

Chapter Five Guidance Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI)

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

What?

The LCCI (Local Community Capacity Index) measures:

- Local community (as opposed to local NGO partner) capacity to identify the source of food security constraints and risks and to design and execute solutions to these constraints with local NGO partners; and
- CRS local NGO partner and CRS country program capacity to “backstop” these community capacity building initiatives and one another.

Who?

The primary audiences (i.e., those individuals/staff/departments/organizations/groups that will fill out the index in order to assess their respective capacity level) for the LCCI template and indicators are:

- The local communities that benefit from CRS’s Title II projects,
- The local NGO partners through which CRS executes most of its Title II projects,¹ and
- The CRS country programs that manage the Title II programs via their relationships with the local NGO partners.

Where and When?

The LCCI should be conducted within each community and local NGO partner during the annual update and planning sessions that are used to develop work plans.

How?

Categories, Variables, and Indicators/Rankings

The Local Community Capacity Index—core capacity category (LCCI-core)

The LCCI core capacity category measures ten capacity variables. Each variable is assessed using one to four indicators. Each indicator is ranked 0-5 with a “0” being no capacity and “5” very good. A system of generic rankings for the indicators is spelled out on Code Sheet A, which is included in this section 2.1 of this chapter.

¹ 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.

The Local Community Capacity Index-technical capacity categories (LCCI-technical)



Model technical indicator for agriculture: Number of farmers trained in pest management through field schools like this one in Indonesia.



Model technical indicator for agriculture: Increased introduction of improved varieties of secondary (non maize) food crops, Title II-funded Development Assistance Programme - Malawi (F. Brockman, 2004)

The LCCI technical capacity categories (four categories) measure the technical capacities that are needed to execute the Title II project. There is one category for each Strategic Objective of a Title II project. Four categories are anticipated since many Title II projects have four Strategic Objectives. If a project only has three Strategic Objectives then the fourth category could be used to measure the capacities that are needed for one of the cross-cutting Intermediate Results or IRs.

Each technical capacity category is measured using four indicators. In contrast to the core capacity category of the LCCI, the technical indicator rankings are not pre-defined. Each project creates its own. A list of indicators that can be used as models is provided in Code Sheet B of this guidance (section 2.2 of this chapter). The list of model technical indicators in Code Sheet B (section 2.2) is broken down into four indicator categories that measure category inputs, processes, and outcomes, as well as impacts. This purpose of breaking down the indicators this way is simply to encourage projects to think of capacity not just in terms of inputs and processes, but also in terms of the desired outcomes and impacts. CRS anticipates that the final choice of indicators will be made by the Title II project staff working with a smaller group of community leaders.

Methodology

The methodology for conducting the LCCI is similar to that for conducting the IDF. The process requires more time during the first year. After the first year, the LCCI core, technical and partner rankings can be updated during the end of year meetings that most projects have prior to writing their annual report.

A seven step process is recommended for the development and execution of a project-specific Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI) as part of the project M&E and management information systems. Each step is explained in terms of when it should occur, the expected output, and the suggested methodology.

Box 5.1 Recommended Steps for Conducting Baseline Assessments and Annual Updates of the LCCI

Year One

- *Step One:* Participatory adjustment of the LCCI core capacity ranking criteria (section 2.1) to the specific project.
- *Step Two:* Clarification of the objectives of the LCCI and how information will be used by village leaders.
- *Step Three:* Initial completion of the LCCI core capacity category.
- *Step Four:* Participatory development of the LCCI technical capacity category (using the indicators provided in section 2.2 as a guide).
- *Step Five:* Initial completion of the LCCI technical capacity category.
- *Step Six:* Initial development of the LCCI partner indicators.

Subsequent

- *Step Seven:* Annual updates and informal reporting of the LCCI community, local NGO partner, and CRS scores.

Step one: initial adjustment of the LCCI core capacity category (section 2.1) to the specific project

The first step involves the participatory adjustment (through interviews with key community leaders) of the suggested ranking criteria for the LCCI-core indicators that are listed in section 2.1 of this chapter. These interviews should be conducted by the local NGO partner and Title II funded CRS M&E specialist and the local NGO partner's supervisor in charge of local capacity building (if one exists).

Output: The output of this step should be an adjusted set of ranking criteria for the 32 LCCI core capacity indicators. The developed code sheet (based on Code Sheet A, section 2.1 of this chapter) is used to rank core capacity in every project village.

Methodology: The suggested methodology for adjusting the rankings of the indicators is for the local NGO partner M&E specialist and local NGO partner local capacity building specialist (if the position exists) to work with a small number of the project's development workers and leaders from a small subset of the communities where the project intervenes in order to:

- Adapt the wording of the specific ranking criteria of the individual LCCI core indicators to its specific situation; but
- Whenever possible, maintain the core indicators (to which the ranking criteria refer). By having one set of fixed indicators to measure core community level capacity-with ranking criteria flexible enough to be adapted to different cultural settings-CRS enhances the chances that it can compare and contrast the impact of its Title II projects on core organizational capacity.

Step two: clarification of the objectives of the LCCI and how information will be used by village leaders

Well ahead of the actual exercise, one technical supervisor and at least one community level development worker need to meet with community leaders and discuss the adjusted index that is developed in first step.

Output: The output of this step should be improved clarity regarding their understanding of what core organizational capacities they think they need to execute the project. This perception will inevitably be influenced by the stage of development of the community. For example, new project villages will not be as clear about the management and financial systems that they need.

