

## **Chapter Four**

### **Guidance**

#### **The Title II Programming Capacity Index (T2- PCI)**

#### **1.0. What, Who When, Where, and How?**

##### What?

Once one of the two tools being proposed in the preceding chapter has been used to identify areas that need improvement in the general organizational infrastructure of CRS's local NGO partners, the Title II Programming Capacity Index (T2-PCI) and Resource Guide, can be used to:

- Identify areas that need improvement within CRS NGO partners and CRS country programs in order to run specific USAID Title II projects; and
- Actualize improvement in these identified areas.

##### Who?

The primary audiences for the T2-PCI are:

- The local NGO partners through which CRS executes most of its Title II projects;<sup>1</sup>
- The CRS country programs that manage Title II projects; and
- The regional CRS program quality staff (deputy regional directors and regional technical advisors) who provide technical assistance and training to CRS country programs and partners.

##### When and Where?

The T2-PCI can be conducted during Title II project design as a way of orienting new partners to USAID as a donor. That type of proactive use of the T2-PCI can help partners and CRS staff understand the proposal development process. This, in turn, will increase their core capacity for proposal development, monitoring and evaluation, and financial systems.

This type of pre-project assessment should be re-administered, however, once the project starts and the project staff have been hired. The T2-PCI should then be conducted annually. The ideal time period for this annual assessment is at the end of the fiscal year when the Title II projects are planning for the next year and writing their annual report to the USAID/FFP office.

---

<sup>1</sup> CRS is directly intervening with communities in Rwanda. In that country, the NGO partner index and the CRS program index would therefore be the same.

## How?

### *Categories, Variables, and Indicators/Rankings*

The T2-PCI uses a “template” of pre-determined indicators to assess capacity in five capacity categories.

- Category 1: Project context and documentation systems
- Category 2: Proposal development
- Category 3: Commodity management
- Category 4: Title II monitoring, evaluation, and reporting
- Category 5: Environmental assessments and specific capacities being developed under CRS's Title II funded Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) grant (FY04-08)

Each capacity category is subdivided into 1-4 variables, which refer to specific sub-types of capacity. Each variable is measured by 1-8 indicators. Each indicator is ranked 1-4. A ranking of “1” is very weak capacity and the highest ranking of “4” suggests that the local NGO partner, CRS country program, or regional CRS office is working to a higher standard and (in the case of a local NGO partner) toward being able to maintain this capacity once project funding ends. The attached code sheet describes the indicators and suggested ranking for each indicator. The rankings are then entered in the appropriate column of the attached excel file.

### *Methodology*

The methodology for conducting the T2-PCI is similar to that used for conducting the Institutional Development Framework (IDF) (chapter three). The process requires more time during the first year (Box 4.1). After the first year, the core organizational development tools and T2-PCI can probably be updated during the same group meeting.

#### **Box 4.1 Recommended Steps for Conducting Baseline Assessments and Annual Updates of the T2-PCI**

##### **Year One**

- *Step One:* Initial explanation of the tool and how it can facilitate Title II program implementation and capacity building.
- *Step Two:* Participatory ranking of the T2-PCI indicators (approximately 3 hours).
- *Step Three:* Data entry and analysis of the information written on the printed data entry form (approximately 2 hours).
- *Step Four:* Joint strategy planning for staff capacity building (local NGO partner and CRS) and request for back-up from the T2-PCI Resource Guide (section 2.0 below).

##### **Subsequent Years**

- *Step One:* Annual update of the IDF and the T2-PCI (3 hours).
- *Step Two:* Joint strategy update for staff capacity building (local NGO partner and CRS) and request for back-up from the T2-PCI Resource Guide (section 2.0 below)

## 2.0. T2-PCI Resource Guide

Capacity Indicators and Variables in the T2-PCI Related to Reference Materials	Suggested Topics for Briefing Papers that Link to Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )	Key Reference Materials for Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )
<b>Category 1: Global Context and Documentation Systems</b>		
1.1. Capacity to situate the project within an institutional and policy context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-USAID and its major subdivisions</li> <li>-CRS's history and its relationship worldwide to its local partners</li> <li>-Title II food security program (past and present) and where to go for more information</li> <li>-The Food Aid and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project and its relationship to Title II</li> <li>-CRS's ICB grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Internal system for classifying final versions of approved DAPs and MYAPs</li> <li>-USAID Title II website</li> <li>-FAM website</li> </ul>
1.2. Capacity to develop and manage Title II project documentation and documentation retrieval systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Guides for developing bibliographies and bibliography standards</li> <li>-Identification of "best practice" within CRS for "turnover notes" and/or simple modules for orienting new staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-ARC/CRS pre-evaluation module (two tools in annex include format guides for bibliography and suggested set up of a simple hard copy documentation library)</li> <li>-CRS/Malawi description of their Title II documentation center</li> <li>-Sharepoint (for regional CRS staff only)</li> <li>-ProPack recommendations for organizing documents</li> <li>-If relevant, a copy of a "best practice" in defining a position description or formulating turnover notes.</li> </ul>
<b>Category 2: Proposal Development</b>		
2.1. Title II proposal development	Summary of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Most recent MYAP guidance on the USAID website</li> <li>-CRS internal DAP guidance (being revised)</li> <li>-CRS 10 step proposal process</li> <li>-CRS DAP lessons learned document</li> <li>-USAID/FFP 1995 Strategy Paper</li> <li>-USAID/FFP 2003 Strategy Paper</li> <li>-1 example of "best practice" in Title II proposal development that conforms to new 2003 policy paper (text only; no annexes)</li> <li>-1 example of "best practice" in Title II proposal development that conforms to 2003 policy paper &amp; IHD Framework (text only; no annexes)</li> </ul>
2.2. General proposal development	Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Propack</li> <li>-CRS Tool kit</li> </ul>

