security consideration into health and disaster interventions Building capacity to support integrated food/health program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food Security 	20 Lesotho Red Cross staff and volunteers	Lesotho
FY07	Lessons Learned Workshop: Lessons learned from Flood response, especially around targeting, logistics and coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Response 	30 Mozambican Red Cross staff and Movement partners	Mozambique
FY08	Training workshop: Fun and games with Log-frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and Evaluation 	12 ARC NH	DC

Year	Types of Training	Themes	Participation	Location
FY08	EIG meeting	▪ M&E	2 ARC HQ, 1 field staff	Baltimore
FY08	AFA annual conference and pre-conference workshops	▪ M&E	1 ARC HQ and 2 field	Baltimore
FY08	Professional Preventive Speakers Series: HIV/AIDS & Nutrition	▪ HIV and nutrition	2 HQ staff	DC

Sources: ARC Senior Food Program Advisor, ARC Senior M&E Advisor, ARC TA Unit Director based on project records. September 2006. Updated 2007 by TA unit Director/ICB grant manager, ARC IDR Director. FY07 Annual Report to USAID.

Annex III.C: Wider Policy and Institutional Context of the ARC ICB Grant: FY04-Present

When ICB was Designed	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<p>ARC</p> <p><i>Food programming institutional context:</i> ARC was considering having a stand-alone food sub-unit that would work with other IDR (International Disaster Relief) units to build capacity for and oversee food programming.</p>	<p><i>Food programming institutional context:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * ARC decided that all food programming must be conceptualized as part of a disaster preparedness/response package (through their IDR office) or MCH programming through the national RC and any local partners working with them on this sub-component rather than a stand-alone sub-unit. * Decision made that IDR/ARC will not incorporate food into emergency response programs (e.g., those responding within two weeks to three-six months) in FY06 	<p><i>Food programming institutional context:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ARC reconfirms its strategic focus as disaster management and health and adopts a strategy of expertise within a few niches in these fields, not including food security.
<p>ISD: TAPE, IP, and IDR units involved in the grant</p>	<p>ISD: Three operational departments dealing with emergency/recovery food programming: International Programs unit (approximately 50 staff), Tsunami Response Program unit (approximately 85 staff), and International Disaster Response unit (approximately six staff). Creation of <i>Technical Assistance Unit (TAU):</i> A technical resource for all three departments (approximately 16 staff).</p>	<p>ISD: Reorganization as a consequence of a departmental strategic planning process. IDR, TAU, and IP come together under one International Programming unit, while TRP remains a stand-alone unit of temporary duration.</p> <p>The regional food security delegate then comes under management of the technical unit.</p>

When ICB was Designed	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<p>Role of ISD units in food programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDR managing some food assistance in emergencies 	<p>Role of ISD units in food programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International Disaster Relief (IDR) unit that oversees international disaster relief does not plan to incorporate food into its ARC response portfolio, but wants to understand food security basics since it is a priority for Movement partner. International Programs (IP) (which focuses on development and recovery) is planning to use food in longer term programs. International Programs committed to increasing portfolio for Africa from approximately 10 to 40 percent. 	<p>Food programming institutional context:</p> <p>Through the ICB IDR deploys a regional food security delegate, based between Lesotho and the Southern Africa Federation Regional Office to assist in Lesotho recovery programs and regional DM, given the prevalence of drought/flood disasters. He helps develop a Lesotho drought recovery proposal that focuses on IIBC/OVC. This proposal is expanded through ICB as part of short-term recovery to drought as well as HIV strategy component.</p> <p>TAU and IP develop a Mozambique food security program that integrates horticulture and nutrition components into HBC and DPDR programs</p> <p>TRP funds WFP post general emergency relief programming: Mother Child Nutrition and School-Feeding programs and funds a parallel program for the Indonesia Red Cross (PMI) to build their capacity to partner with WFP (health promotion and distribution)</p> <p><i>In addition, non-food livelihood programs continue as a TRP partner-funding strategy and cash transfer programming (cash for work and cash grants) become a part of ARC short-term recovery programming.</i></p>

When ICB was Designed	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<p>Transition Programming: ARC food programming almost exclusively in connection with disaster/emergency programming (first three months), which was seen as the area where ARC had its greatest comparative advantage.</p>	<p>Transition Programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tsunami and African food crisis highlight importance of local societies facilitating the types of partnerships with other institutions that can address the root causes of slow onset disasters that make populations vulnerable. • Integrated food-water/sanitation-health is increasingly standard in ARC supported recovery phase interventions executed through partnerships since ARC's comparative advantage lies in emergency response and volunteer network. <p>Partnerships: Positive outcome of ARC routing food assistance through WFP sets the tone for future initiatives that could pave way for additional collaboration between WFP and ARC and between WFP and National Societies both for emergency, transition, and recovery programming. More and more long-term programming is executed with partners.</p>	<p>Transition Programming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Integrated food/health programming implemented by TRP in Indonesia (with WFP) as well as funding partners to implement livelihood programs. ○ Short-term recovery in Lesotho includes integrated food security/HIV/DM program ○ Cash Transfer programming stipulated in strategy as an ARC early recovery intervention
<p>Partnerships: No previous experience with large-scale partnerships with WFP and limited experience in acting as a sub-contractor or sub-grantee on larger consortia efforts.</p>	<p>Partnerships: Positive outcome of ARC routing food assistance through WFP sets the tone for future initiatives that could pave way for additional collaboration between WFP and ARC and between WFP and National Societies both for emergency, transition, and recovery programming. More and more long-term programming is executed with partners.</p>	<p>Partnerships</p>
<p>Perception of Food Programming as High Risk: Food programming seen as risky.</p>	<p>Perception of Food Programming as High Risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food programming is still seen as risky (even though data shows that pro-active training and technical backstopping reduces risk). • Steady increase, however, in situations where use of food is needed to reduce vulnerability in Federation and ARC bilateral projects. 	<p>Perception of Food Programming as High Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MYAPs through FFP are deemed inappropriate for ARC as much for ethical concerns as well as the uncertainty of funding and the cost share requirement. ○ Partnering with WFP is seen as logical for the Movement but more appropriately coordinated with the Federation and/or directly on the ground with the National Society
<p>Federation (RC/RC Movement)</p> <p>Federation Priorities: Primary focus on emergencies</p>	<p>Federation Priorities: Federation decided to focus attention on improved disaster management at same time they are increasingly adopting food security/insecurity approach. Current issue of Federation magazine focuses on food security.</p>	<p>Federation Priorities</p>

When ICB was Designed	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
<p>National Societies</p> <p><i>Priorities of National Red Cross Societies:</i> Strong volunteer networks through National Societies represent an effective mechanism for mobilizing relief during disasters.</p>	<p><i>Priorities of National Red Cross Societies:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ National Societies (183) are wanting more than short-term interventions, especially in areas where disasters are recurrent. ◦ A growing number of National Societies, especially those in chronically food insecure countries in Africa that are prone to natural disasters, are incorporating food into their response to domestic disasters. 	<p><i>Priorities of National Red Cross Societies:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ National Societies (183) are wanting more than short-term interventions, especially in areas where disasters are recurrent. ◦ A growing number of National Societies, especially those in chronically food insecure countries in Africa that are prone to natural disasters, and those with high HIV prevalence, are incorporating food into their response to disasters and into their HIV programming. The regional HIV strategy for Southern Africa and the 10 NS strategies that contribute to this all include a food security and nutrition component. Likewise, the new food security strategies for 7 of these countries include explicit consideration of HIV..
<p>USAID/FFP</p> <p><i>USAID/FFP Food Policy Paper (1995):</i> Traditional focus of ARC on emergencies meant that there was no strong overlap between their comparative advantage and goals of USAID/FFP 1995 food policy paper.</p>	<p><i>USAID/FFP Strategy Paper (2003 draft; 2005 final approved), which builds on 1995 Policy Paper:</i></p> <p>(+) Strong overlap between ARC priorities and support (through its collaboration with WFP and USDA, as well as Title II) for USAID in its stated objective of becoming more of a global</p>	<p><i>USAID/FFP Food Policy Paper</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Wrap-around programming with PEPFAR ◦ Overt reporting on funding WFP (local food purchase?) as an option to emergency needs (a la Southern Africa) ◦ ICB rethink planned

⁵⁶ Need to add citation to this portion of the strategy paper.