Methodology: This session should be facilitated by one community-level development worker (preferably one that the community leaders know and trust) and one technical supervisor from the local NGO partner.² One CRS technical supervisor from the project coordination unit should be present at a minimum of 30 percent of the sessions in order to ensure that: (a) the NGO partners are using a harmonized approach to the LCCI, and that (b) the CRS staff are informed about the local beneficiaries' needs. The suggested topics for discussion include:

- What does the Title II funded project mean to these community members? What does the Title II project mean to the local NGO partner with whom they work? What is the role of the local NGO partner vis-à-vis the agency of the donor (in the case of Title II, the U.S. government) that has given them the grant? What do they (as a community) hope to accomplish under the grant during the remaining period of the Title II funded project?
- What does CRS mean by community capacity building, by core organizational capacity, and by core technical capacities? How does this fit with CRS and the local NGO partner's concept of the Title II project? What is their concept of community capacity building?
- What types of questions are being asked about community core capacity and why? What types of questions are being asked about community technical capacity and why?
- Does the community think this will be useful to them? If so, how? If so, how should they proceed?

Step three: initial completion of the LCCI core capacity category

This third step is best done in conjunction with the annual update of the village action plans that most communities develop as part of a Title II food security project.

Output: The output of this step should be a local community capacity index score for each project village.

² In cases where CRS is not executing through a local partner, this person would be one of the technical supervisors from the CRS project coordination unit.

Methodology: A community-level development worker and one technical supervisor from the local NGO partner should facilitate the initial ranking of each indicator. The facilitators should first write the ranking values on a large sheet of paper or black board in front of the group and then put them on the attached data entry form. Once the communities become accustomed to the core organizational category, they should be able to complete the assessment on their own in step seven (see below). This capacity to assess various community needs and to develop and monitor action plans and strategies to address these needs is in fact one of the core capacities being assessed.

Since the indicator rankings are adapted to the specific project setting in step one (above) this of participatory ranking is relatively easily accomplished during one three hour session

Step four: participatory development of the LCCI technical capacity category

The third step involves the participatory development of a project specific LCCI technical capacity category based on interviews with a smaller sub-sample of communities (probably the same group used in step one). These interviews should be conducted by the local NGO partner M&E specialist and local NGO partner's supervisor in charge of local capacity building.

Output: This step should produce the following outputs.

- The participatory identification of 16 indicators with which to measure the four LCCI technical variables with several farmer groups. The local NGO partner staff will then consolidate these indicators into a typed list that can, in turn, be shared with the communities who participated in the process.
- A final list of 16 technical indicators that incorporates any suggested revisions from the participating villagers.
- This revised version of the attached LCCI excel file that is specific to that particular Title II project. This revised version should summarize the indicators that were selected in the spaces marked "tbd" (to be determined) so that the person filling in the form knows which indicator is being ranked.

Methodology: The suggested methodology for identifying these 16 indicators is for the local NGO partner M&E specialist and local NGO partner local capacity building specialist (if the position exists) to work with several small groups of community leaders from different communities to involve the following.

- Preparation of an exhaustive list of local capacities that communities need to execute each Intermediate Result (IR) of each Strategic Objective (SO) of the project in their community. These capacities should be listed on a large sheet of paper or a blackboard (if available) in front of the group.
- Work with community leaders to determine the top four capacities that need to be achieved for each SO or IR. Encourage them to think of capacity in the broadest sense as involving inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts.
- Work with community members to identify appropriate indicators for these priority areas and define the significance of the rankings (0-5) for each indicator. This process can be facilitated by the local NGO partner specialists using

indicator models from Code Sheet B in section 2.1 of this chapter. An indicator may also be a composite (i.e., it can merge certain elements from several indicators).

- Work with the same sub-group of community leaders (and communities) to develop a final list that everyone agrees are the most relevant indicators to monitor.

Step five: initial completion of the LCCI technical capacity category

During step five the category completed in step four is “scaled up” to use in all the project communities.

Output: The output of this step should be an LCCI technical score for each community. This score is determined by the community leaders assessing themselves for each of the 16 indicators identified in step three.

Methodology: One of the NGO partner's community-level development workers and at least one of the NGO partner's technical supervisors should facilitate the community leaders' self-assessment for each of the 16 indicators developed during step four. This interview process should follow the same model outlined for the LCCI core category in step two. The ranking values should first be written on a flip chart or piece of paper then entered into a printed version of the revised data entry form developed in step four. One copy of the printed technical ranking values should remain in the community archive. A second copy should be delivered to the local NGO partner's M&E specialist. The specialist should enter each community's data into a spread sheet. Once the data entries are complete, the M&E specialists and/or local capacity specialist for the local NGO partner should calculate the technical score for: (a) each of the four technical variables; (b) the combined technical score; and (c) the combined LCCI score (the score for the core category + the four technical categories). This information should then be transmitted to the M&E specialist and/or local capacity building specialists for the entire Title II project, who will calculate the average score for all the local NGO partners (and sites). If the project has incorporated the LCCI into its IPTT, this information is entered into the official IPTT, which is transmitted back to the local NGO partners. Even if the LCCI is not in the official IPTT, this information should be reported back to the local NGO partners to increase their understanding of the global project.

Step six: initial development of the LCCI partner indicators

Once step two through five have been executed, the local NGO partner should facilitate a joint meeting of community leaders from the communities to discuss what types of technical support will be needed from the local NGO partner to build the technical capacities being monitored by the 16 indicators that were identified in steps four through five and the core capacities identified in step three.

Output: The output of this exercise should be 40 indicators broken-down as follows.

- 20 indicators (four technical indicators per SO or crosscutting IR [4x4=16] and four core capacity indicators) that the local communities can use to assess CRS and NGO partner support to these community initiatives.
- 20 indicators (four indicators per SO or crosscutting IR [4x4=16] and four core capacity indicators) that the NGO partners can use to assess CRS support to them for local community capacity building.

Methodology: The methodology for developing the LCCI partner indicators should be the same as that used to develop the community level technical indicators in step four. Like the LCCI technical indicators, each set of LCCI partner rankings will be unique to that project. Some model rankings that can help guide the development of these indicators are described in the fifth column of section 2.2 of this chapter. The same data entry form can also be used (far right-hand columns, section 3.0 of this chapter).