Capacity Indicators and Variables in the T2-PCI Related to Reference Materials	Suggested Topics for Briefing Papers that Link to Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )	Key Reference Materials for Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )
<b>Category 3: Commodity Management</b>		
3.1. Staff knowledge of basic guidance	Summary that explains standard training process developed for each country involved in FFW or direct distribution and how this is coordinated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-CRS Commodity Management Manual</li> <li>-CRS Commodity Management Workshop , Accra Ghana, March-April 2003</li> <li>- FAM Cooperating Sponsor monetization manual (English, French, Spanish)</li> <li>-FAM CD-based monetization training manual</li> <li>Contact: <a href="mailto:bgreen@catholicrelief.org">bgreen@catholicrelief.org</a></li> </ul>
3.2. Capacity of basic commodity systems		
3.3. Human resource capacities to organize commodity management		
3.4. Ethical and gender sensitivity		
3.5. Inter-partner communication and capacity building capacities are in place and foster two-way communication		
<b>Category 4: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting</b>		
4.1. Human resources		2005 ARC/CRS guidance on hiring a M&E specialists
4.2. Indicators and IPTT	½ page summary of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-2006 ARC/CRS module on the IPTT</li> <li>-Current MYAP guidance and template for IPTT</li> <li>-Current CSR4 (2+2) instructions regarding IPTT and reporting on indicators</li> <li>-1 example of best practice of a good IPTT</li> <li>-CRS internal guidance on community and government involvement monitoring and evaluation (excerpts from CRS manual)</li> </ul>
4.3. Surveys	½ page summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Excerpts from MYAP guidance and M&amp;E annexes on expectations governing surveys</li> <li>-FANTA document that outlines sampling requirements and any updates</li> <li>-Proceedings. FAM workshop “Sampling for Title II Managers,” 1999 (FAM and FANTA)</li> <li>-1 recent example of best practice (w/o annexes)</li> <li>-Review of Ag. Project baseline survey methods (FAM) (1999)— contact G. Burpee before distributing or indicating where to find on FAM web site</li> <li>-Review health and nutrition project baseline research methods (FAM)</li> </ul>

Capacity Indicators and Variables in the T2-PCI Related to Reference Materials	Suggested Topics for Briefing Papers that Link to Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )	Key Reference Materials for Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )
		-1999—Contact Mary Hennigen before distributing or indicating where to find on FAM website -Review of health and agriculture project monitoring tools for Title II funded PVO (2001)—Contact Mary Hennigen before distributing or indicating where to find on FAM website. -Nutrition Works: Measuring, Understanding and Improving Nutritional Status. Millwood, VA. 2001. (2001). FAM, FANTA, CORE, CSTS & Project Hope.
4.4. Evaluation	½ page summary	-2005 ARC/CRS module on pre-evaluation planning (this module includes basic references such as MYAP guidance, P. Bonnard document on preparing an Evaluation SOW, etc.) -1 example of a good recent mid-term evaluation -1 example of a good recent final evaluation
4.5. Reporting	½ page summary	-Most recent CSR4 guidance (program and M&E sections) -2 examples of recent best practice including accurate IPTTs
<b>Category 5: Environmental Guidance and Specific Capacities being Developed under the ICB</b>		
5.1. Environmental assessments		-FAM Environmental Documentation Manual (1999) (Eng and French) -A Cooperating Sponsors Field Guide to USAID Environmental Compliance Procedures (CRS and FAM) 1998. -FAM Proceedings. Environmental Reg. 216 Training of Trainers workshop. Washington DC. 2000. -Proceedings various FAM workshops: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Mali (2000)</li> <li>b) Environmental workshop Uganda on rural roads (2001)</li> <li>c) Environmental workshop (Peru) 2--1</li> </ol>
5.2. Capacities targeted by the CRS program quality and support department (PQSD) to enhance Title II program quality and impact	½ page summary	-Title II FFP 2003 strategy (strong overlap with CRS strategy) -2005 Proceedings of workshops -2005 Sample Syllabi that are examples of “best practice” -2005 and 2006 (draft) IHD framework package with information on : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Use of IHD for critical analysis</li> <li>b) Use of IHD for various stages of design and implementation</li> <li>c) Updated tools (needs assessments, PRAs)</li> <li>d) Risk analysis tools and templates</li> </ol>

Capacity Indicators and Variables in the T2-PCI Related to Reference Materials	Suggested Topics for Briefing Papers that Link to Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )	Key Reference Materials for Capacity Variables (contact <a href="mailto:Lthomas@crs.org">Lthomas@crs.org</a> )
		e) Case studies
Developmental Relief	½ page summary	-2005 and 2006 (draft) field tools developed under ICB -Standardized monitoring and assessment of relief and transitions (SMART). Washington, DC. 2002. FAM, FANTA, and Dick Wall (not sure if being circulated)
HIV/AIDS mitigation	½ page summary	-CRS/Johns Hopkins. 2005 (draft) IEC strategies and materials on nutritional needs of PWLA using locally available foods and supplements from the Title II food basket. -CRS training materials -Sample training syllabi
Water insecurity	½ page summary	To be determined.
Structural analysis peace	½ page summary	To be determined.
Circulation of expertise		-CRS/ARC module contracting TA, Annex with outline of trip report (send trip report model only) -Example of best practice of a trip report of a CRS Title II field person participating in an exercise in another country
Sharepoint (CRS regional staff only)	½ page summary	To be determined.

### **3.0. Code Sheet**

#### **Indicators and Suggested Rankings - T2-PCI**

#### **CAPACITY CATEGORY 1: PROJECT CONTEXT AND DOCUMENTATION SYSTEMS (weighted score=20 points out of 100 possible score for T2-PCI)**

##### **Variable 1.1. Capacity to Situate the Project within an Institutional and Policy Context**

###### **Indicator 1.1.1. Ability to explain the project and activities on the project**

1. Only the project coordinator has a copy of the project proposal and final IPTT.
2. Administrators and managers have copies of the project proposal and IPTT, but are not accustomed to using it as a management tool.
3. Administrators and managers have copies of the project proposal and IPTT and refer to them when writing reports.
4. Same as #3 AND they can explain the project, its objectives, and reporting systems to critical government partners and church officials.

