



AFRICARE FOOD SECURITY REVIEW



Number 3

September 2007

Draft Guidance: How to Measure the Food Security Program Capacity Index (FSPCI)

Africare¹

Introduction

The Food Security Program Capacity Index (FSPCI) is a self-assessment tool that food security programs can use to measure their knowledge of important guidance and staff capacity in key programming areas. It currently consists of 10 elements, each of which measures one of the core capacities needed to design and execute a food security program. Every element is composed of sub-elements that address the specific capacities relevant to the associated element (unlike the FSCCI for community capacity [Africare 2007], the sub-elements and ranking criteria do not change from project to project). Aside from its use in measuring key program capacity, the consensus-based method used to calculate the FSPCI is an important and effective tool for orienting new staff and refreshing existing staff on the key concepts that Africare uses in its Title II programs. This document is intended to be a draft guide for food security staff within Africare and other cooperating sponsors (CS) on how the tool is being revised and how it should be calculated. Although the index provided here focuses on the basic skills and guidance needed for food security programming, the basic template could be adapted to other types of programming.

During Africare's ICB midterm evaluation it became clear that, although the FSPCI was useful in the past, in recent years its field use had diminished and the data had become less telling of the entire project's perception of its own capacity. Due to this important finding Africare asked one of the Africare country representatives (Ahmed Moussa N'Game), who has extensive experience in Title II programming in Chad, Mali, and Burkina Faso, to lead a joint review of the tool by the Africare food security M&E and management working groups. The results of this review of the FSPCI were presented at the Africare food security workshop in Niamey in September 2007 (Boxes 1 and 2) and those relevant to the FSPCI guidance have been incorporated into this document. This draft guidance is the first attempt to revise the tool based on the issues raised by this review. The FSPCI and draft guidance may be further revised and will be finalized in FY08 based on feedback from using the tool and draft guidance in the ICB final evaluation (scheduled for November-December 2007).

Below a brief background section is presented that outlines the evolution of the FSPCI. This is followed by an explanation of the FY07 review of the tool that resulted in recommendations for revision. The step by step instructions for measuring the FSPCI are provided in the section below entitled "How to Determine the FSPCI." The last three sections briefly describe the use of the FSPCI in developing an action plan, submission of FSPCI results to the country office, and use of the FSPCI in tracking progress made in building program capacity. Annex A is the FSPCI review form and reflects the format of an Excel file (<http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper3>) that has embedded formulas that can be used by Africare staff to calculate the FSPCI score for their program. Annex B is the complete list of the 10 core elements and the sub-elements and rankings that feed into the 10 core elements.

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Office of Food for Peace, Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Award No. AFP-a-00-03-00052. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Background

The FSPCI was created during the mid-term evaluation of Africare's Title II Institutional Support Assistance (ISA) grant (FY99-FY04). When these grants were funded they required neither a baseline survey nor an indicator performance tracking table (IPTT). One strength of the FSPCI tool was that it enabled the project to measure, retroactively, some of the new indicators that were created during the mid-term.ⁱⁱ During the mid-term, staff were asked to provide rankings for themselves for three periods in time: (1) retroactively back to before the grant started, (2) the present (at mid-term), and (3) where they wanted to be in two years (FY04). Africare found that this self-assessment exercise helped staff better understand some of the new cross-cutting areas being developed and identify new ways these could be strengthened. In fact, based on this experience several Title II NGO cooperating sponsors expressed an interest in the index since it helped shorten the time needed to orient new staff and conduct routine functions like reporting.

Under the new Title II-funded Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) grant (FY04-FY08), Africare proposed to further develop the FSPCI as a tool for strategic planning and monitoring of its institutional capacity. During the first year of the grant (FY04) two new elements were added (elements 9 and 10) to the original eight elements, resulting in a total of 10 elements. Element 9 focuses on identifying risk and developing better strategies to manage risk; element 10 focuses on targeting capacities related to assistance to People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). The following 10 elements are now included in the revised FSPCI (explained in detail in Annex B).

1. Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity
2. Capacity to Design, Implement, and Analyze Baseline and Final Surveys
3. Partnership Analysis and Negotiation
4. Other Technical Skills
5. Proposal Development, Results and Resource Request Reporting
6. Orientation of Staff
7. Project Staff's Access to Critical Information
8. Training Opportunities for Staff
9. Ability to Analyze and Manage Risk
10. Capacity to Identify and Address Risks Associated with HIV/AIDS

This revised index (Africare 2006) was used to assess Africare projects during Africare's internal mid-term evaluation of the ICB in 2006, during which it became obvious that a special review of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the FSPCI and its guidance was needed (see results in Box 1). The revised guidance presented here has been informed by the lessons learned during that mid-term evaluation and the subsequent review of the tool and guidance. Box 2 presents the recommendations that stemmed from the review that were finalized during the 2007 Africare food security workshop.