Step seven: annual updates and informal reporting of the LCCI community, local NGO partner, and CRS scores

Each year, the project should facilitate the communities' updating their rankings for the LCCI core, LCCI technical, and LCC partner indicators.

Output: The output of this step should be an annual update of the baseline measurements of the LCCI core (step two), LCCI technical (step four) rankings, and LCCI partner rankings.

Methodology: While the local NGO partner's community-level development workers may need to play an active role in facilitation initially, their role should diminish over time. By the third year, the community leaders should become conversant in the general strategy and better able to facilitate annual "updates" on their own. Even if the community leaders lead the exercise, it is recommended that at least one technical supervisor and (if this position exists or is created) the local capacity building specialist of the local NGO partner attend this annual session. As a rule of thumb, at least one CRS technical supervisor should attend at least 30 percent of the community level updates to ensure that the CRS Title II project coordination unit remains informed and that all partners are using a similar approach.

2.0. Code Sheets

2.1. Code Sheet A: LCCI Core Capacity Indicators and Indicator Rankings³

List of Indicators and Suggested Rankings (based on the Africare FSCCI Indicators and Rankings).

Note: It is possible to convert these to the MSI/IDF framework described in Volume I, chapter three. Even if this is done, a detailed "code sheet" is recommended.

CAPACITY CATEGORY 1: CORE CAPACITY OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Variable 1.1. Community Organization

Indicator 1.1.1. Growth in the number of groups/organizations in the community

0. There are no groups/organizations present in the village/community
1. Simple group/organization present.
2. Existence of 1 or 2 groups/organizations which may or may not be functional..
3. Existence of 3 functional groups/organizations.
4. Existence of 4 functional groups/organizations.
5. Existence of at least 5 functional groups/organizations.

Indicator 1.1.2. Meetings frequency

0. Group/Organization members never meet at all.
1. Group/Organization meets once or twice a year.
2. Group/Organization meets every 2 or 3 months.
3. Group/Organization meets once a month.
4. Group/Organization meets twice a month.
5. All the scheduled meetings that are agreed upon by members are always held.

Indicator 1.1.3. Existence of a written or oral record of the meeting proceedings

0. No record/Minutes of meetings held.
1. A few proceedings verbally disseminated in an informal manner.
2. Proceedings verbally disseminated in a formal manner.
3. Proceedings are recorded in written form but not so well handled or kept.
4. Proceedings are recorded and/or /written but some are misplaced or skipped.
5. Excellent written and kept/archived records of proceedings.

Indicator 1.1.4. Documentation of activities

0. No form of documentation of activities done by the group.
1. A few activities are documented but not properly recorded or written.
2. Activity records made but a few skipped or misplaced.
3. Activities are documented along with financial records, but with external help.
4. Financial records exist and activities are well documented but documentation not archived in one place (i.e., it is distributed between different people).
5. All group activities and finances are well documented and archived in one place.

³ Source: Africare. 2005. Food Security Community Capacity Index (FSCCI) for Title II programs. Updated and Revised: February 2005. Washington, DC: Africare.

Variable 1.2. Participation

Indicator 1.2.1. Participation in decision-making

0. Decisions are made by one person or a few persons without informing the group/organization.
1. The person or small group making the decision notifies the group/organization.
2. The person or small group making the decision consults with the group/organization.
3. There is fairly broad participation of members in meetings but decisions are arrived at by influential members without consensus.
4. There is fairly broad participation of members and decisions are not made only by influential people.
5. All members fully and democratically participate in decision-making concerning the group/organization.

Indicator 1.2.2. Turn-over in leadership of committees with which project is working⁴

0. Committee leadership has never changed and elections have never been held.
1. Elected leadership still exists since inception with group/village's consent.
2. Group pleased with the current leadership in spite of more than 5 years in office.
3. Only one leadership change in four years.
4. Only one leadership change in three years.
5. Leadership in place as per provision in the by-laws.

Indicator 1.2.3. Percentage of village members present during meetings/general assembly

0. No general assembly ever held by the group/village/organization.
1. 5% of members participate in the general assembly/meetings.
2. 10% of members participate in the general assembly/meetings.
3. 30% of members participate in the general assembly/meetings.
4. 50% of members participate in the general assembly/meetings.
5. More than 60% of members participate in the general assembly/meetings.

⁴ As indicated in the guidance, this indicator as well as others needs to be adapted to the particular project context. The suggested ranking for this indicator is based on Africare's experience when establishing food security committees in "new" communities. Africare found that traditional leaders were usually made members of the committees when it was first established. Rotating leadership within a food security committee was often viewed as challenging the traditional structure of the community. In many cases, this initial inclusion of traditional leaders within a food security committee was a positive experience and led to a voluntary decision to rotate membership within the community. What was also learned was that in certain cases, when the traditional leadership was placed in the newly established food security committee and there were limited activities of benefit to the community during the following year, requests from different community members to change the composition of the food security committee were made. In this context the rotating leadership is a positive indication of increased participation. The NGO's role in this process should focus on supporting overall program objectives, and not become overly involved local political decision-making.

Indicator 1.2.4. Gender equity

0. No women accepted/represented on any committees.
1. Both genders are represented but there is dominance in discussions by one gender and suppression of the other during discussions.
2. All members have opportunity to communicate but the majority of those speaking are always from one specific gender.
3. Equal opportunity availed for each gender to communicate. But this is only after facilitators highlight imbalances.
4. There is free interaction and communication in the group from any member of any gender.
5. Women represent at least 25% of leadership and all women participate actively.