###### **Indicator 1.1.2. Ability to explain the project's linkages with CRS and USAID**

1. Senior Staff know that the project is funded by the U.S. government
2. Senior staff understand the project's source of funding, but cannot comfortably explain this to community leaders or diocesan officials.
3. Senior staff understand the project's funding and have experience explaining it to diocesan officials and community leaders.
4. Same as #3 AND staff have developed a diagram that clarifies these relationships for extension staff and diocesan officials.

###### **Indicator 1.1.3. Senior staff's ability to explain the linkage between CRS's ICB grant and their Title II project**

1. Staff have only heard of the ICB.
2. Staff know that the ICB produces specific products that they can use to increase the relevance and impact of their programs (ProPack, M&E Module series, Integral Human Development Framework materials).
3. Same as #2 AND they know that ICB supports the salary costs of many headquarters-based program quality and support departments (PQSD).
4. Same as #3 AND field staff have provided feedback to the ICB coordinator in Baltimore about the relevance/impact of certain products and technical supported under the Title II funded ICB grant.

##### **Variable 1.2. Capacity to Develop and Manage Title II Project Documentation and Documentation Retrieval Systems**

###### **Indicator 1.2.1. Bibliographic background**

1. Senior staff have some experience with developing project bibliographies, but none with standard bibliography formats.

2. Senior staff have experience with project bibliographies following standard format.
3. Same as #2 AND some experience with researching topics on internet and through international and national research centers.
4. Same as #3 AND have their own collection of documents on the technical areas in which they work and bibliographies on their subject area that can be used to backstop this or their other projects.

**Indicator 1.2.2. Title II project bibliography**

1. Partial list of project documents exists.
2. Complete bibliography of core project documents exists, but doesn't follow any standard bibliographic format.
3. Complete bibliography of core and technical project documents exists AND follows the standard international format.
4. Same as #3 AND the bibliographies are widely known and used by all staff and regularly updated.
5. Same as #4 AND the updated versions of the bibliographies are regularly sent to CRS regional and headquarters-based staff (so that they can be made available, upon request, to other projects).

**Indicator 1.2.3. Title II project documentation system**

1. A central documentation center exists, but is poorly monitored and not cross-referenced to the project bibliography.
2. A central documentation center (hard copy) exists AND is overseen by the project coordinator and/or the project M&E specialists (not support staff).
3. Same as #2 AND the coordinator or specialists regularly update the bibliography and the collection system AND the project has created a CD or hard drive backup of these documents.
4. Same as #3 AND any request for a project document or key Title II guidance document can be responded to within (on average) one hour AND written instructions exist that explain the set up of the documentation system so that a successor can maintain it and build on it.

**Indicator 1.2.4. Distribution of Title II project documents to key government and religious partners**

1. Key partners receive an annual report that is intended for partners (i.e., different from the official report to USAID).
2. Same as #1 AND are informed about other documents that the project has produced.
3. Key partners receive at least part of the official version of the report (including the official IPTT) that goes to USAID AND are informed about other documents that the project has produced.
4. Same as #3 AND, to minimize the impact of turnover in the administration of key partners, the project has in place a system for ensuring that the key partners' basic stock of project documents is maintained and updated.



**Indicator 1.2.5. Access to internet and use of the internet as a research and planning tool**

1. Access to the internet is limited due to either unreliable phone lines or expensive connection fees.
2. Good access to internet resources in terms of phone line reliability and relative inexpensive of connection fees, but primarily used by the project coordinator.
3. Staff other than the project/site coordinator have relatively unrestricted access to the internet for email, but not for research.
4. Same as #3 EXCEPT THAT several staff have used the internet as a tool in the last year to research technical issues related to their Title II program.

**Indicator 1.2.6. Use of documentation to orient Title II funded staff and reduce the impact of staff turnover on project execution and impact**

1. Verbal orientation that cross references to some written material in the project coordinator or supervisor's files is the norm.
2. A written description of most key project positions exists that includes a description of critical guidance (and where to find it) for the project post.
3. Same as #2 AND instructions for updating the bibliography and documentation filing system are included in the position notes.
4. Same as #3 AND instructions on the analysis of the monitoring and impact indicators for that component of the project are included in the position notes.

**CAPACITY CATEGORY 2: PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT** (weighted score=20 points out of 100 points total for T2PCI)

**Variable 2.1. Title II Proposal Development**

**Indicator 2.1.1. Knowledge of internal CRS DAP/MYAP Guidance (DAP Guidance, 10 Step Proposal Process, and DAP "Lessons Learned")**

1. Administrators are aware that CRS has its own internal guidance for writing proposals, but are not aware of the special internal guidance for Title II proposals.
2. Most administrators and staff know that CRS has internal guidance for Title II proposals, but they do not have a copy in the project documentation center.
3. Same as #2 EXCEPT they can find the modules/guidance in the project documentation center.
4. Same as #3 AND they have experience (or special training) in using these materials to develop a proposal.

**Indicator 2.1.2. USAID DAP/MYAP guidance**

1. Title II project managers are aware that Title II has special guidance, but don't know where to find a copy.
2. Same as #1 EXCEPT they do know where to find a current copy at the project site/archive.
3. Same as #2 AND they know what it obligates them to do in terms of design features and M&E.

4. Same as #3 AND they have experience locating the guidance and guidance updates on the internet AND in locating other web-based Title II resources that might supplement the guidance.

**Indicator 2.1.3. Title II strategy documents**

1. Senior Title II Staff have heard of the Title II FFP policy papers, but they have never been briefed on them nor have they been given copies to read.
2. Senior Title II Staff have been briefed, but don't have a copy of either the 1995 or 2003 papers in their local offices.
3. Senior Title II have copies of the two policy documents, but cannot discuss the major thematic differences between the 1995 and 2003 papers.
4. Staff have copies, understand the thematic differences, list the papers in their project bibliography, and know where to locate the documents on the web.