The major results of the review were that although the tool was highly useful in the past, its current utility has been marred by the ways it is being used. The group's analysis showed that in contrast to Africare's well-known community capacity index (the Food Security Community Capacity Index [FSCCI]),ⁱⁱⁱ the FSPCI was never linked to any sort of field program-level action plan for building staff capacity with help from the Africare HQ office. In turn, this has contributed to the tool being "headquarter-driven" with very little real connection to the field.

The revisions to the FSPCI that are presented here are to be finalized and improved upon during the ICB final evaluation. Due to the draft nature of this guidance and the expectation of further revisions based on field data and experience with



Project technical staff filling in FSPCI in Goundam prior to submit to CR. Photo Credit: Goumar Aboubacrine

the new guidance, this guidance is written specifically to the upcoming ICB final evaluation (e.g., it has specific dates and instructions in the “how-to” section that apply to the final ICB evaluation). In 2008 the language of this guidance will be finalized and generalized to all cooperating sponsors. All the changes (those included now and those that will be presented in the next year) will make the FSPCI a more useful management tool that can build program capacity and increase program impact and efficiency during the final year of the ICB grant and in future projects both for Africare and other cooperating sponsors.

Box 1. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (Risks) of the Use of the FSPCI to Build and Track Africare Staff Capacity for Food Security Programming (FY04-FY07)

Strengths

- Tool identifies technical, organizational, and methodological weaknesses of the Title II programs and identifies measures to build staff capacity.
- Similar to the role played by the FSCCI in local communities, the FSPCI can provide programs with a reference point for self-assessing their capacity on key themes related to the management of food security projects.

Weaknesses

- Because of lack of training, staff have not accepted (owned) the FSPCI tool.
- The qualities being ranked (1-5) for certain elements are not clearly defined, especially for elements 9 and 10.
- Some activities may be organized only once or twice in the life time of a project (baseline and final survey), which makes it difficult to track the evolution of capacity.
- Certain elements don't relate to the objectives of the ICB.
- The internal Africare FSPCI guidance, which was used in FY04 (for the final evaluation of the ISA grant) and FY06 (for the mid-term) is unclear about the role of the Africare country representative (CR) in the FSPCI sessions, which has resulted in some countries using the CR to complete the form (i.e., this has resulted in the process being top-down rather than consensus-based) (Africare 2004, 2006).
- In most cases, the participatory process (group meeting) that was supposed to be the format of completing the form is not being followed.
- The current guidance, which was distributed internally during the ICB mid-term evaluation (Africare 2004, 2006) does not explain the internal use of the document (for project teams) in the improvement of their staff capacity so that when they are asked to fill it out it is not as useful as it could be.
- The link between the exercise of filling out the form and the activities of food for development is not apparent; it appears that it is fill out and filed away with little follow-up.
- The tool does not track the capacities necessary for commodity management (monetization, Food for Work, and direct distribution).
- The tool should improve communication between the Title II field programs and Office of Food for Development (OFFD) and does not appear to be accomplishing this.

Opportunities

- The tool should help Africare/OFFD identify weaknesses in project management (e.g., insufficient staff access to, or understanding of, the Africare Food Security Manual).
- Tool should help orient new staff and new projects to the minimum package of documentation and skills (e.g., FANTA regulations for sampling) that they need to manage a Title II project.

Threats (Risks)

- Insufficient staff understanding and access to FSPCI (e.g., due to poor understanding of the tool and the fact that it has not been translated into either French or Portuguese) is a missed opportunity for building field program capacity that may contribute to bad project-level results.^{iv}

Source: Ahmed Moussa N'Game. 2007. **Presentation of the FSPCI Tool: SWOT**
Africare Food Security Workshop, “Good Tools...and How to Use Them” (Part II). Niamey. September 2007.
(Based on analysis of the joint committee)

Over the course of the next year, the person spear-heading the review (Ahmed Moussa N'Game) will work with members of both working groups to ensure that:

- A more participatory process is used for completing the FSPCI in FY07 and during the 2008 workshop;
- The participatory process of completing the FSPCI is linked to a short list of identified needs and “action plans” to address the needs identified by the FSPCI exercise; and
- The Africare Office for Food for Development develops a response to these identified needs.