When ICB was Designed	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
	<p>leader in reducing food insecurity (2005 USAID/FFP Strategy Paper) by influencing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design, implementation, and monitoring of quality for food programming that builds vulnerable people's capacity to identify and manage risk and • Donor public (especially US donor public) perceptions about foreign assistance and food aid. <p>(-) ARC's two Title II proposals for FY05 were not funded.</p> <p>(-) Less overlap in priority countries between ARC and FFP</p> <p>(-) FFP continues to face a challenging funding environment and ARC is reluctant to link RC National Societies with donor funds that may be cut in mid-course.</p> <p>(+) New 2005 strategy paper is concerned with increasing USAID's leadership role in influencing the wide food aid community (e.g., WFP, USDA)⁵⁶</p> <p>(+) Despite the risks, monetization and distribution of food from USAID Title II and USDA sources represents one of the accessible means that ARC has for helping National Societies build longer term program that addresses root causes of disasters and facilitates recovery. These sources are likely to become even more important once Tsunami funds are depleted.</p>	

Annex III.D. List of Key Positions Hired or Rehired by the ARC ICB Grant, FY03-Present

Position	Activities	Year Started	Year Ended	% salary covered by the project (grant & cost share)
ICB Manager/FS advisor				
Pat McLaughlin		8/07	On going	50%
Ange Tingbo		2/06	8/07	100%
Pat McLaughlin (interim –also)		7/05	2/06	25%
Ilisa Gertner		1/05	7/05	** 100% congressional hunger fellow.
Regis Chapman		8/04	12/05	100%
Mark Smith		10/03	8/04	100%
Senior Associate Program				
Nathalie Gamache		05/07	On going	25%
Ilisa Gertner		10/03	12/04	Congressional Hunger Fellow then 100%
Regis Chapman		10/03	8/04	100%
M&E Specialists				
Cynthia Green		4/07	On going	20%
Pat McLaughlin		12/06	4/07	14%
Alice Willard		10/03	12/06	25%
Scott Chaplowe		11/05	11/06	TRP paid
Michael Cohen		11/05	1/07	TRP Paid
Pat McLaughlin		8/04	7/05	15%
Regional S. Africa/IFRC (Food Security and Relief Delegate)				
Negusse Woldemichael		10/06	On going	100%
Secondment to IRFC HQ				
Ben Kim		2/06	10/06	100%
Financial Analyst				
Fati Amandi		09/06	On going	20-30%
Cynthia Runyan		01/05	08/06	20%
IDR Program Officer				
Shelley Cheatham		10/07	On going	25%
Tracy Reines		07/06	09/07	25%

Annex III.E: ICB Program Management Milestones

FY	Dates	Management Milestones
---	1997	Hurricane Mitch aftermath leads ARC to reflect on need to create a technical unit
99	Oct 1, 1998	ISA grant starts
01	June 30, 2001	ISA grant ends
02	----	No Title II capacity building support, but ARC continues to support many activities started under the ISA, including the IPP and food commodity training.
03	----	
04	10/03	ICB agreement awarded by FFP/USAID
	4-6/04	Extensive capacity building to help design of USAID/FFP Malawi consortium
05	Oct 04	ARC pulled out of Malawi consortium for USAID/FFP final decision in Oct.
04	----	Initial planning and discussions for ARC/CRS module series (one produced in draft form)
04	FY04	Joint IDR and TAPE (former name for TAU) participation in organization and execution of food university events
04	FY04	USAID/FFP cut funding in Tajikistan
04	8/05	New one year USDA proposals (Tanzania, Bangladesh, Viet Nam, Bulgaria)
04	9/03 – 8/04	Mark Smith, grant manager
05/	8/04-12/04	Regis Chapman, grant manager
05	12/26/04	Tsunami hits
05	12/04-2/06	A series of interim project managers
05	--	Task order with Tufts signed
05	--	Contracts for ARC/CRS modules signed
05	11/04	Internal audit (review)
05	1/05	Technical Assistance Unit presents their plan for technical assistance to IDR relief efforts
	7-8/05	International Relief and Development splits into: Tsunami Recovery Program, Technical Solutions Program, and International Programs
05	9/05 (fall)	Nan Buzard becomes director of IDR unit
05	9/05)	Pat McLaughlin confirmed as head of Technical Solutions unit (which is later renamed the TAU)
05	8/29/05	Hurricane Katrina
05	7-8/05	Joint IDR and TAU technical assistance to evaluate emergency relief in Sri Lanka
06	11/05/05	TAU/IDR/IP/TRP/Chapter support/communications meetings to reflect on status of ICB grant and discuss whether or not to give grant back or use it effectively and in the spirit of the grant
06	11/18/05	Meet with USAID/FFP to discuss changes in vision for the grant
06	12/05/05	ICB base strategy approved in-house to continue responsibly
06	1/06	FFP approved secondment of Ben Kim to Geneva for Humanitarian Logistics Software (warehouse)
06	11/05 - 2/06 discussed	ARC communicates revised vision of grant on a "strategy that focuses on building Movement capacity to effectively partner with WFP" to USAID/FFP which USAID/FFP agrees is within the spirit of the grant given the shift in context.
06	2/06	Hiring of Ange Tingbo as sr. food program advisor to manage the grant
06	6-7/06	Joint IDR and TAU meeting to define emergency phase objectives and approve Term of Reference for Lesotho post to oversee southern Africa food programming capacity building and pilot countries
06	7/06	Joint IDR and TAU participation in FFP/USAID Food Aid Conference
06	8/06	Joint IDR, IP and TAU selection of three pilot countries
07	10/06	Date Negusse deployed to field for Lesotho and IFRC
07	2/07	Mozambique flood deployment

FY	Dates	Management Milestones
07	2-6/07	ISD undertakes a strategic planning process and decides not to develop expertise in food security programming either as a stand alone or as part of DM or Health portfolio.
07	8/17	Ange Tingbo, ICB grant manager depart; Pat McLaughlin assumes responsibility
07	9/24	USAID confirms Indonesia program as cost share
07	9/25	USAID debriefing
07	9/26	Date the Mozambique thing signed
07	9/27	Regional emergency refresher course using revised materials

Source: Pat McLaughlin, October 2007.

Annex III.F. Financial Data

	Actuals Yr 1 ('04)			Actuals Year 2 ('05)			Actuals Year 3 ('06)			Year 4 (2007)			Year 5 (2008)			Total			Grand Total		
	ICB Fund	ARC Match		ICB Funds	ARC Match		ICB Funds	ARC Match		ICB Funds	ARC Match		ICB Funds	ARC Match		ICB Funds	ARC Match				
Personnel																					
ICB Manager/FS Advisor (50%)																					107,100
Sr. Associate Program Development (25%)																					33,150
Finance Analyst (30% split)																					36,720
Sub Total Food Programming Unit																					176,970
IDR Relief Advisor (25%)																					33,150
Sub Total Int'l Disaster Response Unit																					33,150
Sr. M & E Manager(10% in grant and cost share)																					42,840
Food Security Delegate seconded to IFRC																					-
Sub Total Other Personnel																					42,840
TOTAL SALARIES	50,889	41,929		38,945	28,275		69,988	15,249		104,500	19,500		108,680	20,280		373,001	125,233			498,234	
Fringe (25.50%)	11,959	9,853		9,152	6,458		18,014	3,872		26,648	4,973		27,713	5,171		93,486	30,327			123,813	

TOTAL PERSONNEL	62,847	51,783	48,096	34,733	88,002	19,121	131,148	24,473	194,740	42,896	136,393	25,451	466,487	155,560	622,047
Travel															
Domestic Travel (includes lodging & meals)							2,865	1,910			3,576	2,384	6,441	4,294	10,735
International Travel							18,000	43,900	67,522	8,141	18,000	15,372	36,000	59,272	95,272
TOTAL TRAVEL	12,496	7,240	9,442	3,812	36,983	6,227	20,865	45,810	67,522	8,141	21,576	17,756	101,362	80,844	182,206
Training															
Staff Capacity Development							35,000				35,000	5,000	70,000	5,000	75,000
Development & Dissemination of M&E Guides							16,000				5,145	0	21,145	0	21,145
TA for Target National Societies							0	10,500			15,000		15,000	10,500	25,500
Emergency Food & Logistics Training							10,000	0			15,000	0	25,000	0	25,000
Post EFLT Training							23,500	81,500							
Development & Material															
M&E Training									11,974	37					
TOTAL TRAINING	61,635	0	2,273	0	1,360	1,026	84,500	92,000	11,974	37	70,145	5,000	219,913	98,026	317,939
Other Direct Costs															
Tel/Fax/OTH Comm							0	4,740	507	86	0	4,977	0	9,717	9,717
Consultants:															
1) Food Security & Relief Delegate (6 months)							70,383	0			75,600	0	145,983	0	145,983
M&A & Others							0	113,476			0	118,015	0	231,491	231,491
Relocation							0	1,500			0	0	0	1,500	1,500
2) Emergency Training Coordinator							20,000	0			20,800	0	40,800	0	40,800
PVO/Red Cross							3,000	0			3,000	0	6,000	0	6,000

Conference Memberships Evaluation (Final - only)	500	3,690	2,600	19,029	1,961	8,739	580,024	291,716	98,083	14,524	263,665	2,625	2,000	5,125	9,000	14,125
Specific Activities for all 3 pilot NS's	137,479	62,712	62,411	57,574	128,306	35,112	816,537	453,999	372,319	65,598	491,779	146,640	56,347	630,781	201,347	832,128
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS	500	3,690	2,600	19,029	1,961	8,739	580,024	291,716	98,083	14,524	263,665	146,640	56,347	630,781	201,347	832,128
SUBTOTAL DIRECT COSTS	137,479	62,712	62,411	57,574	128,306	35,112	816,537	453,999	372,319	65,598	491,779	146,640	56,347	630,781	201,347	832,128
Indirect Costs	22,391		17,136		18,468		51,822	48,430	59,287	10,312	53,670	28,739		163,488	77,169	240,657
TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST	159,870	62,712	79,547	57,574	146,775	35,112	868,359	502,428	431,606	75,910	545,450	258,285		1,800,000	916,112	2,716,112

Cost Share contribution from SPMI (July to September 2007)

117,336

Total Cost Share

548,942

Annex IV References Consulted

Official Guidance, Proposal, and Modifications of Assistance

USAID/FFP. 2003. Guidance for the Title II Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Program Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

ARC. 2003. Project Proposal. Institutional Capacity Building Assistance Grant. Washington, DC: ARC.