**Indicator 2.1.4. Experience with developing Title II proposals**

1. Some technical and program staff participated in a design, but the leadership for writing came from outside the local office.
2. Most technical and program staff participated in a design, but the leadership for writing came from outside the local office.
3. Same as #2 AND most staff produced written sections of the proposal under leadership of the project coordinator and/or local NGO partner coordinator.
4. Same as #3 AND some staff have experience in developing the financial sections of the proposal (budget).

**Variable 2.2. General Proposal Development**

**Indicator 2.2.1. Knowledge of CRS internal tools for general proposal development**

1. Staff were briefed on ProPack, but were not trained and have never used it.
2. Staff were trained in ProPack, but have never used.
3. Staff have been trained in ProPack AND have used it to develop a proposal that is not yet funded.
4. Staff have been trained in ProPack AND have used it to develop at least one proposal that has been funded.

**Indicator 2.2.2. Staff experience with developing other types of proposals**

1. Staff have limited experience writing non-Title II grants for that particular country program/local partner that have not been funded.
2. Same as #1 EXCEPT some have been funded.
3. Same as #2 AND the staff have a strategy for developing grants that can help them meet some of the follow-on activities needed to sustain Title II achievements.
4. Same as #3 AND certain elements of this strategy have been funded.

**Indicator 2.2.3. Staff awareness of alternative (non-USAID Title II) funding sources**

1. Staff are aware of other funding sources, but have never applied to other charities or donors for support.
2. Staff are aware of other funding sources AND have officially submitted at least one proposal to one of these sources that has been funded.
3. Staff have submitted numerous proposals to other funding sources, but to date only CRS-facilitated grants to these sources have been funded.
4. Staff have submitted numerous proposals to non-Catholic funding sources AND some have been funded without CRS assistance.

**CAPACITY CATEGORY 3: COMMODITY MANAGEMENT**  
(weighted score=20 points out of 100 points total for T2-PCI)

**Variable 3.1. Staff Knowledge of Basic Guidance**

**Indicator 3.1.1. Staff knowledge of basic guidance**

1. Staff are aware of guidance, but are unable to recall it or locate a copy.
2. Staff are aware of guidance AND are able to locate a copy, but cannot apply it.
3. Staff are aware of guidance AND are able to locate a copy AND are conversant with it AND apply the guidance.
4. Same as #3 AND are able to apply CRS commodity management principles.

**Variable 3.2. Capacity of Basic Commodity Systems**

**Indicator 3.2.1. General commodity management capacity**

1. Staff have access to, but no control of, warehouse AND warehouse may not be secure or weather tight.
2. Staff have access to AND control of warehouse AND warehouse is weather tight AND secure AND has stacking system AND rudimentary ledgers.
3. Staff have access to AND control of warehouse AND warehouse is weather tight AND secure AND has stacking cards AND waybills AND ledgers.
4. Same as #3 AND ledgers reflect stock movement and inventory.



*Local NGO partner (Catholic Development Commission in Malawi) warehouse & staff associated with Title II-funded CRS Malawi Development Assistance Programme (D. McMillan 2004)*

**Indicator 3.2.2. General commodity reporting capacity**

1. Records of commodities exist, but are incomplete.
2. Records of commodities exist AND are accurate AND reports can be produced upon request.

3. Records of commodities exit AND are accurate AND reports are regularly produced.
4. Same as #3 AND these routinely produced accurate reports that feed into annual results and loss reports in a timely manner.

**Indicator 3.2.3. General commodity tracking capacity**

1. Basic ledgers exist AND monthly reports are possible, but are not completely accurate.
2. There are accurate AND up-to-date ledgers AND basic waybill system AND project is able to produce weekly reports.
3. Same as #2 AND stacking cards are linked to basic waybill system.
4. There are accurate AND up-to-date ledgers AND basic waybill system AND stacking cards are linked to basic waybill system AND preprinted and pre-numbered waybill system is linked to stacking cards AND ledger AND stacking cards feed into ledger balances AND ledgers are basis of regular reporting AND can produce daily reports.

**Indicator 3.2.4. Physical placement of commodities**

1. Commodities are stacked on floor AND countable, but with poor spacing.
2. Commodities are stacked on dunnage<sup>2</sup> AND are countable, but with poor spacing.
3. Commodities are stacked on dunnage AND are countable AND are spaced away from walls and ceiling.
4. Commodities are stacked on dunnage AND are countable AND are spaced away from walls and ceiling AND placed so FIFO can be applied.

**Variable 3.3. Human Resource Capacities to Organize Commodity Management**

**Indicator 3.3.1. Seasoned commodity management specialists**

1. The individuals managing or likely to manage the commodities have experience working within a management structure, but not as managers (i.e., they worked for someone else).
2. Previous general management experience.
3. Same as #2 AND some knowledge of commodities and logistics.
4. Seasoned commodity management specialists.

**Indicator 3.3.2. Gender balance in management**

1. Women in clerical and pre-professional positions, such as village-based extension workers (animators) or teachers' aids.
2. Women employed in professional capacity, such as project officer or technical positions.
3. Women in management positions.
4. Women in the top two tiers of management and have positions on or influence with the board of directors.

---

<sup>2</sup> Loose material used to support and protect cargo in a ship's hold; padding in a shipping container.

**Indicator 3.3.3. Gender sensitivity/balance in hiring field staff**

1. 20% or less of field staff are women.
2. More than 20% and less than 50% of field staff are women.
3. More than 20%, but less than 50%, of field staff are women AND the overwhelming majority of staff working on programming targeted to women are women.
4. The overwhelming majority of all field staff – greater than 50% are women.