Other recommendations (see Box 2) stemming from the review of the FSPCI--such as the need to develop an annotated bibliography that will show key internal and web-based resources that programs can use to

Box 2. Priority Recommendations Resulting from FY07 Review and Africare Food Security Workshop in Niamey for Revision of FSPCI

Lack of coherence between activities tracked under elements 9 and 10 and capacities targeted by ICB activities.

- Consider ways that the capacities being tracked can be better aligned with the objective of the ICB, specifically:
 - Continue asking projects to track the “core” capacities (elements 1-8) and
 - Rewrite elements 9 and 10 so that there is a direct coherence between the capacities being tracked here and the project-level objectives of the ICB (SO1, SO2, and SO3 of the ICB).
- Organize a sub-committee composed of persons from different working groups to oversee the reformulation of the FSPCI guidance section and the indicators.
- Revise the FSPCI indicators to ensure that the rankings are rigorous and reflect field program realities (see specific recommendations below).
- Consider rewriting indicator rankings that are all scored at a “5” (i.e., indicators that all projects score at a 5 may reflect a lack of clear language in the ranking criteria).

Lack of field-level ownership and impact of the tool.

- Revise the FSPCI guidance section so that staff better understand:
 - The link between their programs and the FSPCI and
 - That the group meeting is expected to last about two hours and that data entry and calculation (in a pre-formulated Excel file) takes between 40 and 60 minutes.

Lack of staff understanding of link between FSPCI and their programs.

- Translate the current FSPCI into French and Portuguese.
- Ensure that the FSPCI in the appropriate language is included in the orientation package of all new CR's and project coordinators in Title II countries.
- Require countries to report their FSPCI scores in their annual CSR2 reports (including discussion of how these may have been affected by the timing of resources).
- Ensure that measures are taken by OFFD to address (through training and staff exchange) some of the weaknesses identified during the FSPCI exercise by specific Title II country programs.
- Edit, produce, and distribute reports and guidance that are examples of “best practice” for inclusion in the Africare Food Security Review (AFSR) series (<http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php>) that programs can use to build their capacity in key elements tracked by the FSPCI.
- Develop bibliography that summarizes materials that staff can access from Africare, FANTA, and other resources to build capacities in areas tracked by the FSPCI. Develop short, two-three page summaries of key internal documents and guidance on specific topics or categories of capacity being developed (e.g., proposal writing, anthropometric measurement) for posting on website and distribution to field staff as part of AFSR series.
- Ensure that the results of the FSPCI analysis are presented in a brief summary report that is distributed to all field programs (so that programs can compare and contrast the country ratings in key areas).

build their capacity in the 10 elements being tracked and the development of indicators that address issues like Reg. 11 and OMB Circulars^v—will be acted upon and shared during the coming year (FY08). Both working groups will review the results of the use of the FSPCI during the ICB final evaluation survey during an ICB-sponsored workshop, which is tentatively scheduled for February 2008.

How to Determine the FSPCI

Step 1: Clarify the Tool and its Role to Staff

The FSPCI sub-element and element rankings are determined by consensus by all relevant project staff for the particular program being evaluated. Although consensus is used to assign the scores for each sub-element, one person leads the FSPCI session. The leader of the FSPCI session is to be one of the project team members. The first step (after the leader has been selected) is for this person to clarify the following objectives and output of the FSPCI session.

- *Objectives:* The objectives involve staff self-assessment of the key capacities and knowledge of key documents (and/or guidance and/or websites) needed to execute food security programming. The FSPCI is a consensus ranking. It ranks the entire team and the processes put in place by the project.
- *Outputs:* The expected output of the exercise is a consensus ranking (by the entire project team) of the major elements and sub-elements. A secondary output is to orient new and reorient existing staff to the key materials and concepts that Africare uses in its Title II programs.

To encourage staff reflection and preparation, the FSPCI elements, sub-elements, and rankings (Annex B) should be distributed prior to the meeting (several days before or even a week before). Senior staff should be encouraged to read over the document before coming to the meeting.

Step 2: Ask the Project Team to Conduct a “Self-Assessment” for Each Sub-Element as a Team and Reach Consensus on a Ranking

During a group meeting of the project staff, the team should be asked to conduct a self-assessment on each sub-element. Whenever possible everyone at the meeting should have a printed copy of the index and the project coordinator (or her/his designated representative) should translate (in the local working language) the text and rankings on the wall. If staff have any questions and/or wish to justify a particular ranking, they should insert a footnote next to the ranking.

Step 3: Review Previous Rankings Based on Current Understanding of the Tool (step specific to Africare ICB final evaluation)

Once staff have completed the ranking exercise for the present, they should review their ratings for the previous period since many staff may not have understood the goal of the exercise and/or did not participate in the rankings during the previous FSPCI session (in this case in 2006). If there was widespread misunderstanding some of the rankings for the previous session (2006, at mid-term) may need to be adjusted in 2008. When adjustments are made, please insert a footnote explaining this.