ARC. 2003. Modification of Assistance. ARC ICB Grant. Award. Washington, DC: ARC. (August 23, 2004).

ARC. 2003. Modification of Assistance. ARC ICB Grant. Award. Washington, DC: ARC. (September 18, 2004).

Mid-Term Evaluation

Della E. McMillan and Ange Tingbo. 2006. American Red Cross. Mid-Term Evaluation. Institutional Capacity Building Grant (FY04-FY08). Washington, DC: ARC.

Annual Work Plans and Reports

ARC. 2004. FY04 Annual Work-Plan. Institutional Capacity Building Project. Washington, DC: ARC.

ARC. 2004. FY2004 Annual Performance Report: Institutional Capacity Building Project. October 1, 2003-September 30, 2004. Washington, DC: ARC.

ARC. 2005. FY2005 Annual Performance Report: Institutional Capacity Building Project. October 1, 2004-September 30, 2005. Washington, DC: ARC.

ARC. 2006. FY07 Annual Work Plan. Institutional Capacity Building Project. Washington, DC: ARC.

ARC. 2007. FY2007. Annual Performance Report: Institutional Capacity Building Project. October 1, 2006-September 30, 2007. Washington, DC: ARC.

ARC. 2006. FY08 Annual Work Plan. Institutional Capacity Building Project. Washington, DC: ARC.

Internal Audits

Asgeirsdottir, Svafa H. 2004. Interoffice Memorandum to Gerald Jones. Washington, DC: ARC. (November 1, 2004).

World Food Programme Partnership

World Food Programme (WFP). 2005. World Food Programme Funding Proposal to American Red Cross. Washington, DC: ARC. (14 January 2005).

World Food Programme (WFP). 2005. Real-Time Evaluation of WFP's Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami—December 2004-June 2005. Washington, DC: WFP. (November 9, 2005; WFP/EB.2/2005/6-C/Rev.1).

Pangaribuan, Rosnani and Luh Ade Ari Wiradnyani. N.d. Health and Nutritional Status Survey for Primary School Children: in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province and Nias Island. Washington, DC: ARC.

Chapman, Regis. 2006. Delegate End of Mission Report: Indonesia. Washington, DC: ARC.

Girerd-Barclay, Ellen. 2007. Evaluation of American Red Cross-World Food Programme Tsunami Relief Operation Partnership: Final Report. Washington DC: Academy for Educational Development.

ICB Monitoring and Evaluation Documents

ARC. 2004. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan: Institutional Capacity Building Project. Washington, DC: ARC.

IPP (Integrated Planning Process)

ARC. 2006. Integrated Planning Process: Environmental & Organizational Assessment (EOA) Guide. Version 3.0. Washington, DC: ARC. (January) (IP1).

ARC. 2006. Integrated Planning Process: Regional Strategic Planning Guide. Washington, DC: ARC. (January 2006) (IP2).

ARC. 2006. Integrated Planning Process: Country Annual Planning Guide: Country-Level Implementation Guidance for Regional Strategic Plans. Washington, DC: ARC. (August 2005 revised in January 2006). (IP3)

ARC. 2006. Integrated Planning Process: Project Design & Proposal Writing Guide. Washington, DC: ARC. (January 2006). (IP4)

IPP Training Modules

IRD Integrated Planning (January 2006)

Integrated Planning Process: Regional Strategic Planning (January 2006)

Integrated Planning Process: Country Annual Planning (January 2006)

Integrated Planning Process: Project design Training (January 2006)

ARC and CRS M&E Module Series

Long, T. 2004. Success and Learning Story-Writing Packet. Version 1.0. ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. No. 1. Washington, DC: ARC and CRS.

Norem, Rosalie and Constance M. McCorkle. 2005. Planning for High-Quality Delivery of Capacity-Building Services. Version 1.0. ARC/CRS Monitoring and Evaluation Series. ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. No. 2. Washington, DC: ARC and CRS.

Norem, Rosalie. 2005. Hiring M&E Field Staff. Version 1.0. ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. No. 3. Washington, DC: ARC and CRS.

McMillan, Della E. and Alice Willard. 2006. Preparing for the Evaluation: Guidelines and Tools for Pre-evaluation Planning. Version 1.0. ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. No. 4. Washington, DC: ARC and CRS.

McMillan, Della E., Guy Sharrock, and Alice Willard. 2006. Guidelines and Tools for the Preparation and Use of Performance Indicator Tracking Tables. Version 1.0. (Draft) ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. ARC/CRS M&E Training Module Series. No. 5. Washington, DC: ARC and CRS.

ARC and IFRC Partnership—Logistics Software & Food Security Paradigm

ARC. 2005. Annex 4. Secondment Agreement. Washington, DC: ARC. (November 1, 2005).

Kim, Benjamin. 2006. Supply Chain Management—ARC Staff on Loan Secondment. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies Status Report. Reporting Period 8 July 2006-4 August 2006.

IFRC, 2006, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Warehouse Management System, Request for Proposal, Geneva, IFRC July 2006.

IFRC Food Security Unit

North, Rosemarie. 2006. Food Security--A Paradigm Shift. Red Cross Red Crescent. The Magazine of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. Issue 2. Geneva: IFRC.

IFRC (International Federation of the Red Cross). 2007. Five-year strategic framework on food security for Africare 2003-2012. Washington, DC: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

IFRC. N.d. Algiers Plan of Action.

Marketing and Communication Reports

ARC Communication and Marketing Department. Market Research and Planning. 2006. American Red Cross International Services Poll. July 5, 2006.

Title II ISA Project

Mason, John P. 2001. Final Evaluation: Title II/FFP Institutional Support Assistance Grant (for the period covering October 1, 1998-June 30, 2001). Washington, DC: ARC.

Commodity Management

Smith, Mark J. and Nick Denton. 2004. The ARC Commodity Management Tool Kit. Washington, DC: ARC.

Miscellaneous

Sphere Project. 2004. Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response. 2004 Edition. Geneva: Sphere Project (Distributed by Oxfam).

IFRC Food Security Programs

IFRC (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies). 2007. Long-term food security : investing in people and livelihoods. Five year strategic framework on food security for Africa 2008-1012. Geneva: IFRC/RCS, Disaster Policy and Preparedness Department.

IFRC. 2007. Long-term food security: investing in people and livelihoods. Geneva: IFRC, Disaster Policy and Preparedness Department.

International Services Department (ISD), ARC, Policy Statements

ISD-ARC. 2001. American Red Cross - International Doctrine. Washington, DC: ARC.

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

ISD-ARC. 2005. International Services. Revision. 2005. Washington, DC: ISD-ARC.

ARC ICB Pilot Programs in Southern Africa

Negusse, Woldemichael. 2007. Progress Report (11 December 2006-28 February 2007). Mesuru, Lesotho: LCRS for the ARC ICB Grant.

Negusse, Wodemichael. 2007. Three Months Work Plan (September-November 2007). Mesuru, Lesotho: LCRS for the ARC ICB Grant.

Negusse, Woldemichael. 2007. Plan of Action for Southern Africa (2007/8). Mesuru, Lesotho: LCRS for the ARC ICB Grant.

Negusse, Woldemichael. 2007. Major Accomplishments September – November, 2007 Progress Report. Mesuru: Lesotho: LCRS for the ARC ICB Grant.

ICB Mozambique Pilot Program

CVM (Red Cross Society of Mozambique). 2007. Support Project to Integrate Food Security into Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Response, HIV and OVC Programs. September 21, 2007 FINAL. Maputu: CVM for the ICB.

ICB Indonesia Pilot Program

Palang Merah Indonesia (PMI). Support to PMI branches participating as a World Food Program Cooperating Partner (SPMI) December 2006 – June 2008. Aceh: Indonesia.

Annex V: Interview Tools/Forms

Form 1: General Capacity Assessment

Name: _____

Institutional Affiliation and Department: _____

Date: _____

We deeply appreciate your agreeing to be interviewed. We hope that you will find that this experience may help you better understand how certain activities within your program were related to some broader cross-cutting initiatives within the American Red Cross and the Federation. We also hope that the analysis of “lessons learned” can illuminate “lessons learned” about capacity building that can be applied to future initiatives within the Federation and ARC, as well as USAID. If you have any questions and/or are willing to be interviewed over the telephone, please contact me or Leah.

*Della E. McMillan, External Team Leader, ARC ICB Evaluation
(Email: dellamcmillan@aol.com, fax: 352 377 3740, tel: 352 377 5250)
Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Evaluation
(Email: leahajcohen@gmail.com)*

A. Instructions

According to project records, you have participated in a wide range of ICB activities. We would deeply appreciate your responding to this questionnaire and/or setting a time when we could interview you over the telephone.

Based on your personal experience (and those of your colleagues/colleague if you are answering as a group) could you:

- Describe the impact of these activities on you as a professional (in your own words) and
- Explain what, if any, impact this personal training/capacity building/technical assistance has had on specific projects and/or types of training or design work you have implemented?

Box 1. Sample rankings for assessing ICB Impact (to be used in sections B and C below)

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Assessment Criteria</i>
5	Major impact that has already had an impact on a variety of programs.
4	Major impact that is likely to be sustained beyond the duration of the project, but no wider-spread effects to date.
3	Major impact, but sustainability not yet assured.
2	Activities/training executed impact likely, but not yet demonstrated.
1	Activities/training executed limited impact demonstrated or likely.
0	Activities/training executed no impact demonstrated or likely.
n/a	I/we are not aware of activity in this area.