**Indicator 3.3.4. Role of leadership in the administration**

1. Most activity flows to and from a single person with some delegation.
2. Strong leadership, but unclear reporting and decision-making structure.
3. Strong leadership AND clear chain of command, top down decision-making.
4. Same as #3 AND decisions are made at the appropriate levels of the hierarchy.

**Variable 3.4. Ethical and Gender Sensitivity**

**Indicator 3.4.1. Gender sensitivity training of field staff**

1. Field staff are ambivalent and see no need for gender sensitivity training.
2. Field staff have been trained on gender sensitivity, but are unclear on how to apply the training due (in their own words) to “cultural factors”.
3. Field staff have been trained on gender sensitivity AND are attempting with limited success to apply lessons.
4. Field staff have been trained on gender sensitivity AND are successfully applying lessons learned AND ongoing refreshers are provided regarding application of gender sensitivity to the field work.

**Indicator 3.4.2. Gender sensitivity in commodity management structures**

1. Management is ambivalent AND puts no effort into promoting gender sensitivity.
2. Gender sensitivity is not a management priority, but there is some awareness of importance of gender sensitivity training for field staff.
3. Management gives priority to gender sensitivity training AND there has been some attempt to implement such training.
4. Management gives gender sensitivity training high priority AND there is affirmative action program under way to promote gender balance.

**Indicator 3.4.3. Ethical sensitivity**

1. Staff and administrators do not know what ethical framework of organization is AND assets are co-mingled AND staff and administrators recognize the need for a system of records to track accountability, but few, if any, records are kept AND staff and administrators are ambivalent (overall) to the need for ethical and accountable behavior.
2. Ethical framework in place and known to management, but assets are still co-mingled AND records are in place and fairly accurate AND management desires culture of accountability and ethical behavior.

3. Ethical framework is a familiar part of organization culture and is applied to the separation of resources and record keeping accountable AND ethical behavior is promoted.
4. Ethical organization with systems in place that promote and reward ethical and accountable behavior and that maintain auditable records.

**Indicator 3.4.4. Link between ethical sensitivity and management/controls**

1. Unable to audit due to incomplete records and lack of controls.
2. Somewhat able to audit AND records kept, but few controls.
3. Able to follow an audit trail, controls are weak and could pose material weaknesses.
4. Fully auditable AND controls in place AND no obvious material weaknesses.

**Indicator 3.4.5. Community perception of legitimacy**

1. Unknown to the community, but little track record of success.
2. Somewhat known to the community, but mission/work ambiguous.
3. Widely known to the community as a service provider.
4. Widely known to the community as a trusted service provider and membership organization.

**Variable 3.5. Inter-Partners Communication and Capacity Building: Capacities are in Place and Foster Two-Way Communication**

**Indicator 3.5.1. Frequency of communication: partner to CRS**

1. Irregular.
2. Monthly.
3. Weekly/regularly and monitored.
4. Weekly/regularly and monitored even if person in charge is on vacation or positions changes/changed.



*Local NGO partner CADECOM Phalombe & CRS staff associated with the Title II funded Development Assistance Programme in Malawi (D. McMillan 2004)*

**Indicator 3.5.2. Frequency of communication: CRS to partner**

1. Irregular.
2. Monthly.
3. Weekly/regularly and monitored.
4. Weekly/regularly and monitored even if person in charge is on vacation or position holder changes/changed.

**Indicator 3.5.3. Regional CRS technical assistance and backstopping**

1. Irregular.
2. Monthly.
3. Weekly/regularly and monitored.

4. Weekly/regularly and monitored even if person in charge is on vacation or positions changes/changed.

**Indicator 3.5.4. Country program technical assistance and backstopping**

1. Irregular.
2. Monthly.
3. Weekly/regularly and monitored.
4. Weekly/regularly and monitored even if person in charge is on vacation or positions changes/changed.

**CAPACITY CATEGORY 4: DESIGN, MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING (DMER)** (weighted score=20 points out of 100 points total for T2FSPCI)

**Variable 4.1. Human Resources**

**Indicator 4.1.1. M&E specialist (position)<sup>3</sup>**

1. Someone is tasked with Title II M&E, but they have little knowledge, responsibility and/or resources (equipment, guidance, financial resources).
2. Same as #1 EXCEPT they do have some knowledge, equipment and experience.
3. Same as #2 EXCEPT they have good knowledge, experience, and resources.
4. Same as #3 AND the person with the designated responsibility for M&E trained the other advisors.

**Indicator 4.1.2. M&E specialist (technical capacity of the M&E specialist)**

1. Informed about the Title II rules and regulations AND collects and transmits data to managers in response to requests but almost no resources (equipment, etc.).
2. Same as #1 but still lacking some important resources (computers, financial support, printers) to do the job.
3. Informed, has the necessary resources to do the job, AND is/are working independently with M&E specialists at other Title project sites in that country to interpret and report on the data for the entire project.
4. Same as #3 AND providing feedback to CRS country program, CRS regional and headquarters staff about the efficiency of certain Title II indicators and training modules .

**Variable 4.2. Indicators and IPTT/PITT (Indicator Performance Tracking Table)**

**Indicator 4.2.1. Knowledge and use of indicators**

1. Minimal understanding of the principle of using “monitoring” and “impact” indicators.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> M&E specialist usually refers to the person responsible for overseeing data collection and analysis in the local NGO partner. The person responsible for data analysis and write up within the CRS Country Programme may have a different title. The basic rankings are relevant at either level.

<sup>4</sup> Only passive integration of the principles into project management (for example, project sites [PQSD staff] collect data on standardized M&E forms which are transmitted to another location for analysis).

2. Staff understand the basic principles of why and how indicators are used AND collect data and analyze data on standard M&E forms.
3. Same as #2 AND they are working in partnership with the other NGO partners on the grant to improve the data forms, the indicators, and project M&E processes.
4. Same as #3 AND are providing active feedback to regional staff (deputy regional director or regional technical advisor) and HQ M&E staff about the efficacy of certain indicators and M&E training modules.