Step 4: Identify the Desired Rankings for the End of FY08 and Actions/Support Needed to Achieve these Rankings (step specific to the ICB final evaluation)

Staff might also be asked where they would like to be in terms of their rankings in 2008 and should reflect on what actions (internal and external) might help the project team achieve higher rankings. These actions should be noted on a flip chart or piece of paper.

Step 5: Data Entry

Data (rankings) can be recorded either by hand on paper or directly into the Excel file (<http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper3>). Annex A provides a data entry form that can be printed out for the ranking exercise. This is an image of the Excel file that accompanies this guidance

that can be used to enter the ranking data electronically. The Excel file is embedded with formulas in the relevant cells that will automatically calculate element scores and the total score for the FSPCI. It is recommended that the Excel file be downloaded and saved as a master copy and then each time the FSPCI ranking exercise is completed a copy be made first into which all the data for that particular time period will be entered. When the group comes to a consensus on their ranking for each of the sub-elements and 10 elements, these scores should be recorded on this sheet or in the Excel file (<http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper3>).

Step 6: Calculation of the Rankings and Total FSPCI Score

The ranking of each element will be adjusted to take into account the different number of sub-elements in each of the 10 elements; no matter how many sub-elements are included for a particular element, each element will only account for 1/10th of the total score of the FSPCI. This results in an FSPCI score with a total possible score of 100 points, which will make comparison both across country programs and over time easier.

Each element will have a maximum total of 10 points, regardless of the number of sub-elements for the element (10 elements x 10 points = 100 points possible). The calculation of the point total for each element will be completed in the following manner. The Excel file (<http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper3>) does these adjustments automatically, provided the formulas are not deleted from the cells.

If # of Sub-Elements is	Then Use This Formula
1	Sub-Element Sum x 2
2	Sub-Element Sum is final score
3	Sub-Element Sum divided by 15 x 10
4	Sub-Element Sum divided by 2
5	Sub-Element Sum divided by 25 x 10
6	Sub-Element Sum divided by 30 x 10
7	Sub-Element Sum divided by 35 x 10
8	Sub-Element Sum divided by 40 x 10
9	Sub-Element Sum divided by 45 x 10
10	Sub-Element Sum divided by 50 x 10

Use of the FSPCI in Developing an Action Plan

A summary of actions (internal) and external (assistance from the Office of Food for Development) that could help the program improve its capacity for each of the 10 core elements should be written up. Any additional points that the program wishes to focus on should be calculated and reported separately under element 11. Someone on the project team (usually the project coordinator) should be tasked with monitoring progress on the action plans.

Once the FSPCI and action plan are finalized they should be communicated to the country representative and then submitted to the Office of Food for Development (OFFD). Given the draft nature of the revised guidance, the head of the sub-working group reviewing and revising this tool and guidance (Ahmed Moussa N’Game) should also be copied on the submission. Within a relatively short period of time—usually less than a month—the team should have a written response to their FSPCI rankings and action plan.

Using the FSPCI Global and Element Scores to Track Impact on Capacity Building and Design Interventions

The overall FSPCI score can be used to observe trends for a particular Title II program. It is especially useful in: (a) determining what types of training new programs start and (b) minimizing the impact of turnover on program capacity (by helping to better orient new staff).

An improvement in FSPCI scores over time in one program may be followed by a dramatic dip in capacity due to staff turnover and other changes. Identifying these dips and developing an action plan for responding to the dip that can be shared with the headquarters office of the NGO is a sure sign of good program management. Turning in a perfect score that shows that nothing is weak and that there is a steady progression of capacity is usually a sure sign that the exercise is either not understood or isn't being administered properly.

References and Other Guidance

Africare. 2007. Guidance: How to Measure the Food Security Community Capacity Index (FSCCI). *Africare Food Security Review*, No. 2, September, <http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper2>. Washington DC: Africare.

Africare. 2004. *The Food Security Program Capacity Index (FSPCI)*. Unpublished Internal Guidance. Washington DC: Africare.

Africare. 2006. *The Food Security Program Capacity Index (FSPCI)*. Unpublished Internal Guidance. Washington DC: Africare.

McMillan, Della E. 2001. Africare Institutional Support Assistance Grant (ISA). 1998-2003. *Mid-term Evaluation*. July 16. Washington, DC: Africare.

McMillan, Della; Lee Thompson; Judy Bryson; Ange Tingbo; and Erika Tarver. 2004. *Africare Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Title II Programs Workshops*, Mozambique and Burkina Faso (April 2-30 and July 5-9, 2004). Washington DC: Africare.