Variable 1.3. Transparency of Management of the Project's Executive Committees

Indicator 1.3.1. Openness in how business is carried out

0. Management of activities is not transparent and are carried out by only one individual or a very small group. Almost no knowledge of how business is run by majority of community members.
1. Some information on management of business is shared /known but by a few people only. This is restricted to a few committee members and not all transactions are known.
2. Most of the group/village members are informed of the business through verbal and informal discussions.
3. 50% of group/village members know about how business is run through information during scheduled meetings.
4. 60% of group/village members know about how the group business/activities are planned and run through scheduled meetings.
5. 80% of group/village members know about how the group business/activities are planned and run through scheduled meetings. Documents and information are accessible to anyone.

Variable 1.4. Good Internal Functioning of the Project Executive Committees

Indicator 1.4.1 Definition of roles of committee members

0. No defined roles. No one knows his/her role or the roles of others.
1. Roles exist but are not very clear to either committee members or the other members of the group/village.
2. Roles exist and are defined but not respected.
3. At least 40% of committee members understand and execute their roles.
4. At least 100% of the committee members understand and execute their roles.
5. Conditions as in ranking, plus at least 90% of village understands the member's roles.

Indicator 1.4.2. Understanding of the project executive committees rules by members

0. No rules or by-laws.
1. Rules/by-laws exist but not adhered to or respected.
2. Rules/by-laws exist but respected just by 2 or 3 people.
3. Rules exist, known by most people but respected by a few people.

4. More than 50% at least of members know and respect the rules/by-laws.
5. Rules/by-laws exist, known by all group members and respected all members.

Indicator 1.4.3. Formalized organizational structures

0. No organizational structure for the group. It exists in name only.
1. Organizational structure for the group exists but not laid out in any statutes or by-laws.
2. Organization structure exists, formally laid out but needs streamlining and re-organizing.
3. Well organized, formalized and functioning organizational structure.
4. Organization structure exists and is formalized and functioning, but known by only 50% or less of villagers.
5. Well organized, formalized and functioning organizational structure recognized by local authorities and over 50% of villagers.

Indicator 1.4.4. Capacity to manage conflicts

0. Never manage / resolve emerging conflicts or disagreements within the group members.
1. Existence of leaders who can or have resolved emerging or open conflicts.
2. A few cases of conflicts are resolved by the group members but others are pending or deferred indefinitely.
3. Conflicts are resolved but after external mitigation e.g., by village traditional mitigation structure, project staff, etc.
4. Conflicts are resolved, but are often delayed until general assembly makes a ruling.
5. The group members themselves immediately resolve any conflicts that emerge.

Indicator 1.4.5. Timeliness of debt payment (e.g., for inputs, seeds, credit, etc.)

0. Never paid debts at all.
1. Paid back a portion of the debt.
2. Paid debts back but after harsh external enforcement.
3. Paid back the debt but in small, staggered and irregular amounts.
4. Debts Paid but always delayed.
5. Group pays its debts immediately according to repayment schedule.

Variable 1.5. Capacity to Analyze and Plan

Indicator 1.5.1. Capacity to use Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques (e.g. food security calendars, action plans, resource maps)

0. The group doesn't know any of the RRA and PRA techniques.
1. The group can list some RRA and PRA techniques, but does not use them.
2. The group can use some RRA and PRA techniques with external assistance but has no or little understanding of the process.
3. The group uses at least 1 RRA/PRA technique.
4. The group uses at least 2 RRA/PRA techniques.
5. The group knows many RRA/PRA tools and uses at least three.

Indicator 1.5.2. Capacity to analyze needs

0. Don't know their needs as a group.
1. Little knowledge about their needs.
2. Able to list their needs but only in broad and not specific terms.
3. Ability to analyze their needs is still lacking and group needs much outside assistance.
4. The group can assess its needs but forgets some important details.
5. Group understands their needs well and presents precise and specific needs.

Indicator 1.5.3. Ability to explain a problem

0. Total failure or inability of the group to explain their current situation.
1. Explains the situation with difficulty.
2. Can explain elements of the situation but cannot to put ideas together in order.
3. Often guided by external people /facilitators before explaining their situation.
4. Good at explaining their situation, with minimal support.
5. Can explicitly explain the group's situation.

Indicator 1.5.4. Capacity to analyze situations, prioritize problems and develop solutions

0. Group has no concept of this type of process.
1. Group is aware of this type of exercise, but cannot analyze situations, prioritize problems or develop solutions.
2. The group can only assess their present situation but finds difficulty in prioritizing problems and/or developing solutions.
3. The group can assess their present situation and prioritize problems but always need strong external support from outside in developing solutions.
4. The group can assess their present situation, prioritize problems and develop some solutions.
5. The group can analyze their present situation, prioritizing problems and develops many solutions.



Microfinance group collaborates to build community well, India (G. Burpoe)

Variable 1.6. Capacity to Take Action

Indicator 1.6.1. Ability to elaborate, implement, and evaluate plans of action

0. The group doesn't have action plans.
1. The group has action plans, but cannot elaborate/explain plans, implement and/or evaluate them.
2. The group has an action plan(s) but only 25% of the plan(s) has/have been executed.
3. The group has an action plan(s), and 50% of the plan(s) has/have been executed.
4. The group has an action plan(s) and 80% of the plan(s) has/have been executed.
5. The group clearly elaborates/explains, implements, and evaluates 100% of plans of action.

Indicator 1.7. Ability to Analyze and Manage Risk and Vulnerability

Indicators 1.7.1. On-going assessment of risks and vulnerability based on a functioning village information system

0. No evidence of a village information system (VIS).
1. Unstructured assessments on an irregular basis that do not lend themselves to analysis and action.
2. Existence of a formal committee, which meets annually to assess village's food security, risks, and vulnerabilities. However no structured village information system is in place.
3. Formal Committee, which meets quarterly, uses data collection tools for analysis.
4. Formal committee meeting monthly and collecting and analyzing data with accuracy.
5. Formal functional village information system created and operated independently by the village with monthly meetings to analyze situation. The system documents a dynamic food security situation for all groups in the village on a continuous basis. Effective preventive actions to mitigate shocks, risks and vulnerabilities are identified that result in enhanced Food Security for the whole village.