B. Assessment of Global Impact on ARC and NHS Capacity in the Countries Associated with the TDR Program, the ICB Pilot Countries

Learning Objectives	Rankings (0-5 see Box 1 above)	Comments
Strengthen ARC capacity to understand the basic elements of food (in) security, especially as these relate to what we need to be aware of in undertaking emergency needs assessments and to train others in targeting, distribution, reporting, etc.		
Strengthen ONS capacity to target, distribute, report on, and in general manage relief (including food) <i>[In the areas affected by the TDR Program, the ICB Pilot Countries (Lesotho, Mozambique, Indonesia), and Viet Nam].</i>		
Strengthen ONS capacity to access, use and report on food and food security interventions in longer term programs, especially HIV/AIDS related strategies) <i>[In the areas affected by the TRP Program, the ICB Pilot Countries (Lesotho, Mozambique, Indonesia), and Viet Nam].</i>		
Assist the ARC/RC Movement to define its approach to “chronic” food security disasters such as recurrent drought or drought/flood cycles		

C. CAPACITY BUILDING: Below is a list of different capacity-building strategies and activities used in the grant. Could you please try to rank these different capacities in terms of your subjective assessment of their utility using the same 0-5 ranking criteria described above (Box 1).

ICB Capacity Building Strategies/Activities	Rankings (0-5)	Comments
Placement of bilateral delegates in the field to support specific projects (Indonesia SPMI, the Tsunami TRP program for example)		
Attachment of Negusse Woldemichael to the S.Af. Regional Office of the Federation to Support Lesotho pilot activities and broader food security efforts		
Secondment of staff to WFP and/or staff who are assigned to manage ARC support to WFP and FAO (Food Security related) –including the two ICB Managers who were later posted as WFP Program coordinators and/or IOM/FAO/FWP Partnership Coordinator		
Provision of training and updating of training tools within the established formal Response training framework (RDRT/ERU)		
In-house ARC Integrated Planning Process (IPP) training and provision of materials		
Provision of training /coaching through field visits		
Participation in Federation Review of Implementation of the African Food Security Action Plan in Africa		
Production/Dissemination of Modules and other Tools		
Participation of ARC staff in FFP and PVO working Groups, collaborations		
Evaluations including both the WFP-ARC Partnership evaluation and the Mid-term Evaluation of the ICB		
Brown Bag Seminars (HQ)		
<i>Other (please explain)</i>		

D. PARTNERSHIP: As a professional/group of professionals with extensive experience in the design of emergency and/or longer-term development interventions, could you assess the strengths, weaknesses, potential opportunities, and potential constraints (threats) to collaboration with the following partners. Please mark N/A if you do not feel qualified to speak on this particular partnership.

Partner	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities (potential benefits)	Constraints (potential risks)
WFP and USDA				
Title II FFP office				
The ONS in the 3 ICB Pilot Countries (Lesotho, Mozambique, Indonesia)				
The South Africare regional ONS working with the regional ICB officer based in Lesotho				
IFRC (Geneva)				
Other US NGOs working in food security like CRS				

Form 2: Tools Assessment

Name: _____

Institutional Affiliation and Department: _____

Date: _____

Contacts:

*Della E. McMillan, External Team Leader, ARC ICB Evaluation, email : dellamcmillan@aol.com, fax: 352 377 3740,
tel : 352 377 5250*

Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Evaluation, email: leahajcohen@gmail.com

Could you please provide us a little information on how you received the tool, how you have used it, and what, if any, impact the tool has had on your programming.

Box 1. Sample rankings for assessing ICB impact

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Assessment Criteria</i>
5	Major impact that has already had an impact on a variety of programs.
4	Major impact that is likely to be sustained beyond the duration of the project but no wider-spread effects to date.
3	Major impact but sustainability not yet assured.
2	Activities/training executed, impact likely but not yet demonstrated.
1	Activities/training executed, limited impact demonstrated or likely.
0	Activities/training executed, no impact demonstrated or likely.
n/a	I/We are not aware of activity in this area.

Tool/Training Moduels	Aware of tool? Y=Yes N=No	IS it relevant to your work? Y=Yes N=No	Have you used it? Y=Yes N=No	What did you use it for?	How would you rank the utility? (0-5 Box 1)	How did you acquire the tool?	Recommendations for strengthening the impact of the tool
ARC/CRS M&E Series							
<i>Success and Learning Story Packet (June 06)</i>							
<i>Planning for High Quality Delivery of Capacity Building Services (June 06)</i>							
<i>Preparing for Evaluation (June 06)</i>							
<i>Hiring M&E Filled Staff (07/08)*</i>							
<i>Editing Human Interest(07/08)*</i>							
<i>IPTT Module (07/08)*</i>							
<i>Log Frame to M&E Plan (07/08)</i>							
Additional Tools:							
Revised IPP Sections (Adapted for the Tsunami TRP Program, ie proposal guidance, also for IP)							
RFP for humanitarian software							
ERU Training manual (revised 06-uploaded 07)							
ERU Refresher food security materials							
Evaluation of WFP-ARC partnership							
ABCC (Appreciative Inquiry for Behavior Change and Communication) (local AED staff gave to ARC and Indonesian Red Cross (AED) (Indonesia)							
Other Case Studies							
* <i>draft modules exist</i>							

Form 3.B: Lesotho Pilot Project

We deeply appreciate your agreeing to be interviewed. We hope that you will find that this experience may help you better understand how certain activities within your program were related to some broader cross-cutting initiatives within the American Red Cross and the Federation. We also hope that the analysis of “lessons learned” can illuminate “lessons learned” about capacity building that can be applied to future initiatives within the Federation and the ARC as well as USAID. If you have any questions and/or are willing to be interviewed over the telephone, please contact me or Leah.

Della E. McMillan, External Team Leader, ARC ICB Evaluation

Email: dellamcmillan@aol.com, fax: 352 377 3740, tel: 352 377 5250

Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Evaluation

Email: leahajcohen@gmail.com

A. Context

One important aspect 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 pilot programs before scaling up (ARC 2003: 14). Although the ARC Technical Assistance Unit provided extensive case by case technical assistance to specific countries, they did not start execution of the pilot programs until FY07.

- Two pilot programs have been chosen in Africa (Lesotho and Mozambique) based on their identified need and the expressed interest of the national operating society.
- A third pilot country is Indonesia SPIM project. In contrast to the other two pilot programs, which are funded more or less exclusively by the ICB grant, the SPIM project is co-funded by WFP MCN and SF. It has received TA from staff supported by the grant. Due to the close congruence of objectives between the project and the ICB grant, USAID recently approved ARC counting part of the funds associated with the grant as ICB “cost share.”

B. Key Questions for Lesotho

B.1. Could you please describe your relationship to the project?

B.2. CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY— At NS level

What capacities do key stakeholders in the LRCS (Lesotho Red Cross Society) believe they have acquired as a result of provision of technical support (through Negusse Woldemichael) to Mafeting and Quithing CBAD projects, food security training and to the development of food security and DM strategies?

B.2.3. Have LRCS staff and volunteers who have been trained in specific skills incorporated the training they have received into their work? If so, how? What data are you currently collecting or likely to collect that supports this?.

B.3. CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY—At Community level

B.3.1. Have the project's efforts in general and at community level, increased the base of skills needed to increase "food availability" (i.e. to increase crop and livestock yields, reduce erosion) and reduce household vulnerability to long-term chronic food insecurity among target beneficiaries?

B.3.2. Have these skills resulted (or are they likely to result) in decreased household food insecurity and/or increased household assets? In decreased vulnerability to chronic food insecurity? What data are you currently collecting or likely to collect supports this?

B.4. SWOT

Please analyze the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and risks of the project's methodology for host society capacity building.

SWOT—Capacity Building Efforts
Strengths
Weaknesses
Opportunities
Risks/Threats

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

What activities would you like to see that are not being provided by the current project? Are their recommendations for strengthening capacity building strategies? For strengthening ARC support?

Form 3.C: Mozambique Pilot Project

We deeply appreciate your agreeing to be interviewed or filling in this form and returning it by email. We hope you will find that this experience may help you better understand how activities within the pilot program were related to some broader cross-cutting initiatives within the American Red Cross and the Federation. We also hope that the analysis of “lessons learned” can illuminate “lessons learned” about capacity building that can be applied to future initiatives within the Federation and the ARC as well as USAID. Please use the email addresses listed below to return the form (you are welcome to complete it as a group and email it in) or if you have any questions and/or are willing or prefer to be interviewed over the telephone please email Leah to set up a time.

Della E. McMillan, External Team Leader, ARC ICB Evaluation

Email: dellamcmillan@aol.com, fax: 352 377 3740, tel: 352 377 5250

Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Evaluation

Email: Leahajcohen@gmail.com

Context

One important aspect 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 pilot programs before scaling up (ARC 2003: 14). Although the ARC Technical Assistance Unit provided extensive case by case technical assistance to specific countries, they did not start execution of the pilot programs until FY07. Two pilot programs have been chosen in Africa (Lesotho and Mozambique) based on their identified need and the expressed interest of the national operating society. A third pilot project is the Indonesia SPIM project.

1. Please describe your relationship to the *Project to Integrate Food Security into Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Response, HIV and OVC Programs* that is funded through the American Red Cross ICB grant.

2. CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY – HOST SOCIETIES

What capacities does the Mozambique Red Cross Society (MRCS) believe they will acquire as a result of ICB activities? Are the proposed ICB-funded activities likely to result in improved capacity of the MRCS (Mozambique Red Cross Society) to implement integrated HIV and food security projects?

3. CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY—COMMUNITIES

What capacities do you think the communities will acquire as a result of ICB activities initiated through the Mozambique Red Cross Society? Are the proposed ICB-funded activities likely to result in improved capacity of the communities to implement and/or maintain integrated HIV and food security project activities?

4. GLOBAL CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY

To date, most of the ICB-related activities in Mozambique have been in project design. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of this process and offer suggestions for how to improve the design process. What do you think of the proposed learning strategy? What are its strengths? What are its potential weaknesses and/or risks?

SWOT
Strengths
Weaknesses
Opportunities
Risks/Threats

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

What activities would you like to see that are not planned or being provide by the current ICB-funded project? Are there recommendations for strengthening capacity building strategies? For strengthening/improving ARC's support? Do you anticipate problems with the implementation of the pilot project and if so, what do you recommend to head these off?

Form 3.D: Vietnam

We deeply appreciate your agreeing to be interviewed. We hope that you will find that this experience may help you better understand how certain activities within your program were related to some broader cross-cutting initiatives within the American Red Cross and the Federation. We also hope that the analysis of “lessons learned” can illuminate “lessons learned” about capacity building that can be applied to future initiatives within the Federation and the ARC as well as USAID. If you have any questions and/or are willing to be interviewed over the telephone, please contact me or Leah.

Della E. McMillan, External Team Leader, ARC ICB Evaluation

Email: dellamcmillan@aol.com, fax: 352 377 3740, tel: 352 377 5250

Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Evaluation

Email: leahajcohen@gmail.com

A. Context

Two important outputs of ARC’s Title II funded ICB (Institutional Capacity Building) Grant (FY04-FY08) were expected to be:

- Enhanced emergency response planning that integrates food and nutrition with water/sanitation and other public health interventions; and
- Enhanced collaboration between the ARC and other PVOs and institutions [including WFP and USDA] in the design and management of food and nutrition interventions in emergencies and risk mitigation environment.

Under the current ICB grant—and its predecessor (the Institutional Assistance Grant, FY00-02) ARC recruited a number of staff (Mark Smith, Alice Willard, Regis Chapman, Ange Tingbo) that worked directly with the ARC’s USDA program in Viet Nam. During the last four years, the ISA and the ICB supported the development (under the ISA) and revision and training (under the ICB) of numerous international staff as well as staff associated with the National Host Society on IPP (Integrated Programming Plan), M&E, Warehousing, and Monetization. These ICB facilitated activities reinforced other activities that were funded by the grant itself. Various staff who were all or partially supported by the ICB (Mark Smith, Regis Chapman, Ange Tingbo, Alice Willard) have supplied Technical Assistance to the grant during the last four years. Although the primary focus of this TA and training was to increase the effectiveness and impact of the Viet Nam project, these activities were also expected to help ARC extrapolate some important “lessons learned” that it could then apply to future ARC projects as well as joint ARC collaborations with other food security partners (WFP, USDA) focused on relief and risk mitigation.

Melissa Quimby oversaw an initial “qualitative assessment of some “institutional” lessons learned from the Viet Nam project in August 2007 which is attached to this memo. The purpose of this memo is to try to assess what “value added” came from some of the ICB supported training and TA to the project.

B.1. Could you please describe your relationship to the USDA funded school feeding and nutrition project in Viet Nam?

B.2. CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY— At NS level

B.2.1. What capacities do key stakeholders in the Viet Nam Red Cross Society believe they have acquired as a result of provision of technical assistance (through Regis Chapman, Ange Tingbo and Alice Willard); formal IPP, monetization, and warehouse training to the execution of the project?

B.2.2. Have Viet Nam Red Cross society staff and volunteers who have been trained in specific activities that were executed in collaboration with the ICB (for M&E, monetization, warehouse management, IPP) incorporated the training they have received into their work? If so, how? What data are you currently collecting or likely to collect that support this?

B.3. ARC HQ LEVEL SUPPORT FOR FOOD SECURITY

B.3.1. What was the HQ level support for food security programming to your project?

--What were the strengths of this support?

--What were its weaknesses?

B.4. Could you please describe in your words what you think would have been the impact on your project had there NOT been any ARC HQ level support for facilitating food security partnerships (with organizations like USDA)?

C.RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the shift in ARC's willingness and ability to execute food programming but the continued need for food in emergencies and to address chronic food insecurity issues in recovery programs, as well as the importance of access to adequate food and nutrition to HBC clients, what types of support do you think ARC field programs and the NS with whom they collaborate are likely to need in the future? Who should provide this? What if any role do you see for a Food Security Advisor position within ARC in the future?

Form 4: Regional Food Security Initiative with IFRC in Southern Africa

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, ARC Title II funded ICB (Institutional Capacity Building) Grant Evaluation

Leah Cohen, Team Member, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation

dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655

leahajcohen@gmail.com, telephone 352 262 3829

Date: October 25, 2007

Re: **Key Informant Interview (Federation and ICB Efforts to Build Capacity for the Design and execution of Food Security Action Plans)**

- Proposed agenda for the Interview
- Identification of other persons in your office I should interview (for example people who work with WFP)

Introduction

We look forward to interviewing you since we think your input will help both us and ARC answer key questions to be addressed in final evaluation of the USAID/Title II-funded ICB (Institutional Capacity Building) Grant. Under this grant in the last year the American Red Cross has developed M&E tools, has supported Emergency Response Unit training, supported NS candidates to attend RDRT training, placed a regional food security delegate in Southern Africa, who has supported the LRCS in developing their food security strategy and drought recovery programs (as well as Southern African country and the regional food security strategies), participated in a Secretariat sponsored “Federation Review of Implementation of the African Food Security action Plan in Africa” (Ange Tingbo), completed and presented out to NS and others this past July, and is supporting integrated food security/health or HIV programming in Indonesia, Lesotho and Mozambique.

Interview Time: If you feel comfortable completing this interview form by email, that is great. If you have time for Della to interview you (any time between now and October 30, Thursday) that would be wonderful; after that date, Leah could conduct the interviews (over skype to skype or skype to telephone) If you share an office with one of the key informants identified above OR have someone on your staff who is familiar with the software, please feel free to complete the form as a “group” exercise. This type of group response is especially useful in getting good information on if an how people are using one of the ICB deliverables.

Key Questions

As you can see from the attached evaluation Scope of Work, we are particularly interested in exploring the outcomes and the factors affecting these of different capacity building strategies supported through this grant.

1. I would like your perspective on what you see as the outcome/ impact of the Federation Review of Implementation of the African Food Security action Plan in Africa (the Ouagadougou Initiative).

2. Can you compare the outcomes of the Federation Review of Implementation of the African Food Security Action Plan in Africa (the Ouagadougou Initiative) with the results being achieved by the joint HNS/Regional IFRC office and Amcross FS regional delegate (funded by the Title II ICB grant) effort to develop country and regional food security strategies?

3. Could you compare and contrast the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and risks associated with the two capacity building strategy—i.e. the strategy adopted by the African Longer-Term Food Security Review (in response to the Ouagadougou Initiative) and the current effort to develop country and regional food security strategies?
 - Please describe the perceived strengths in the appropriate box
 - Please apply a global ranking (Box 1) to the activity and provide a brief explanation of your ranking

Box 1. Sample rankings for assessing ICB Impact (to be used in sections B and C below)

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Assessment Criteria</i>
5	Major impact that has already had an impact on a variety of programs.
4	Major impact that is likely to be sustained beyond the duration of the project, but no wider-spread effects to date.
3	Major impact, but sustainability not yet assured.
2	Activities/training executed impact likely, but not yet demonstrated.
1	Activities/training executed limited impact demonstrated or likely.
0	Activities/training executed no impact demonstrated or likely.
n/a	I/we are not aware of activity in this area.

SWOT and Ranking	Federation Review of Implementation of the African Food Security action Plan in Africa	Federation-ARC Development of Country and Regional Food Security Strategies
Strengths		
Weaknesses		
Opportunities		
Risks/Threats		
Global Ranking (Box 1 above) and justification of Ranking		

4. Can you speak to any particular consideration that make one or other of these strategies more appropriate in different circumstances?

5. Recommendations for what kind of support you think is needed at regional or country level to build capacity to develop good integrated HIV-food security programming and/or better develop implement and evaluate the Red Cross approach to slow on-set disasters(or chronic food insecurity punctuated by acute disaster shocks)?

Form 5: LOGIC Software

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, ARC USAID/Title II funded ICB (Institutional Capacity Building) Grant Evaluation
Leah Cohen, Team Member, Evaluation of the USAID funded ARC ICB (Institutional Capacity Building) Grant
dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655
leahajcohen@gmail.com, cell 352 262 3829

Date: November 13, 2007

Re: Key Informant Interview—LOGIC system

Introduction: We look forward to interviewing you since we think your input will help both us and ARC identify some of the key questions that we should ask in assessing the impact of ARC's investment in developing the LOGIC system under the Title II ICB Grant, primarily through the secondment of Ben Kim to the Federation office for 10 months where notably he assisted the Federation develop the RFP for the warehouse control software.