Annex A

Africare Food Security Program Capacity Index Review Form

(Revised and Updated by the September 2007 Workshop in Niamey, Niger)

Part 1.

The table below (Part 1) is an image of the Excel file (Part 2: <http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper3>) that accompanies this guidance that can be used by Africare field staff for entering FSPCI rankings and automatically calculating the score. The Excel file has the necessary mathematical formulas embedded that will automatically update the score as data are entered. The image below is not active and numbers will not change; it is only meant to be an illustration of the way the FSPCI is calculated. This form can be printed out and data entered by hand prior to entering it electronically into the Excel file.

		Rankings 1-5 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)*			
Capacity Building Elements ()=sub-elements	Indicators	FY04 (ICB baseline)	FY06 (ICB mid-term)	FY07 (ICB Final Evaluation)	FY08 (ICB LOA)
1. M&E Capacity (4)	1.1 Measure community capacity to identify food security issues and design initiatives to address them using the FSCCI				
	1.2 Measure community food security using the MAHFP				
	1.3 Measure nutritional and health status				
	1.4 Create and execute a Food Security M&E Plan				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0
2. Capacity to Design, Implement and Analyze Baseline and Final Surveys (2)	2.1 Baseline Surveys				
	2.2 Final Surveys				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0

Elements (=sub-elements)	Indicators	Rankings 1-5 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)*			
		FY04 (ICB baseline)	FY06 (ICB mid-term)	FY07 (ICB Final Evaluation)	FY08 (ICB LOA)
3. Partnership Analysis and Negotiation (7)	3.1 General partnership				
	3.2 Partnership-Agricultural Sector				
	3.3 Partnership-Health/Nutrition.				
	3.4 Partnership-Collaborative Research				
	3.5 Partnership MOUs for key project components				
	3.6 Participation NGO councils				
	3.7 Participation district/sub-regional NGO coordinating councils				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0
4. Other Technical Skills (2)	4.1 Marketing				
	4.2 Anthropometric measurement				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0
5. Proposal Development, Results and Resource Request Reporting (4)	5.1 Proposals (programming)				
	5.2 Reporting: text portion				
	5.3 Reporting: financial sections				
	5.4 Reporting: IPTT tables				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0

Capacity Building Elements (=sub-elements)	Indicators	Rankings 1-5 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)*			
		FY04 (ICB baseline)	FY06 (ICB mid-term)	FY07 (ICB Final Evaluation)	FY08 (ICB LOA)
6. Orientation of Staff (2)	6.1 New national technical specialists and administrators in Title II field projects (PC, technical and M&E specialists, etc.)				
	6.2 New international technical specialists and administrators in Title II countries (CR, admin, etc.)				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0
7. Project Staff's Access to Critical Information (8)	7.1 Basic project bibliography				
	7.2 Project documents past and present				
	7.3 Staff access to internet				
	7.4 Staff access to email				
	7.5 Access to information about "best practice" from other Africare programs				
	7.6 Access to information about "best practice" from other Title II Cooperating Sponsors				
	7.7 Access to information about Africare colleagues/experts in other programs				
	7.8 Africare food security manual				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0

Capacity Building Elements ()=sub-elements	Indicators	Rankings 1-5 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)*			
		FY04 (ICB baseline)	FY06 (ICB mid-term)	FY07 (ICB Final Evaluation)	FY08 (ICB LOA)
8. Training Opportunities for Staff (2)	8.1 Distance learning activities				
	8.2 Inter-Africare Project Mentoring for Programming				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0
9. Ability to Analyze and Manage Risk (5)	9.1 Capacity of the program to backstop community-based early warning and emergency response systems				
	9.2 Existence of a formal project plan/strategy for assessing communities identify and cope with risks				
	9.3 Participation in local/regional early warning and response				
	9.4. Project capacity to assist community to access resources needed to respond to emergencies				
	9.5 HH vulnerability (based on the MAHFP) incorporated into technical outreach program				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	0	0	0	0

Capacity Building Elements ()=sub-elements	Indicators	Rankings 1-5 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)*			
		FY04 (ICB baseline)	FY06 (ICB mid-term)	FY07 (ICB Final Evaluation)	FY08 (ICB LOA)
10. Capacity to Identify and Address Risks Associated with HIV/AIDS (3)	10.1 Incorporation of HIV/AIDS across sectors				
	10.2 Level of HIV/AIDS collaboration with other service providers				
	10.3 Capacity to backstop community actions plans for PLWHA				
	ELEMENT TOTAL	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL FSPCI SCORE				0	
11. Other capacities (should be tracked and monitored separately to avoid confusion)					

Annex B

Suggested Rankings for each Indicator of the Africare Food Security Program Capacity Index (FSPCI)

(Note: There are 10 elements, 39 sub-elements, and a maximum score of 100 achievable by a food security program (not including element 11).