**Indicator 4.2.2. Knowledge and use of the IPTT/PITT in routine monitoring and reporting**

1. Staff are familiar with the indicators for their specific site and their portrayal in an IPTT/PITT.
2. Staff are familiar with the IPTT for the project site where they intervene AND they understand how their site relates to other project sites in a combined project IPTT/PITT.
3. Same as #2 AND routinely use the IPTT/PITT as a tool for strategy planning and monitoring in staff meetings and meetings with partners.
4. Same as #3 AND routinely include and/or refer to the IPTT in reports.

**Indicator 4.2.3. Government involvement in the design and implementation of Title II M&E systems**

1. Government partners are aware that the project has an M&E system, but merely respond to questions (about rainfall, yields, health data, etc.) when asked.
2. Government partners participate by volunteering certain information to the project M&E system and/or relying on some of the project generated data.
3. Same as #2 AND they have a working knowledge of the system and the basic M&E principles that support it.
4. Government partners have been actively involved in the elaboration of the M&E system and/or some of its indicators and data collection techniques and analyses AND government agents have participated in project M&E training sessions, baseline surveys and evaluations.

**Variable 4.3. Surveys**

**Indicator 4.3.1. Design, execution and analysis of baseline and final surveys**

1. Outside consultants have been used to conduct baseline or final surveys; staff have helped with data collection, but not analysis or design.
2. Outside consultants have trained staff to assist with key elements of a baseline or final survey.
3. Staff are familiar with donor and FANTA expectations for surveys and sampling AND have used this training to develop a SOW (or to participate in the development of an SOW) for a baseline or final survey that was approved.
4. Same as #3 AND two or more members of the staff have participated in the analysis and/or write-up, including editing and review, of a Title II baseline or final survey in this or another country.



**Indicator 4.3.2. Background understanding of the guidance concerning anthropometric measurements and their role in the DMER of Title II projects**

1. Staff are not aware of guidance or justification for guidance, but have worked with outside consultants doing measurements.
2. Staff understand the reason that USAID has set a priority on anthropometric measurement AND have been trained to assist in measurements.
3. Same as #2 AND have actually participated in the weighting part a survey.
4. Same as #3 AND are aware of the guidance on sampling AND have actively participated in the analysis and write up (as well as data collection) of at least one baseline or final surveys' anthropometric measurements.

**Variable 4.4. Evaluation**

**Indicator 4.4.1. Background understanding of the Title II evaluation and pre-evaluation guidance**

1. Administrators have shared with staff the MYAP/DAP guidance concerning mid-term and final evaluations.
2. Same as #1 AND the FANTA guidance on writing Title II evaluation SOWs, as well as the justification for a clear evaluation SOW.
3. Same as #2 AND the ARC/CRS module on pre-evaluation planning and how it can help facilitate evaluations AND have used this knowledge to develop a SOW.
4. Same as #3 AND have established a system for monitoring local partner and CRS program follow-up on recommendations stemming from evaluations in the annual report for USAID.

**Variable 4.5. Reporting**

**Indicator 4.5.1. Background understanding of and participation in the process of preparing Title II reports**

1. Local partner writes site reports that the CRS program office compile and then CRS/HQ staff rewrite.
2. Senior Staff write site/component reports that the CRS program offices compile according to USAID guidance which is then submitted to USAID with minimal revision.
3. Same as #2 including indicator updates and examples of best practice.
4. Same as #3 AND all local NGO partners or staff received copies of the official annual report to the donor (i.e., are aware of how their information is reported to the donor and how it feeds back into the summary report on the project's progress and impact).

**Indicator 4.5.2. Reporting "best practice"**

1. Staff have, upon request, submitted information to CRS country representative on examples of best practice from Title II field projects.
2. Staff have taken the initiative to submit information on Title II field project best practice to the CRS country program and/or regional CRS offices

3. Staff routinely submit (in text box form) information to CRS country representative or CRS regional staff on Title II best practice.
4. Same as #3 AND have received information from other countries which has been distributed to staff to promote capacity building.

**CAPACITY CATEGORY 5: ENVIRONMENTAL GUIDANCE AND SPECIFIC CAPACITIES BEING DEVELOPED UNDER THE ICB** (weighted score=20 points out of 100 total points for T2-PCI)

**Variable 5.1. Environmental Assessments**

**Indicator 5.1.1. Familiarity with and use of USAID/Title II environmental regulations (Reg. 216) to ensure environmentally sound Title II programming (all)**

1. Relevant staff are aware that an environmental review is required in Title II food aid proposals.
2. Relevant staff are familiar with the USAID-FAM Environmental Documentation Manual and the field guide to Reg. 216<sup>5</sup> AND can locate these two sets of guidance, but have never conducted a Title II environmental review or IEE, on their own (i.e., without backstopping from the CRS regional or HQ offices).
3. Same as #2 EXCEPT staff have completed at least one IEE on their own that has been approved by USAID's environmental compliance officer in Washington, DC.
4. Same as #3 AND have trained one or more CRS staff from another country program in how to conduct an IEE AND have trained relevant partners in appropriate mitigation and monitoring activities outlined in the IEE.

**Variable 5.2. Capacities Targeted by the CRS Program Quality and Support Department (POSD) to Enhance Title II Program Quality and Impact**

**Indicator 5.2.1. Staff (NGO partners and CRS country programs) capacity for helping CRS and local NGO partners institutionalize the IHD (Integral Human Development) framework within existing and future Title II programming**

1. The CR and head of programming have received some IHD materials from HQ, but no one has been tasked with reviewing the materials.
2. At least one member of the Title II funded staff has received formal training or technical assistance in the IHD methodology.
3. Every member of the Title II country program (administrators, technical managers, M&E specialists) (or regional staff) has been trained AND the team is investigating various ways that the IHD framework can be used to support program design, implementation, or M&E.