Indicator 1.7.2. Plans in place for coping with risks

0. No plan.
1. Oral plan without capacity to implement.
2. Written plan without capacity to implement or preparations.
3. Written plan exists with capacity to implement but no preparation in place.
4. Written plan exists with capacity and preparations in place.
5. Annual review of all aspects of the plan and communicated to village.

Indicator 1.7.3. Diversification of productive activities (Diversification of productive activities is defined as planting one new crop, breeding one new animal or starting a new processing technique or other income generating activity not completed during the previous agricultural cycle.)

0. No understanding about diversification of productive activities.
1. At least 10% of households have diversified their productive activities.
2. At least 25% of households have diversified their productive activities.
3. At least 50% of households have diversified their productive activities.
4. At least 75% of households have diversified their productive activities.
5. At least 90% of households have diversified their productive activities.

Indicator 1.7.4. Capacity to request and receive assistance from outside community when required

0. No mechanism of negotiating for external resources/assurances when required.
1. Community has thought about negotiating external resources/assistance but no action taken.
2. Information on the community risks has been formulated into a proposal.
3. The formulated proposal has been submitted to a higher local leadership levels.
4. Community proposal and negotiation skills were sufficient for a response from outside resources to be received.

5. Community has a highly effective system in place for proposal development and negotiation recognized by outside resource sources and resulting in the receipt of resources.

Indicator 1.7.5. Periodic reflection on how coping has worked

0. No indicators in place.
1. Committee members have started putting some indicators and guidelines together.
2. Indicators have been developed by some members but are not yet understood very well by all members and therefore not yet applied in any evaluation.
3. Indicators have been developed and all members are aware of them but have not yet used them in any evaluation.
4. Members have own well-developed indicators that are well understood by all. Indicators have been periodically used by the committee members with the help of the project and other organizations.
5. Members have own well-developed indicators that are well understood by all. The indicators have been periodically used by the committee members without the help of the local NGO partner or CRS staff.

Variable 1.8. Capacity to Manage Risks associated with HIV/AIDS

Indicator 1.8.1. Existence of an HIV/AIDS sub-committee with an action plan

0. No such committee exists.
1. A committee exists, but has no work plan.
2. A committee exists and has informally discussed a work plan.
3. A committee exists and has a formal work plan.
4. A committee exists and has a formal work plan in which less than 50% of the planned activities have taken place.
5. A committee exists and has a formal work plan and has implemented 80% or more of the planned activities.

Indicator 1.8.2. Knowledge of executive committee members on HIV/AIDS in their community

0. No committee members have ever received HIV/AIDS awareness training.
1. Less than 20% of the members have ever received basic HIV/AIDS awareness training.
2. Between 20-50% of the members have ever received basic HIV/AIDS awareness training.
3. At least 50% of the members have ever received basic HIV/AIDS awareness training.
4. The committee knows where to access up-to-date HIV/AIDS technical information at an organization or facility in their area.
5. The committee can name a person or organization for each technical area of HIV/AIDS (VCT, Home based care, peer education, treatment if applicable).

Indicator 1.8.3. Evidence of formal collaboration between the community and health service providers

0. The community does not know of the health and HIV/AIDS services available in their area.

1. The community knows of the services, but has not made any contact with any health service providers in their area.
2. The community has identified key services and has made contact with at least 50% of the service providers for HIV/AIDS in the area.
3. The committee has created formal linkages with the health system to provide committee/community sensitization and prevention education efforts.
4. The committee has identified key services in their area for HIV/AIDS and has established a formal mechanism for referral of community members to these services.
5. Same as #4 AND a referral system is documented..

Variable 1.9. Communication and Exchanges with Outsiders

Indicator 1.9.1. Exchanges with outsiders

0. Unable to speak to outsiders about themselves and what they do.
1. Rarely speak to outsiders about themselves and what they do.
2. Often speaks to outsiders about themselves and what they do but with reservations unless with the presence of a facilitator.
3. Can speak to outsiders and have visited another group once to share what they do.
4. Can speak to outsiders and visit and invite other groups to share what they do.
5. Most of the members of the group can perfectly and explicitly communicate and exchange information with outsiders.

Indicator 1.9.2. Capacity to negotiate for external resources

0. No form / idea of negotiation for external resources exist within the group
1. Group has developed an idea or seeking or negotiating for external resources but no action plan for approaching a specific funding source has been developed.
2. Group has already set up a task force for negotiating for external resources, the specific sources of resources are known but only informal contacts made so far.
3. Group has developed one project from the action plan and has submitted to outside partners for funding.
4. Group has developed 2 projects from the plan of action and funding obtained for at least one.
5. Good linkage with external resources. The group is benefiting from self-initiated and negotiated external resources.

Variable 1.10. Individual Capacity

Indicator 1.10.1. Percentage of persons that know how to read and write proficiently enough to record group activities

0. No adult is literate in the group/community.
1. One - three people in the group/community can read and write and record keeping is weak and problematic.
2. 5% of the adult population/members of the group can read and write and keep record of the group activities.
3. 10% of the adult population/members of the group can read and write and keep record of the group activities.

4. 20% of the adult population/members of the group can read and write and keep record of the group activities.
5. 30% of the adult population/members of the group can read and write and keep accurate record of the group activities AND individuals are present who can handle financial records.

Indicator 1.10.2. Presence of local expertise

0. No adult in the group/community has ever been trained.
1. Less than 5% of adults persons in the group/community have received training in a skill needed by the group.
2. At least 5% of adults in the group/community have some training in a skill area needed to carry out the activities.
3. At least 10% of adults in the group/community have some training in a skill area needed to carry out the activities.
4. At least 25% of adults in the group/community have some training in a skill area needed to carry out the activities.
5. At least 50% of adults in the group/community have some training in a skill area needed to carry out the activities.