Interview Time: If you feel comfortable completing this interview form by email that is great. If you have time for either of us to interview you by telephone or skype, that would be wonderful; please contact Leah Cohen (email above). If you share offices with one of the key informants identified above OR have someone on your staff that is familiar with the software, please feel free to complete the form as a "group" exercise. This type of group response is especially useful in getting good information on if and how people are using one of the ICB deliverables.

Key Questions:

1. What role did you play in the development of the LOGIC system software?
2. How have you and projects you are associated with used the software?
3. What has been the impact of the software (in terms of quality, speed and costs) on the projects with which you have been directly involved?
4. Is the LOGIC system an improvement from what was being used previously?
Why or why not?
5. Could you please list your recommendations for improving:
 - The LOGIC software itself?
 - Training in the use of the software?
 - Distribution of the software?
 - Marketing/communication?
 - User Adoption?
 - Other?
6. During the course of the project and its rollout and usage, what was done well or successfully? Was the tool rolled out successfully? What would you have done

differently? Would you have done an RFP? Would you have built it using the internet?

7. Could you please rate your level of satisfaction with the LOGIC system using the suggested rankings in Box 1?

Box 1. Sample rankings for assessing ICB Impact (to be used in sections B and C below)

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Assessment Criteria</i>
5	Major impact that has already had an impact on a variety of programs.
4	Major impact that is likely to be sustained beyond the duration of the project, but no wider-spread effects to date.
3	Major impact, but sustainability not yet assured.
2	Activities/training executed impact likely, but not yet demonstrated.
1	Activities/training executed limited impact demonstrated or likely.
0	Activities/training executed no impact demonstrated or likely.
n/a	I/we are not aware of activity in this area.

Aspects of the System	Rankings 0-5	Comments (if not mentioned above or you would like to make a particular point)
The LOGIC software itself		
Training in the use of the software		
Distribution of the software		
Marketing/communication		
User Adoption		
Other?		

Form 6.A: USAID

To:

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655

Date: October 18, 2007

Re: **Key Informant Interview—USAID**

Introduction: I look forward to interviewing you since I think your input will help both me and ARC identify some of the key questions that you and your colleagues that work with the FFP office would like addressed.

Key Questions:

1. Could you review (in your own words) the relationship between USAID/FFP and the ARC in the context of changing strategies, directions, and institutional arrangements?
2. In your opinion could something else have been done to resolve the WFP question (i.e., the question of whether ARC could use ICB funds to build national society capacity to partner with WFP who received Title II funds) in a more timely fashion? The document files show that this issue was raised in an annual report in 2005, in meetings and emails, and reiterated in the annual report 2006, but not officially resolved (in writing) until September 2007)?
3. Is this strategy of building national Red Cross capacity to work with a variety of partners involved in food security a strategy that USAID is interested in pursuing (WFP-RC Movement [now recognized as a PIO] -USAID)?
4. Is the USAID/FFP **meta evaluation** going to look at just the ICB or the cumulative effect of all Title II capacity building assistance to organizations? As you know, ARC has only had two grants. Prior to the ISA, ARC had neither the staff nor experience to manage food security partnerships with either Title II or non-Title II partners (USDA, WFP). This capacity had a major impact on the Tsunami relief effort, as well as other relief programs that are currently being designed and executed through a variety of partners with ARC, the Red Cross Federation and the Red Cross national societies.
5. What do you see as the current and potential value added of the ARC ICB grant to the pool of “lessons learned” by USAID? Are there activities/reports/analyses that you think could strengthen this programmatic impact in FY08?
6. (6.a.) In sum, could you summarize what you see as the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) (e.g. risks to sustainability) of your current relationship to ARC under the ICB? (6.b.) What do you see as potential SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) to your future collaboration?
7. Are there other issues you would like to see addressed in the ARC/ICB final evaluation?

Form 6.B:

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655
Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
leahajcohen@gmail.com, cell 352 262 3829

Date: October 31, 2007

Re: Key Informant Interview—Evaluation of the WFP-ARC Collaboration during the first year of the tsunami operations (operational research)
(a) Proposed agenda for the Interview

Introduction: We look forward to interviewing you since we think your input will help us better understand the impact that this particular study had on ARC and the Federation.

Clarify Evaluation Process: One unusual aspect of the ARC/WFP collaboration was both parties' commitment to supporting operational research to determine the process and status of the partnership during the first year. The resulting report is widely heralded as a landmark and an example of "best practice" that could be used to analyze other partnerships for emergency and non-emergency programming.

Assessment of Impact: The purpose of these interviews is to assess the impact of the assessment process on staff capacity within WFP as well as the ARC and the Red Cross Federation. How were people involved in the study? What did people learn? What did people think of the process? Should this type of assessment be repeated? Should this type of partnership be repeated?

Key Questions:

1. Did you read the report and attend any of the debriefing sessions/presentations?
2. What information/lessons learned have you retained from the report/presentations?
3. Have the results/process of the report affected /or likely to affect the way you do your work or conduct partnerships in any way?
4. Should this type of exercise be repeated and if so why?
5. What role do you see for future collaborations between you and the units you work with and WFP? How might this work be affected by the results in this report?

Form 6.C: FAO/ARC Livelihoods Project

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655
Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
leahajcohen@gmail.com, cell 352 262 3829

Date: October 30, 2007

Re: Key Informant Interview—FAO/ARC Collaboration on Design of the FAO Livelihoods Project

Introduction: We look forward to interviewing you since we think your input will help us better understand the role that ICB support for your participation in the FAO livelihoods project design.

Key Questions:

1. Could you please describe the role that ARC (and WWF) played in facilitating the design of the FAO livelihoods project and the creation of the partnerships that will be executing the project?
2. Has ARC (or WWF) worked with FAO in the past or is this a new partnership? If so could you describe the nature of this partnership/program?
3. *(For ARC respondents only)* What if anything distinguishes this grant from earlier partnerships with WFP?
4. What is the potential impact of this partnership and grant (in terms of lessons learned) in your opinion on ARC and the Federation?

5. Can you analyze what you see as the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and risks associated with the project (see table below)?

SWOT
Strengths
Weaknesses
Opportunities
Risks/Threats

**Form 6.D: ARC/CRS Collaboration
Key Questions**

1. What is the nature of the relationship between ARC and CRS for designing and completing the field manuals? What was your specific involvement?
2. What worked well regarding the partnership?
3. What could have been better or gone more smoothly in this partnership?
4. Recommendations for ARC when working on producing such tools with other organizations.
5. What sort of technical skills and capacity building knowledge did ARC bring to the table? What have been ARC's strengths for this type of project?
6. What do you think the success in using the manuals has been by other CS's?

Form 6.E: ARC Participation in InterAction (non-ARC respondents form)

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, and ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone: 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655
 Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
leahajcohen@gmail.com, cell: 352 262 3829

Date: November 7, 2007

Re: ICB final evaluation interview—ARC participation with the Wider Title II CS community through the Interaction Evaluation Interest (activity under Output 1.2 of the ARC ICB)

1.0. Introduction: We look forward to interviewing you since we think your input will help us better understand the indirect and direct impact of ARC’s ICB grant in helping

- Maintain the EIG Working Group;
- Develop New and Revised Evaluation Principles and Practice in INGOs; and
- Maintain the EPEWG Working Group.

If possible please comment on the evidence of impact of ARC’s participation in the ICB-supported activities listed in the table below on Interaction’s related objectives.

1. Could you please describe your involvement with ARC in activities related to the Interaction working groups?

2. What, if any, impact has ARC’s involvement had on the goals, functioning, and effectiveness of Interaction’s work related to the EIG working group, self-certification, and the EPE working group?

ICB-Supported Activities	Early Evidence of Impact of ARC’s Participation on the Activities of the EIG and the Self-Certification Process
<p>EIG Working Group (FY04-06)</p> <p>Alice Willard, Pat McLaughlin, Scott Chaplowe, and Michael Cohen Participation (co-funded through ICB grant)</p> <p>Regular meetings at ARC (for exchange) and preparation for AEA</p> <p>Conference participation of Scott Chaplowe, Michael Cohen, and Alice Willard</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">ICB-Supported Activities</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Early Evidence of Impact of ARC's Participation on the Activities of the EIG and the Self-Certification Process</p>
<p><i>For Jim Rugh to answer:</i> ARC's involvement with sharing good M&E practices.</p> <p>Other (if any, please specify): _____</p> <p>_____</p>	
<p>Self-Certification Work</p> <p>Pat McLaughlin's role on the committee drafting paper demonstrating NGO effectiveness Creation/modification/pilot testing of the first standards (ARC's contribution to the standards)</p> <p>ARC's involvement in the survey for self-certification distributed by Thomaz Chianca.</p> <p>Updating Self-Certification/Evaluation Principles and practice in INGOs Standards (Pat McLaughlin)</p> <p>Other (if any, please specify): _____</p> <p>_____</p>	
<p>ARC's involvement in other aspects of the EPE Working Group</p> <p>Meetings—Interaction</p> <p>Meetings AEA/Panels/joint presentations (Alice Willard, Scott Chaplowe, and Michael Cohen participation)</p> <p>Other (if any, please specify): _____</p> <p>_____</p>	

ICB-Supported Activities	Early Evidence of Impact of ARC's Participation on the Activities of the EIG and the Self-Certification Process
Recommendations for increasing impact of ARC on the group(s) (support that ARC could provide)	

Form 6.E: ARC Participation in InterAction (ARC respondents form)

From: Della E. McMillan, Team Leader, and ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
dellamcmillan@aol.com; telephone: 352 377 5250; cell: 352 275 6655
Leah Cohen, External Team Member, ARC ICB Grant Evaluation
leahajcohen@gmail.com, cell: 352 262 3829

Date: November 7, 2007

Re: **ICB final evaluation interview—ARC participation with the Wider Title II CS community through the Interaction Evaluation Interest (activity under Output 1.2 of the ARC ICB)**

Introduction

We look forward to interviewing you since we think your input will help us better understand the indirect and direct impact of ARC's ICB grant in helping

- Maintain the EIG Working Group;
- Develop New and Revised Evaluation Principles and Practice in INGOs; and
- Maintain the EPEWG Working Group.