---

<sup>5</sup> Developed by CRS with FAM (entitled: A Cooperating Sponsor's Field Guide to USAID Environmental Compliance Procedures) to help Title II projects prepare environmental assessments or IEEs (Initial Environmental Examinations)

4. Same as #3 AND that the team has used the IHD framework to guide a design, ongoing programming, monitoring, or evaluation.<sup>6</sup>

**Indicator 5.2.2. IHD (Integral Human Development): Regional staff's capacity for helping CRS and NGO partners institutionalize the IHD framework within existing and future Title II programming**

1. Regional Program Quality/Management Quality (PQ/MQ) staff have been introduced to the IHD framework AND have read IHD materials or attended a training, but have not used them.
2. Regional PQ/MQ staff introduced/presented the IHD framework at a regional or country program meeting.
3. Regional PQ/MQ staff have led or mentored others in the use of the IHD framework for proposal design, SPPs, or evaluation.
4. Regional PQ/MQ staff have developed or modified/adapted IHD tools or materials for their region.

**Indicator 5.2.3. Developmental relief (NGO partners and CRS country programs)**

1. The CR and head of programming (or deputy regional director for program quality) have received a copy of the CRS study of current practices in emergency and transitional food programming, which includes a menu of indicators for phasing food assistance in and out during acute emergencies, but no one in the Title II programming office has been tasked with reviewing the materials or building them into any activities that support new or ongoing programming.
2. Materials in #1 have been received, a few staff trained, the need for strategy discussed, but nothing has been implemented.
3. Every member of the Title II country program (administrators, technical managers, M&E specialists) has been trained or mentored in the use of the IHD.
4. Same as #3 AND based on this assessment, a CRS team has implemented or facilitated a local NGO partner's developing emergency-development bridge activities.<sup>7</sup>

**Indicator 5.2.4. Developmental relief (regional staff only):**

1. Regional PQ/MQ staff have been introduced to the developmental relief concept AND have read materials or attended a training, but have not used them.
2. Regional PQ/MQ staff introduced/presented the developmental relief concept at a regional or country program meeting.
3. Regional PQ/MQ staff have led or mentored others in the use of the developmental relief concept in proposal designs, SPPs, or evaluations.
4. Regional PQ/MQ staff have developed or modified/adapted developmental relief tools or materials for their region.

---

<sup>6</sup> The team has been able to use the IHD framework to guide problem analysis and design of a new Title II project, guide the design and analysis of a baseline survey, or guide the formulation of the project's M&E plan, indicators, and IPTT [submitted at the end of the first year of a Title II project] or a mid-term or final evaluation

<sup>7</sup>That is to say activities that have helped mobilize communities ahead of time for likely shocks and/or that have helped plan a response to an emergency that improves the chances that recovery activities enhance community strengths, capacities and livelihood strategies.

**Indicator 5.2.5. HIV/AIDS mitigation (NGO partners and CRS country programs)**

1. The CR or head of programming has received the food security and HIV/AIDS CD and booklet, but no one within the CRS office has been tasked with operationalizing the new approach into the country program's Title II programming.
2. The Title II project has received materials and/or staff have attended a regional, but the perspective has not been incorporated into programming.
3. Same as #2 EXCEPT the local NGO partner or CRS country program has an HIV/AIDS mitigation strategy they are implementing..
4. Same as #3 AND certain of the activities in the strategy have been successful.

**Indicator 5.2.6. HIV/AIDS mitigation (Regional staff only)**

1. Based on regional workshops, the ICB-supported materials, and mentoring by regional technical advisors (RTA), the regional staff have identified the need for a regional strategy.
2. The regional staff has started the analyses and structured discussions needed in order to develop a regional strategy.
3. The regional staff has developed an HIV/AIDS regional mitigation strategy, but it has not yet been translated into programming or TA for the country teams.
4. There is an HIV/AIDS regional mitigation strategy AND it is being actively implemented.

**Indicator 5.2.7. Water security programming (NGO partners and CRS country programs)**

1. The CR or head of programming have received some of the ICB-supported training materials on this topic, but no one has been tasked with operationalizing the new approach in CRS's Title II programming for that country.
2. At least one member of the CRS country program has been trained or mentored on the new approach, but the program's water programming hasn't changed.<sup>8</sup>
3. Every member of the Title II country program team has some rudimentary concept of the need for a more integrated approach to water security AND the team has conducted a "water security" assessment exercise.
4. Same as #3 AND this has affected project design, programming or evaluation.



*Labor for irrigation canals, Ecuador (G. Burpee)*

<sup>8</sup> That is to say it continues to follow a classic approach focused on developing domestic water and sanitation or water for agricultural uses.

**Indicator 5.2.8. Water security programming (regional staff only)**

1. Based on regional workshops, the ICB-supported materials, and technical assistance, regional staff have identified the need for a regional strategy.
2. The regional staff have started the analyses and structured discussions needed in order to develop a regional strategy.
3. Regional staff have developed a regional water strategy, but it has not yet been translated into programming or TA to the country teams within the region.
4. Regional staff have developed a regional water strategy AND it has been translated into programming or TA to the country teams within the region; AND the strategy is being actively implemented.

**Indicator 5.2.9. Structural analysis/peace (CRS country programs and regional staff only)**

1. The country representative (CR) or head of programming (or deputy regional director for program quality) have received the training materials developed under the ICB, but no one has been tasked with operationalizing the approach in CRS's Title II programming for that country (or the countries backstopped by that regional office).
2. The materials have been used to train CRS program staff, but this training has not yet been translated into Title II supported programming or advocacy.
3. Staff have been trained AND have incorporated this perspective into the analysis of their programming.
4. Staff have been trained AND have introduced this perspective into a new or existing program.