Indicator 1.10.3. Application of learned technologies in the group/village

0. No adoption or initiation of any practices or technologies by community/group members.
1. 5% of community/group members have adopted or initiated a practice or technology.
2. 25% of the members in the community/group adopted or initiated a practice or technology introduced in the group/village.
3. 50% of community/group members have adopted or initiated any practice or technology introduced in the group/village.
4. 75% of community members have adopted or initiated any practice or technology introduced in the group/village.
5. Every member of the community/group adopted or initiated one or more of the practices or technologies introduced in the group/village.

2.2. Code Sheet B: Sample Indicators that Can be Used as Models for Assessing Community Technical Capacity⁵ and NGO Partner and CRS Technical Support to Community-Level Initiatives

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
Community infrastructure (physical) necessary to achieve activities that are critical to the IR or SO	Training	Awareness and utilization of services	Community self-reliance	Provision of infrastructure (how much, of what kind)
Social networks and organizations	Dissemination of information and awareness building	Behavior change	Sectoral impact indicators (health, agriculture, micro-finance, education, etc.)	Provision of social infrastructure (health services), input supply, or other inputs necessary to bring about desired impacts or behavior changes
Financial resources to fund the activities in a particular SO	Demonstrated ability of community based organizations that are critical to the execution of a particular group of activities to manage money	Increased skills and service Provision	Emergency response and preparedness	Provide funding for phase one interventions Training programs in financial management. Training programs in basic literacy

⁵ A “model” list of indicators based on the FAM/LCB working group inventory is included for the major technical categories that are supported under Title II. Title II projects may choose from this list or create their own (Ferris-Morris 2002 a, 2002 b, 2002 c, 2002 d).

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
Gender relations	Gender Inclusiveness Participation in project activities (by gender)	Improved resource management for female headed households	Women benefit from a particular category of activity with greater frequency	Training programs for NGO partner and CRS staff Gender sensitivity training for village leaders
Time/talent/labor	Community organization and mobilization	Mechanisms of community self-management	Communities investing time/talent/labor differently	Village level training programs provided
Experiences with external development organization	Improved processes for dealing with external development organizations (regular meetings) Village organizations learn how to prepare project requests	Advocacy Project requests get submitted	Increased funding from outside sources from non-project sources	Local NGO partner or CRS staff facilitate meetings with external development organizations Exchange visits to other projects facilitated
Agriculture SO/Variable				
Community infrastructure	Village promoters, facilitators and counterpart staff trained	Producers who developed or updated contingency plans	Increased % of communities with Title II programming phase-out plans	CRS/local partners help facilitate initial phase out plan formulation CRS/local partners sponsor courses for community leaders on how to develop simple proposals

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
Social networks and organization	Resource persons trained and active	# of producers who developed a production plan	# of farmer groups who receive agricultural loans	CRS hires necessary staff Local partner hire and equip qualified development workers to train community resource persons
Financial resources	# of training sessions provided to community organization with potential for self-sufficiency	Improved technical and managerial capacity in the area of food security programming	Demonstrated financial sustainability of all marketing activities in 100% of units SGAs by FYXX	Local NGO partner or CRS provide necessary training courses TA provided to insure that books are being filled out correctly
Gender relations	# of training module presentations given by village-based agricultural experts	Number of community price boards showing current price of cereal crops	At least 50 associations each year are able to negotiate a contract with traders themselves from the third year of project	Qualified development workers train village-based agricultural experts on a regular basis Project facilitates exchange visits with other projects that have successfully addressed gender issues
Time/talent/labor	Gender inclusiveness of training sessions	# of commercialization networks organized	At least 70% of the above contracts are fulfilled	

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
Experience with external development organizations	Establishment of commercialization committees	# of commercialization committees linked to a commercialization network of the economic corridor	# of farmer association members receiving goats from other association members	Project facilitates access to veterinary services Village level animal health services improved
	Establishment of work committees	Contract established between small producers and private companies	At least three medium to large farmers embark into commercial seed production	# of local producers who participate in exchange visits to observe other community seed projects Local government agricultural researchers trained and equipped for overseeing certified seed
	Establishment of infrastructure work committees	% of community organizations implementing improved production activities for market and commercialization	At least 10% of seeds for maize and beans are produced by private commercial seed producers	
		Trained community female promoters	# of farmers with access to farm implements	
		Trained male agricultural promoters	# of goats, # of livestock, kg forage seeds distributed per family or beneficiary (could also be % of households receiving)	
			# of functional workshops repairing agricultural implements (could also be % of households receiving)	

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
			75% of farmers in project area receive regular and updated market information during marketing periods	
			Women's time pounding maize or cassava is reduced by 10 hours per week by FYXX	
			Establishment of committees to implement and operate the agricultural product processing centers	
Natural Resource Management SO/Variable				
% increase of UP budget allocation for land development activities	Development and use of administrative/financial manuals and procedures	Maintain and care for trees; take care of rivers and water resources; care for wildlife	Area of communal land protected/reclaimed (ha)	Project-funded development workers provide the necessary training to support activities
Ha of land developed with rainfed water harvesting technologies	Schools with environment curriculum	Community actions to stop erosion	# of bush surveillance systems established with functioning committees	Project-funded development workers facilitate participatory on-farm trials
New technologies identified through institutions disseminated to target farmers		90% of families participating in community based organizations understand and recognize importance of conservation and environmental renewal		# of villagers trained to supervise tree nurseries

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indictors	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
		# of tree associations or nurseries established and operational (by women's groups)		Support to village for building and maintaining appropriate fencing (for protected forest areas)
		Design of soil and water conservation network		Purchase/supply of appropriate equipment for watering new trees
		# of commercialization networks organized		Extent to which the project has improved environmental management in the village
Maternal and Child Health SO/Variable				
Agreement signed with counterparts on portion of participant contribution for medicine sustainability fund	% of clinics submitting logistics forms monthly	# of mothers' clubs	# of ongoing income generating projects with volunteer community health workers	Maternal and child health educational materials developed and distributed to the village
		# of caring mothers networks created	# of health promoters functioning	Government health staff trained in techniques they need to support community level initiatives
		# of partner staff trained in breast feeding concepts	# of health related activities implemented by the health committee that broaden sustainable community participation in preventative and primary health	# of project-funded community development workers posted in or near village who make routine visits