Similarly, we are interested in the evidence of early impact of the EPEWG and EIG on ARC's international programs in general and international programs that incorporate food in particular. If possible could you comment on the evidence of the early impact of these different activities on ARC (see table below).

1. Personal Impact of your Participation in Interaction Activities

1.a Could you please describe the impact your personal involvement with the EIG or EPE working group activities has had on your work with ARC?

1.b What, if any, impact has it had on your ability to address food security issues in an emergency and recovery context?

2. Early Evidence of Institutional Impact

If possible, could you describe in your own words what, if any, direct or indirect impact this type of "networking" has had on ARC activities and/or what impact ARC's networking through these groups has had on the EIG or the EPE working group's activities and deliverables? (Use the table listed below if you find it helpful.)

<p style="text-align: center;">ICB-funded activities</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Impact of ICB-related activities (listed on left) on ARC's capacity to carry out activities related to emergency or recovery food programs</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Impact of ARC's involvement (through activities listed on left) on the work of Interaction (how have they contributed to work with Interaction in these activities)</p>
<p>EIG Working Group (FY04-06)</p> <p>Alice Willard, Pat McLaughlin, Scott Chaplowe, and Michael Cohen Participation (co-funded through ICB grant)</p> <p>Regular meetings at ARC (for exchange) and preparation for AEA</p> <p>Conference participation of Scott Chaplowe, Michael Cohen, and Alice Willard</p> <p>ARC's involvement with sharing good M&E practices.</p> <p>Other (if any, please specify): _____</p> <p>_____</p>		
<p>Self-Certification Work</p> <p>Pat McLaughlin's role on the committee drafting paper demonstrating NGO effectiveness Creation/modification/pilot testing of the first standards (ARC's contribution to the standards)</p>		

<p>ICB-funded activities</p>	<p>Impact of ICB-related activities (listed on left) on ARC's capacity to carry out activities related to emergency or recovery food programs</p>	<p>Impact of ARC's involvement (through activities listed on left) on the work of Interaction (how have they contributed to work with Interaction in these activities)</p>
<p>ARC's involvement in the survey for self-certification distributed by Thomas Chianza.</p> <p>Updating Self-Certification/Evaluation Principles and practice in INGOs Standards (Pat McLaughlin)</p> <p>Other (if any, please specify): _____ _____</p>		
<p>ARC's involvement in other aspects of the EPE Working Group</p> <p>Meetings—Interaction</p> <p>Meetings AEA/Panels/joint presentations (Alice Willard, Scott Chaplowe, and Michael Cohen participation)</p> <p>Other (if any, please specify): _____</p>		
<p>Recommendations for increasing impact (through participation in Interaction)</p>		

Form 7: Emergency Relief Unit Volunteer (ERU) Refresher Course

Name: _____

Most Recent Training Attended: _____

Number of Trainings and Retraining Attended Before: _____

Countries in which you have worked as an ARC volunteer in the past:

Institutional Affiliation and
Department: _____

Date form completed: _____

Introduction: The American Red Cross requested and received USAID funds to implement an Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) grant over a five year period beginning in FY2004. The overall goal of the ICB programs is to develop the capacity of the American Red Cross (ARC) and its partners throughout the International Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement to protect and promote the nutritional well-being of people affected by emergencies. This grant has supported trainings, field visits, and technical assistance (from Tracy Reines and Woldemichael Negusse) that have helped ARC revise various portions of its ERU field manual and trainings like the one you recently participated in.

1. What information did you retain from the presentation on field deployments in Mozambique and Madagascar that you might apply to your activities as an ARC International ERU?

2. What information did you retain from Woldemichael Negusse's presentation on reducing the impact of flooding on vulnerable groups in Lesotho?

3. Could you rank the overall relevance of these presentations to your volunteer activities using the scale described in Table 1 below? (*Ranking 0-5*)

Box 1. Sample rankings for assessing ICB impact

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Assessment Criteria</i>
5	Major impact that has already had an impact on a variety of programs.
4	Major impact that is likely to be sustained beyond the duration of the project but no wider-spread effects to date.
3	Major impact but sustainability not yet assured.
2	Activities/training executed, impact likely but not yet demonstrated.
1	Activities/training executed, limited impact demonstrated or likely.
0	Activities/training executed, no impact demonstrated or likely.
n/a	I/We are not aware of activity in this area.

4. What recommendations would you made for revision of the existing ERU materials that address the food security issues (c.g. food targeting, assessment of food needs, basic understanding of what food security constitutes) associated with international disasters? Do you see this as a high priority or a low priority in the basic training and/or refresher courses?

5. Could you rank the overall relevance of the retraining workshop using the scale described in Table 1 above? (*Ranking 0-5*)

Annex VI: Final Evaluation Scope of Work (SOW)

Background

The American Red Cross requested and received USAID funds to implement an Institutional Capacity Building Program over a five-year period beginning in FY 2004. The overall goal of the Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) program is to develop the capacity of the American Red Cross (ARC) and its partners throughout the International Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement to protect and promote the nutritional well-being of people affected by emergencies. The original proposal presented a general plan to expand ARC national headquarters capacity to program food in developmental relief situations, expand ARC Red Cross Movement partners' capacity to program food in developmental relief situations, and create domestic awareness/potential support for foreign assistance writ large and for food programming in particular. There were significant changes to the implementation strategy over time, as were documented and explained in the mid-term review. Notably these include a shift away from Multi-Year Assistance Programs, paralleling the decrease in available funding for those grants from FFP; expanded support to Humanitarian Logistics Software; more involvement and interest in partnering with WFP; and a specific focus on improving Red Cross management of disaster relief supplies, both food or non food. While the implementation strategy changed significantly over the life of the grant, the objective of the grant remained constant; the two intermediate results, modified but slightly as per the mid-term review are:

Intermediate Result 1 (IR.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

Intermediate Result 2 (IR.2): 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., Mozambique and Lesotho

Specific learning objectives relating to these results were defined over time:

- **Strengthen ARC capacity** to understand the basic elements of food (in)security, especially as these relate to what we need to be aware of in undertaking emergency needs assessments and to train others in targeting, distribution, reporting, etc.
- **Strengthen ONS capacity** to target, distribute, report on, and in general manage relief (including food).
- **Strengthen ONS capacity** to access, use and report on food and food security interventions in longer-term programs, especially HIV/AIDS-related strategies.
- **Assist the RC/RC Movement** to define its approach to "chronic" food security disasters such as recurrent drought or drought/flood cycles.

The indicator tracking table was changed significantly as the focus of the grant changed and became more concrete.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation serves two purposes – one is to feed into the FFP meta-evaluation of ICB grants and inform the development of the next ICB Request for Proposal, the other is to inform American Red Cross future programming, particularly as relates to internal and partner capacity-building in the

context of food security with key aspects applicable to capacity-building efforts in general. The evaluation aims to assess the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency and cost effectiveness, and sustainability of capacities promoted through this grant, highlight achievements, good practices and shortcomings and formulate recommendations for the remainder of the grant and for future programming.

Specific tasks include:

Effectiveness

1. Determine the accomplishments of the ICB grant based on the proposal plan and modifications to that plan as specifically relating to the indicator performance tracking table, mid-term evaluation and annual implementation plan FY 07/08.
2. Determine whether the implementation of the ICB activities resulted in increased capacity as defined by the 4 specific learning objectives and IPTT indicators.
3. Determine the effectiveness of the different capacity building strategies and activities used in the grant, specifically:
 - Placement of bilateral delegates in the field to support specific projects (Indonesia SPMI)
 - Attachment of Negusse Woldemichael to the Southern Africa Regional Office of the Federation to support Lesotho pilot activities and broader food security efforts
 - Secondment of staff to WFP and/or staff who are assigned to manage our support to WFP & FAO (Food security related). Staff in both cases had been ICB grant managers or interim grant managers. Has our experience as a donor, especially to WFP/FAO served to build our capacity – what recommendation can be made to cement the learning acquired? Were the skills acquired or being used while the staff were ICB managers useful in their roles as WFP Programme Coordinator and/or IOM, FAO, WFP Partnership Coordinator?
 - Provision of training and updating of training tools within the established formal Response training frameworks (RDRT/ERU)
 - In house ARC Integrated Planning Process trainings and provision of materials
 - Provision of training/coaching through field visits (Mark Smith, Regis, Ange esp)
 - Participation in Federation Review of Implementation of the African Food Security Action Plan in Africa
 - Production/Dissemination of Modules and other tools
 - Participation of ARC staff in FFP and PVO working groups, collaborations
 - Evaluations including both the WFP-ARC Partnership evaluation and the Mid-term Evaluation of ICB.
4. Assess ARC relationships with FFP, CRS, pilot country and other Movement, WFP stakeholders. What have been the strengths, weaknesses, benefits and constraints in ARC's work with others?