**Indicator 5.2.10. Circulation of expertise and best practice between CRS Title II projects (all)**

1. Someone from the CRS regional or CRS country office has discussed other examples of best practice in Title II programming with staff.
2. Senior staff have access to hard or soft copies of CRS proposals that are considered recent examples of best practice and these are catalogued in the project's administrative archive.
3. At least one person on staff has participated in a DAP or MYAP design, baseline survey, mid-term, or final survey in another country and/or another part of the country where this project is located.
4. Same as #3 EXCEPT at least two persons have participated.

**Indicator 5.2.11. Sharepoint (regional staff only)**

1. The deputy regional director for PQ has no knowledge of the PQSD Sharepoint activity list.
2. The deputy regional director for PQ is aware of the PQSD Sharepoint activity list AND has used it sporadically
3. The data entered in the activity list is primarily reporting as a result of requests from CRS/HQ.

4. The deputy regional director for PQ is aware of the system AND are entering data for all reporting of both non-Title II and Title II countries AND are aware that the data can be printed or sent electronically.

**4.0. Data Entry Form (T2-PCI)**

**Note: Sample scores inserted**

Capacity Building Variables	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term	Final
<b>Capacity Category 1: Context and Documentation Systems</b>				
1.1. Situate Project within a Context	1.1.1. Ability to explain project and activities on project	1		
	1.1.2. CRS relationship to USAID	1		
	1.1.3. ICB relationship to current project	1		
1.2. Documentation and Document Retrieval Systems	1.2.1. Bibliographic background	1		
	1.2.2. Bibliography of project	1		
	1.2.3. Project doc.& retrieval system	1		
	1.2.4. Distribution of documents to partners	1		
	1.2.5. Internet access	1		
	1.2.6. Orientation of staff	1		
<i>Subtotal (raw score):</i>		<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Subtotal (adjusted) 20 pts max</i>		<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Capacity Category 2: Proposal Development</b>				
2.1 Title II Proposal Skills	2.1.1. CRS Internal DAP/MYAP guidance			
	2.1.2. USAID DAP/MYAP			
	2.1.3. Title II strategy documents			
	2.1.4. Experience with Title II proposal preparation			
2.2. General Proposal Development	2.2.1. CRS ProPack			
	2.2.2. Experience with other types of proposals			
	2.2.3. Awareness of alternative funding sources			
<i>Subtotal (raw score):</i>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Subtotal (adjusted) 20 pts max</i>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Capacity Category 3: Commodity Management</b>				
3.1. Basic Guidance	3.1.1. Guidance			
3.2. Commodity Systems	3.2.1. Management			
	3.2.2. Reporting			
	3.2.3. Tracking			
	3.2.4. Placement			
3.3. Human Resources	3.3.1. Management exp			
	3.3.2. Gender balance management			
	3.3.3. Gender sensitivity/balance in hiring			
	3.3.4. Position in administration			
3.4. Ethical and Gender Sensitivity	3.4.1. Gender sensitivity training of field workers			
	3.4.2. Gender sensitivity management			
	3.4.3. Ethical sensitivity			
	3.4.4. Link between ethical sensitivity and management/controls			
	3.4.5. Community perception of legitimacy			

<b>Data Entry Form - T2-PCI</b>				
<b>Capacity Building Variables</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Mid-Term</b>	<b>Final</b>
3.5. Inter-Partner Communication and Capacity Building	3.5.1. Partner to CRS			
	3.5.2. CRS to partner			
	3.5.3. Regional tech. assistance and backstopping			
	3.5.4. Country program TA and backstopping			
<i>Subtotal (raw score):</i>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Subtotal (adjusted) 20 pts max:</i>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Capacity Category 4: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting</b>				
4.1. Human Resources	4.1.1. M&E specialist (position)			
	4.1.2. M&E specialist (capacity)			
4.2. Indicators and IPTT	4.2.1. Knowledge of indicators			
	4.2.2. Knowledge of IPTT/PITT			
	4.2.3. Govnt Involvement and support (national partner, CRS program)			
4.3. Surveys	4.3.1. Baseline and final surveys			
	4.3.2. Anthropometric measurements			
4.4. Evaluation	4.4.1. Evaluation and pre-evaluation guidance			
4.5. Reporting	4.5.1. Annual reports			
	4.5.2. Reporting best practice			
<i>Subtotal (raw score):</i>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Subtotal Adjusted (20 points max):</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Capacity Category 5: Environmental Assessment and Specific Capacities being Developed under the ICB</b>				
5.1. Environmental Assessments	5.1. Env. assessment			
5.2. ICB Specific Capacities	5.2.1. IHD ( NGO partner & CP)			
	5.2.2. IHD (regional staff)			
	5.2.3. Emerg-dev bridge (partner & CP)			
	5.2.4. Emerg-dev bridge (regional			
	5.2.5. HIV/AIDS mitigation (partner & CP)			
	5.2.6. HIV/AIDS mitigation (regional staff)			
	5.2.7. Water insecurity prg. (partner & CP)			
	5.2.8. Water insecurity reg. strat (regional staff)			
	5.2.9. Structural analysis/peace			
	5.2.10. Circulation of expertise/best practice between Title II projects			
	5.2.11. Sharepoint (regional staff)			



<b>Data Entry Form - T2-PCI</b>				
<b>Capacity Building Variables</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Mid-Term</b>	<b>Final</b>
<i>Subtotal 5.b.1 Country Programs and National Partners (raw score):</i>		0	0	0
<i>Subtotal 5.b.1. CRS Country Program and National Partners Adjusted (20</i>		0	0	0
<i>Subtotal 5.b.2.Regional CRS Offices (raw score)</i>		0	0	0
<i>Subtotal 5.b.2. CRS Regional Offices adjusted (20 points max)</i>		0	0	0
<b>Total Adjusted NGO Partner</b>	<b>1+2+3+4+5</b>	6	0	0
<b>Total adjusted CRS Country Programs w/Title II</b>	<b>1+2+3+4+5</b>	6	0	0
<b>Total adjusted Regional Scores</b>	<b>1+2+3+4+5</b>	6	0	0