Element 1. Monitoring & Evaluation Capacity

Sub-Element 1.1: Capacity to use the FSCCI and other tools to measure community capacity to identify food security issues and design initiatives to address them and strengthen community capacity to manage risk.

1. No measurements conceptualized as part of IPTT or M&E plan.
2. Measurements conceptualized in the IPTT and M&E plan, but staff not familiar with how to carry the measurements out or analyze them.
3. Measurements (such as FSCCI) have been conducted on a fraction of project villages at least once with plans to extend this further.
4. Measurements of community capacity have been conducted and analyzed for all villages at least once AND are tracked in the IPTT OR exist for all villages, but measurements do not include the FSCCI.
5. Measurements of community capacity are conducted at baseline, mid-term, and final evaluation and/or annually for all project villages/communities AND measurements are comparable between Africare projects.

Sub-Element 1.2: Capacity to use the MAHFP to track project impact on food access and to identify vulnerable groups and the impact of project activities on vulnerability in the project intervention zone.

1. No measurements conceptualized as part of IPTT or M&E plan.
2. Measurements conceptualized in the IPTT and M&E plan, but staff not familiar with how to carry the measurements out or analyze them
3. The project IPTT includes the average number of months of adequate household food provisioning (MAHFP) and “% of households in the most food insecure category.”^{vi}
4. The project IPTT includes the average number of months of adequate household food provisioning (MAHFP) and “% of households in the most food insecure category” in the project IPTT;^{vii} AND the team is using the guidance for the indicator.
5. The project IPTT includes the average number of months of adequate household food provisioning (MAHFP) and “% of households in the most food insecure category”^{viii} AND the team is using a quantitative indicator to measure the MAHFP AND the team is using the MAHFP-PRA to measure vulnerable groups and risk management strategies for vulnerable groups.

Sub-Element 1.3: Capacity to measure nutritional and health status.

1. No measurements conceptualized as part of IPTT or M&E plan.
2. Measurements conceptualized in the IPTT and M&E plan, but staff not familiar with how to carry the measurements out or analyze them.
3. Measurements (of nutritional/health status of the population) have been conducted on a sample of project villages as part of the baseline surveys, but no follow-up measurements have been conducted.
4. Measurements of nutritional/health status have been conducted as part of the baselines AND routine monitoring has started in the project villages.
5. Measurements of nutritional/health status have been conducted as part of the baselines AND routine monitoring has started AND monitoring data is being analyzed and shared with partners and/or incorporated into project planning.

Sub-Element 1.4: State of the M&E plan.

1. M&E plan not yet conceived (only have the M&E draft plan in the DAP).
2. M&E plan designed by someone from Africare HQ and/or by an outside consultant/or by project M&E specialist, but little understanding of the plan by the project staff and not yet formally submitted/approved by USAID.
3. M&E plan exists AND staff are collecting the data and analyzing in ways that allow the project to monitor the project's activities for routine annual reporting.
4. M&E plan exists AND staff are collecting and analyzing the data in ways that allow the project to monitor the project's activities for routine reporting AND a subset of this M&E information is being used by the project to orient monthly and quarterly planning exercises by the staff.
5. M&E plan exists AND staff are collecting and analyzing the data in ways that allow the project to monitor the project's activities for routine reporting AND a subset of this M&E information is being used by the project to orient monthly and quarterly planning exercises by the staff AND staff are sufficiently conversant with the methods that they are able to train staff in other countries AND/OR reports generated by the M&E system are being shared with other national NGO and/or government partners in the region.

Element 2. Capacity to Design, Implement and Analyze Baseline and Final Surveys

Sub-Element 2.1: Baseline surveys.

1. All baseline surveys implemented and analyzed by external consultants or study not yet conducted (conducted before project started with almost no staff involvement).
2. Staff participated in baseline surveys, which were designed and implemented by external consultants.
3. Staff received technical assistance, but participated in all phases of design, implementation, evaluation, and write-up of baseline surveys led by an external consultant.
4. Staff received some Africare HQ technical assistance in design, but designed and implemented, and analyzed its own baseline survey at least once.
5. Staff received some Africare HQ technical assistance in design, but designed, implemented, and analyzed its own baseline survey at least once AND at least one technical specialist on the project team has participated in the design, implementation, analysis, and write-up of more than one baseline survey for another Africare food security project and/or have assisted another country with this.