5. Particular to pilot countries address the following

- a. In Lesotho,
 - i. Have the efforts at community level, increased “availability” related skills among target beneficiaries? Have they resulted (or are they likely to result) in decreased household food insecurity and/or increased household assets;
 - ii. Have those who have been trained in specific skills in Lesotho incorporated training into work? How?
 - iii. What capacities do key stakeholders in the LRCS believe they have acquired as a result of ICB activities?
- b. In Mozambique
 - i. Are the proposed ICB activities likely to result in improved capacity of the MRCS to implement integrated HIV and food security projects? Is there a clear learning strategy?
- c. In Indonesia
 - i. Does the cascade of training proposed, the provision of job aids and subsequent coaching seem appropriate as a capacity building method?
 - ii. Have PMI staff and volunteers who have received training incorporated this training messages/skills into their work? How?
 - iii. What capacities do key stakeholders in PMI believe they have or will acquire as a result of SPMI activities?

Relevance

6. Given changes in the American Red Cross 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 the changes in the ICB implementation strategies resulted in more relevance to ARC and Movement partners over time?

Efficiency and cost effectiveness

8. Review/assess the efficiency and transparency of project and financial administrative and management systems for the project.

- Arc grant procedures and any regulations complied with by the grant managers? Were procedures, regulations and tools shared with relevant staff in a clear and timely manner?
- Were the management recommendations from the mid-term implemented? Has grant management become more effective efficient?
- Is decision-making authority clear (especially post midterm)?
- Does the current management structure seem efficient?

Specific FFP objectives for all ICB grants

9. Review the relationship with USAID/FFP and the ARC in the context of changing strategies, directions and institutional arrangements. Could something else have been done to resolve the WFP question (raised in an annual report in 2005, in meetings and emails, reiterated in the annual report 2006) in a more timely fashion?

10. As specifically requested by FFP please:

- a) Demonstrate how the grant was used in relation to its original intent under the RFA. How was this shown/supported in annual reports and the Mid-Term Evaluation?
- b) Demonstrate how the ICB activities have strengthened the capacity of the organization to implement effective Title II and/or food security programs.
 - Specify: What have been the main linkages between the ICB strategies and activities with Title II and/or food security program outputs and Intermediate Results? What would not have been accomplished if the ICB grant had not been available?
- c) What are the key challenges affecting progress in the implementation and management of the ICB grant? Please describe any efforts made to overcome these challenges.
 - Specify: Describe the challenges (e.g., institutional, policy-related, etc.) linked to the grant, to the Title II program or to other areas, especially those tied to food security programs.
- d) What recommendations can be made in relation to (i) incorporating lessons learned from the successes and failures in the use of the ICB grant; (ii) identifying innovations and best practices and scaling up the innovations and best practices; and (iii) facilitating inter-organizational learning, partnerships and capacity building in the Title II program.

Methods

The evaluator(s) will use a variety of methods to determine status. These will include:

- Document review (project deliverables and project documents, email correspondence, ISD strategic planning documents, evaluations etc)
- Field visits (site visits, key informant and group interviews)
- Key informant interviews (long interview)
- Email or phone interviews with stakeholders and overseas participants
- (Potentially) focus group discussions with ISD and Movement partners?

Activities

There are five key activities in this evaluation. The first is a document review, anticipated to occur in Washington that will inform the development of standard interview protocols for the key informants and email interviews. The second is a field visit to Lesotho where pilot project activity sites will be visited and various LRCS and community level stakeholders interviewed a series of key interviews (with grant personnel past and present, current management staff, current

technical assistance staff, USAID and Movement partners). The third is key informant interviews most of which will occur in Washington. The consultant will have assistance in creating a productive interview schedule with the key stakeholders. The fourth is email, phone and potentially in person interviews with more distant stakeholders, particularly in pilot countries. The fifth builds on the previous four data-collection efforts to undertake an analysis achievement of the grant and make recommendations.

Schedule

A preliminary evaluation meeting will take place on the 26/27 of September where methodology and work plan will be finalized and documentation provided to the consultant. Additional data collection will take place in November with a first draft and presentation by and the final draft of the document provided to American Red Cross by the 15th of December.

Team Members

The final evaluation will be led by the same external consultant who did the mid-term, not only because she has experience in American Red Cross operations and the dynamics of the ICBA grant mechanism, but because she begins with a strong knowledge of the history of the grant and can bring a keen analysis when looking at whether recommendations from the mid-term have been implemented or not. An additional evaluation team member may be contracted in negotiation with the lead evaluator

Additional input and participation from NHIQ staff (including TA staff) is anticipated, but specific staff assignments will be determined in the pre-evaluation phase.

Key Inputs from American Red Cross NHQ

1. All available project documents, preferably both hard and electronic copies
2. Travel arrangements, housing, setting up interview etc for field visit
3. List of key people to interview and preliminary schedule of key interviews prior to evaluation start
4. Email, phone, computer access to conduct interviews

Deliverables

1. Draft evaluation findings presented to ARC NHQ staff in brown bag/debriefing.
2. Final evaluation report within two weeks of draft presentation that addresses key issues in the SOW above

Appendices

The Evaluation report will include the following key elements.

- Executive summary of key findings
- Methods section
- Analysis of program
- Overall statistics on project activities
- Training and other materials developed

- Conclusions and Recommendations
- List of persons interviewed
- Evaluation schedule
- Evaluation SOW

Sign-offs

Pat McLaughlin, Director, Technical Assistance

Nan Buzard, Senior Director International Programs

Annex VII. List of Persons Interviewed

Name	Position	Location	Organization
Alice Willard	FS consultant	US	-
Ange Tingbo	Deputy Director Food Unit	Washington DC	Africare
Carol Garrison	International Services	Washington	ARC
Constance McCorkle	FS Consultant	Falls Church	Private consultant/ARC-CRS modules
Kopano Masilo	FS Focal Point	Lesotho	LRCS
Cynthia Green	M&E Unit	Washington	ARC
Davel Patel	Acting Head of Programs	Indonesia	ARC
Edward Shea	Senior Field Representative, Asia, International Services	Viet Nam	ARC
Emily Rand	Water and Sanitation	Aceh	
Eric Baranick	International Services	El Salvador	ARC
Farid Alywar	Regional Disaster Management Coordinator, Federation	Harare	IFRC
Nathalie Gamache	National Headquarters, Africa Region	Washington	ARC
Guy Sharrock	Sr. M&E Advisor	England	CRS
Harold Tarver	Director Food Unit	Washington DC	Africare
Hugh Peterken	Head of Information Systems	Geneva	IFRC
Ilisa Gertner	TRP Partnership Coordinator	Washington	ARC
Juli Majernak	CTO ICB FFP	Washington	USAID
Jim Rugh	Private consultant m&e	Tennessee	Independent consultant/Interaction
Juan Galvez	Former Project Manager, LOGIC	Panama	Spanish Red Cross seconded to IFRC
Luke Greeves	Sr. Director, Planning and Management, ISD	Washington	ARC
Mario Fetz	World Food Program, NHQ	Rome	WFP
Mark Preslan	International Services, Asia Region	Washington	ARC
Martin Bush	Senior Officer, Systems and Processes Logistics and Resource Mobilization Department	Geneva	IFRC
Melissa Quimby	IFEN II Program Manager	Vietnam	ARC
Mija Ververs	Sr. Food Security Advisor	Geneva	IFRC
Minal Amin	Senior Program Advisor, Asia and Europe, International Services	Washington	ARC
Monica Marshall	Senior Donor Relations Officer, Private Donor Relations	Rome	WFP
Nan Buzard	Sr. Director, International programs and response International Services	Washington	ARC
Nancy Campbell	International Services	Africa	ARC
Nathan Cooper	International Disaster Response	Washington	ARC
Negusse Woldemichael	Regional FS Advisor	Southern Africa	ARC
Neidi de Carvalho	OCV National Coordinator	Mozambique	CVM
Pat McLaughlin	Technical Manager, International Services	Washington	ARC

Name	Position	Location	Organization
Philip Denino	International Services, Asia Region	Washington	ARC
Rachel Lucas	Technical Management, HIV Advisor, International Services	Washington	ARC
Richardo Caivano	Tsunami Recovery Program	Sri Lanka	ARC
Robert Laprade	International Services/Tsunami Recovery Program	Washington	ARC
Rolf Willmann	Senior Fishery Planning Officer	Indonesia	FAO
Scott Chaplowe	Tsunami Recovery Program	Sri Lanka	ARC
Sylvie Wobbes	Emergency Rehabilitation Operations Service	Indonesia	FAO
Tracy Reines	Director, International Disaster Response	Washington	ARC
Tram Ahn	IFEN II Commodity management Coordinator	Vietnam	ARC
Vu Quang Huy	Associate Professor/Chief of Projects Management Board under Vietnam Red Cross, Member of IFEN Project Steering Board and Head of Executive Board of IFEN project under Vietnam Red Cross	Vietnam	VNRC
Elizabeth Whelan	Tsunami Recovery Program	Washington	ARC
Ben Kim	Program Manager, Disaster Services	Washington	ARC
Tram Anh	IFEN II Commodity Management Coordinator/ former Commodity Accountant	Vietnam	ARC
Jacinto Moiane	Head of Finance and Administration	Mozambique	CVM
Frieda Draisma	Head of Community Programs	Mozambique	CVM
Ivete Dengo	Head of Social Sector Programs	Mozambique	CVM