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
		# of resource persons trained and active	Increased # of effective referrals made by community health providers	Project provides all the equipment needed to measure the children (scales, etc.) when it is needed
			% of parents receiving nutrition advise	Development workers and community health workers trained to conduct growth monitoring
			% of children that complete vaccination schedule/improved immunization coverage	
			% of mothers of children <24 months w/immunization card	
			% of deliveries by trained personnel (vs. unattended home deliveries)	
			% of children w/growth monitoring card who've been weighed in last 4 weeks	
			Increased number of children who are brought in for growth monitoring services	

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
Rural Water and Sanitation SO/Variable				
		# of water user groups mobilized to participate in project activities	Infrastructure services provided to communities on a sustainable basis (residents with access to services, infrastructure adequately maintained)	NGO partner conducts necessary community-level trainings
		% increase in attendance levels of trainees	Improved water resources	Number of contracts signed for wells construction
		% increase in enrollment level of trainees	# of functioning wells in village (% of HH within a certain distance of a functioning well for potable water)	Number of potable water drinking points rehabilitated
		# of new water and sanitation facilities maintained	Increased operational water point capacity in target areas	# of community leaders trained in low cost, appropriate sanitation techniques
		% of communities protecting their water resources	# of HHs with access to safe water	
			Improved access to drinking water	
			# of HHs with access to latrines and sewage	
			# of latrines built and used	

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
			Risk of sanitation and hygiene related disease transmission reduced by the provision of appropriate community infrastructure	
			# of new water and sanitation facilities maintained	
Micro-enterprise Development and Income Diversification SO/Variable				
		# of associations created or groups formed (cumulative) (i.e., dairy enterprises, credit associations)	% of villages with their own bank account	Training provided
		# of village banks formed	Increase in group capital fund	Local partner support for the creation of the village bank actualized
		% of village banks licensed	Savings levels	CRS/Local NGO provide necessary technical assistance/support to insure proper management
		% of villages with village banks	# of revolving fund committees	Extent to which project has linked villagers to other promising regional initiatives for micro-enterprise development and credit (if this is a community-level goal)

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indictors	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
		Development and use of administrative/financial manuals and procedures	# of projects funded as a follow-up to training provided	
		# of credit associations formed per development worker	# of institutions that have been put in contact with other sources of funding through CRS to increase sustainability	
		Loan limits established	# of rural group enterprises operating in target areas	
			Provide credit and savings services to X poor rural women	
			% of women's groups receiving support to income generating activities and food processing technologies	
			# of micro-enterprises improved	
HIV/AIDS Mitigation SO/Variable⁶				
				Extent to which project activities raised community awareness of HIV/AIDS mitigation strategies

⁶ The FAM/LCB inventory did not include any community level indicators for HIV/AIDS mitigation. It is anticipated that a list of appropriate indicators will be proposed by the PQSD department during FY06 (see Volume I, chapter two).

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indictors	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
				Extent to which community has increased its capacity to intervene
				Extent to which vulnerable groups affected by HIV/AIDS are better off
Vulnerable Groups/Safety Nets SO/Variable				
# of individuals in households classified as “extremely vulnerable” participating in one of the project’s non-FFW safety net programs	Village committee trained to identify vulnerable groups and identify opportunities for food aid to build basic assets that they need to reduce their vulnerability	# of ha of land associated with vulnerable households developed using safety net programs	Extent to which vulnerable social and economic groups are better off	Mega tons (MT) delivered to FFW beneficiaries on time
			Average # of months of adequate household food provisioning increased	Mechanisms in place to ensure efficient control and distribution of Title II commodities
				# of spot checks of ration distributions that were found to be accurate
Basic Education SO/Variable				
Materials for and/or construction of schools	% of schools with elected PTA officers		# of established or trained PTAs which meet CRS criteria for functioning	

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
	% of schools holding at least one PTA meeting per trimester		# of trained PTAs that implement community development or fund raising projects	
			# of community-driven projects executed or underway in education project supported schools	
Risk Management SO/Variable				
		# of disaster committees established in villages and village groups	Access/understanding at the village- level of early warning information	Extent to which project has met their identified needs
		% of disaster committees established in villages and unions	Emergency preparedness plan developed and maintained	Extent to which the project divided the community or brought it closer together in addressing risk
		# of feedback meetings with farmer groups	% increase in active disaster management committees in targeted communities	
		# of technical bulletins produced	% of disaster committees established in villages and unions	
			Improved information gathering and food security monitoring for early response to potential emergencies affecting livelihood/survival	

Sample Indicators To Assess Local Community Capacity in Key Technical Areas Relevant to Title II Project Management				Sample Indicators to Assess Local Partners and CRS Support for Community-level Title II Initiatives
Input Indicators	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	Impact Indicators	Indicators
Rural Roads (Food for Work [FFW]) SO/Variable				
# of kg of food supplied for food for work	Communities trained in road construction and maintenance as part of FFW program	# of km of roads maintained to project's specifications	Time needed to go to an important regional market is reduced (#km/ # hours spent traveling)	Food to support the scheduled FFW activities arrives when needed
				Project negotiates the necessary contracts with government services to supply heavy road construction equipment
				Heavy construction equipment arrives when needed

3.0. Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI) Data Entry Forms

3.1. Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI) Community Capacity Data Entry Form

Note: Sample scores inserted; LCCI partner data entry form in on sheet two.