Sub-Element 2.2: Final surveys (impact assessment).

1. Little familiarity with USAID guidelines regarding the requirements for final surveys OR there have been no final surveys.
2. Staff participated in a final survey of a project that was designed and implemented by external consultants.
3. Staff received technical assistance, but participated in all phases of design, implementation, evaluation, and write-up of final survey, which was led by an international consultant.
4. Staff received some Africare technical assistance in design, but designed, implemented, and analyzed its own final survey at least once.
5. Staff received some Africare technical assistance in design, but designed, implemented, and analyzed its own final survey at least once AND at least one technical specialist on the project team has participated in the design, implementation, analysis, and write-up of more than one final survey for another Africare food security project and/or has assisted another country with this.

Element 3. Partnership Analysis and Negotiation

Sub-Element 3.1: *Analysis of extent and relevance of general (all sectors) national and regional partnerships (and potential partnerships) with government and private institutions related to policies on education, health, and agriculture.*

1. No such detailed analysis exists for any of the sectors.
2. Analysis exists for one sector only (e.g., only for agriculture or only for health).
3. Analysis exists for more than one sector, but not all the sectors.
4. Analysis exists for all the sectors and includes identification of areas for collaboration (document outlining partnerships exists and is being shared with partners).
5. Analysis exists for all the sectors and includes identification of areas for collaboration AND many are occurring and are being monitored with the partners involved (i.e., documents monitoring partnerships exist and are being actively shared with partners).

Sub-Element 3.2: *Analysis of extent, relevance, and context (policy implications) of existing and potential agriculture/food security related partnerships (both government and private) (e.g., World Bank; International and National Agricultural Research Center programs for research, extension, etc.).*

1. No detailed analysis in original proposal or other project paper beyond mentioning that they exist.
2. Some limited discussion of current programs and potential areas of collaboration without explicit identification of partnerships in the MYAP annual results reports.
3. Identification of key areas and partnerships in project documents.
4. Identification of key partnerships in proposal and/or other documents that are based on a strong, sophisticated analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to current government and non-governmental increased agricultural productivity programs.
5. Potential partnerships are identified in key project documents and regularly monitored in project documents (CSR4's) AND meetings held in collaboration with the partners.

Sub-Element 3.3: *Analysis of extent, relevance, and context (policy implications) of existing and potential health and nutrition intervention related partnerships (both government and private)(e.g., UNICEF, World Bank, or UNDP).*

1. No detailed analysis in original proposal or other project paper beyond mentioning that they exist.
2. Some limited discussion of current programs and potential areas of collaboration without explicit identification of partnerships.
3. Identification of key areas and partnerships in project documents and a limited number of MOUs' have been signed to perform specific functions.
4. Identification of key partnerships in proposal that are based on a thorough written analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the health and nutritional status of the population, either by the team, a consultant, or as part of a workshop.
5. Potential partnerships are identified in key project documents and regularly monitored in project documents (CSR4's) AND meetings held in collaboration with the partners.

Sub-Element 3.4: *Analysis of the extent to which the FFD project has negotiated a two way collaborative research program with an international, national, or NGO to extend some food security enhancing technologies for crop production, improved storage, or improved processing. (Note that the simple receipt of seeds or technology does not constitute research unless some sort of analysis of the results was conducted and/or the results of this analysis reported back to the transfer agency.)*

1. No collaborative applied research.
2. Received technology from a NARC or an IARC that was demonstrated on-farm or on demonstration plots in project villages AND received technology from a NARC or IARC that was analyzed, but did not report back the findings to the agency that disseminated the technology and/or any other research network.

3. Received technology (e.g., seeds, recommendations regarding diguettes, new seeders, and new model for storage or processing) from a NARC or IARC AND analyzed the results AND sent reports to the agency and/or relevant research network.
4. Have developed formal MOU (memorandum of understanding) or other types of formal collaboration with an IARC or NARC to test and or adapt a new technology.
5. Based on collaboration defined in a MOU, field research results have been shared with IARC or NARC for follow-on trials at the research station levels.

Sub-Element 3.5: Signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) for execution of key project components (e.g., Agreements with National Agricultural Research Centers, International Agricultural Research Centers, government ministries and offices, other NGOs, or US or African universities).