Capacity Building Variables	Local Community Capacity			
	Indicators	FY	FY	FY
Category 1: LCCI-Core Capacity Category (FSCCI)				
1.1. Community Organization	1.1.1.Growth in the number of organizations, groups in the community	3	1	4
	1.1.2.Meeting frequency	3	1	4
	1.1.3.Existence of a written or oral record of meeting proceedings	3	1	4
	1.1.4.Documentation of activities	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	12	4	16
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8
1.2. Participation	1.2.1.Participation in decision making	3	1	4
	1.2.2.Turnover in leader	3	1	4
	1.2.3.Percentage of village member present during meetings/general assemblies?	3	1	4
	1.2.4.Gender equity	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	12	4	16
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8
1.3. Transparency of Management	1.3.1.Openness on how the business is carried out	3	1	4
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8
1.4. Good Internal Functioning of Community or Organization	1.4.1.Definition of roles	3	1	4
	1.4.2.Understanding of the association rules by members	3	1	4
	1.4.3.Formalized organizational structures	3	1	4
	1.4.4.Capacity to manage conflict	3	1	4
	1.4.5.Timeliness of debt payment	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	15	5	20
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8
1.5. Capacity to Analyze and Plan	1.5.1.Capacity to use RRA and PRA techniques	3	1	4
	1.5.2.Capacity to analyze needs	3	1	4
	1.5.3.Ability to explain a situation	3	1	4
	1.5.4.Capacity to analyze situations, prioritize problems and develop solutions	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	12	4	16
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8
1.6. Capacity to Take Action	1.6.1.Ability to elaborate plans of actions, implement and evaluate them	3	1	4
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8

LCCI Data Entry Form		Local Community Capacity		
Capacity Building Variables	Indicators	FY	FY	FY
Category 1: LCCI-Core Capacity Category (FSCCI)				
1.7. Ability to Analyze and Manage Risk and Vulnerability	1.7.1.On-going assessment of risks and vulnerability based on a functioning village	3	1	4
	1.7.2.Plans in place for coping with risk	3	1	4
	1.7.3.Diversification of activiteis	3	1	4
	1.7.4.Capacity to request and receive assistance	3	1	4
	1.7.5.Periodic refelction on how coping plans have worked	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	15	5	20
	Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8
1.8. Capacity to Manage Risks	1.8.1.Knowledge level on HIV/AIDS	3	1	4
	1.8.2.HIV/AIDS behavior practices of the	3	1	4
	1.8.3.Existence of Community level services for HIV/AIDS affected households	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	9	3	12
Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8	
1.9. Communication and Exchanges	1.9.1.Exchanges with outsiders	3	1	4
	1.9.2.Capacity to negotiate for external resources	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	6	2	8
Subtotal (adjusted 10 pts)	6	2	8	
1.10. Individual Capacity	1.10.1.% of persons that know how to read and	3	1	4
	1.10.2.presence of local expertise	3	1	4
	1.10.3.application of learned technogeis in the gorup/village	3	1	4
	Subtotal (raw)	9	3	12
Subtotal adjusted (10 pts)	6	2	8	
LCCI-Core Capacity (FSCCI) Subtotal (raw adjusted scores=100 pts max)		60	20	80
LCCI-Core Capacity (FSCCI) Subtotal (adjusted 20 pts)		12	4	16
Category 2: LCCI Technical Capacity Category				
2.1. Strategic Objective 1: Project Specific (20 pts)-see suggested basket for technical areas	a.inputs: tbd	3	1	4
	b.process: tbd	3	1	4
	c.outcomes: tbd	3	1	4
	d.impact: tbd	3	1	4
2.2. Strategic Objective 2: Project Specific (20 pts)--see suggested basket for technical areas	a.inputs: tbd	3	1	4
	b.process: tbd	3	1	4
	c.outcomes:tbd	3	1	4
	d.impact: tbd	3	1	4
2.3. Strategic Objective 3: Project Specific (20 pts)--see suggested basket for technical areas	a.inputs: tbd	3	1	4
	b.process:tbd	3	1	4
	c.outcomes:tbd	3	1	4
	d.impact: tbd	3	1	4
2.4. Strategic Objective 4 or other cross-cutting themes (like sustainability plans, vulnerable groups, gender, etc.): Project Specific	a. inputs: tbd	3	1	4
	b. process: tbd	3	1	4
	c. outcomes: tbd	3	1	4
	d. impact: tbd	3	1	4
LCCI-Technical Capacity Subtotal Subtotal (raw score=80 pts max)		48	16	64
LCCI-Core Capacity (FSPCI) (20 pt adjusted) + Technical Capacity (100 pts)		60	20	80

3.2. Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI) Partner Support for Community Capacity Data Entry Form							
NGO Partner Support				CRS Partner Support			
Indicator (project to create)	FY	FY	FY	Indicator (project to create)	FY	FY	FY
Category 1: LCCI-Core Capacity Category (FSCCI)							
a.tbd				a.tbd			
b.tbd				b.tbd			
c.tbd				c.tbd			
d.tbd				d.tbd			
<i>Subtotal (Support for community core capacity)</i>				<i>Subtotal (Support for community core capacity)</i>			
Category 2: LCCI Technical Capacity Category							
a.tbd				a.tbd			
b.tbd				b.tbd			
c.tbd				c.tbd			
d.tbd				d.tbd			
a.tbd				a.tbd			
b.tbd				b.tbd			
c.tbd				c.tbd			
d.tbd				d.tbd			
a.tbd				a.tbd			
b.tbd				b.tbd			
c.tbd				c.tbd			
d.tbd				d.tbd			
a.tbd				a.tbd			
b.tbd				b.tbd			
c.tbd				c.tbd			
d.tbd				d.tbd			
<i>Subtotal (Support for community technical capacity)</i>				<i>Subtotal (Support for community technical capacity)</i>			
<i>CRS & NGO Support of Community Core + Technical Capacity</i>				<i>CRS & NGO Support of Community Core + Technical Capacity</i>			