1. Some limited identification of potential partners in proposal and/or other project documents, but analysis needs deepening/strengthening before embarking on partnerships/MOUs.
2. Some limited identification of potential partners in proposal and/or other project documents resulted in signed MOU partnerships (or formal collaborative structures); however they were ill-conceived and/or did not work out.
3. Project has conducted a fairly comprehensive analysis of potential governmental and NGO partners that is resulting in informal collaboration between the partners that is helping to implement specific project activities and/or activities that complement the project.
4. Project has conducted a fairly comprehensive analysis of potential governmental and NGO partners AND this has resulted in at least one successful signed MOU and a series of other types of informal collaboration between the partners that is helping to implement specific project activities and/or activities that complement the project.
5. Project has conducted a fairly comprehensive analysis of potential governmental and NGO partners AND this has resulted in two or more successful signed MOUs as well as other types of informal collaboration between the partners that is helping to implement specific project activities and/or activities that complement the project AND information about the results of these partnerships (for both partners) are being shared among partners.

Sub-Element 3.6: Participation in national NGO coordinating councils.

1. No active, documented participation by either national office or project office staff in either national or regional NGO coordinating councils.
2. Africare belongs to one or more national coordinating council in that country, but no one person on the staff has attended meetings for the councils regularly during the last two years.
3. Africare belongs to one or more national coordinating councils in the country AND one or more staff members is tasked with attending these meetings and keeping notes.
4. Africare belongs to one or more national coordinating councils in the country AND one or more staff member is tasked with attending these meetings and keeping notes AND OFFD project staff receive a written and verbal debriefing on broad national and regional-level activities of other NGOs in the country and in their region.
5. Africare belongs to one or more national coordinating councils in the country AND one or more staff members tasked with attending these meetings and keeping notes AND OFFD project staff receive a written and verbal debriefing on broad national and regional-level activities of other NGOs in the country and in their region AND project staff (such as the project coordinator) are sometimes allowed/ encouraged to attend these national level meetings where they are introduced and describe what the project is doing.

Sub-Element 3.7: Participation in district/sub-regional level NGO coordinating councils (and or district level planning councils).

1. No active, documented participation by OFFD project staff in district or sub-region level NGO coordinating councils or planning boards.
2. Africare belongs to one or more district/wubregional level planning council/NGO, but no one person on the staff has attended meetings for the council regularly during the last two years.

3. Africare belongs to one or more district/sub-region level planning councils AND one or more staff members are tasked with attending these meetings and keeping notes, which are shared with other staff.
4. Africare belongs to one or more district/sub-regional level planning councils/NGOs AND one or more staff members are tasked with attending these meetings and keeping notes AND Africare uses these as a mechanism for keeping current and actual partners apprised of its activities, results, and concerns in the region.
5. Africare belongs to one or more district/sub-regional level planning councils/NGOs AND one or more staff members are tasked with attending these meetings and keeping notes AND Africare uses these as a mechanism for keeping current and actual partners apprised of its activities, results, and concerns in the region AND other FFD project staff receive a written and verbal debriefing on broad national and regional-level activities of other NGOs, bilateral and multilateral donors in the country and in their region during some of the staff meetings convened during the year.

Element 4. Other Technical Skills

Sub-Element 4.1: Analysis of marketing opportunities and constraints within the project zone in general and especially in areas where project interventions are designed to increase food security.

1. No marketing analysis planned as part of project.
2. Market analysis planned, but not yet implemented.
3. Regional marketing specialist, OFFD Africare, or outside technical assistant has worked with team to conduct an initial analysis of marketing constraints/opportunities, but there is no regular monitoring of the process as part of the project, although this type of monitoring is planned.
4. Technical specialist and/or extension agent(s) tasked with gathering and analyzing regular market data as part of the project M&E system.
5. Technical specialist and/or extension agent(s) tasked with gathering and analyzing market data as part of the project M&E system AND project activities are in place to disseminate this information in ways that increase program impact.

Sub-Element 4.2: Anthropometric measurement and nutritional monitoring.

1. No measurements exist on IPTT of current project (it is not being monitored).
2. Measurement exists on IPTT table OR was added based on the recommendation of a midterm, but there is no or limited internal capacity to measure it.
3. Baseline measurements and/or identification of impact and monitoring indicators done by outside consultant (or ministry of health) or Africare HQ with staff receiving some rudimentary training to assist with study.
4. Staff received sufficient training to conduct and analyze the baseline measurements with small amounts of Africare and non-Africare technical assistance.
5. Basic training of technical specialists and extension staff conducted AND baseline measurements conducted and analyzed AND follow-up measurements being gathered and analyzed as part of M&E program AND results of this analysis being shared with colleagues in the ministry of health and other relevant partners.

Element 5. Proposal Development, Results and Resource Request Reporting

Sub-Element 5.1: Proposals (programming).

1. No experience with writing a Title II proposal among the current staff; proposal was written by an outside team.
2. Individual staff participated in the preparation of the proposal for the currently funded project, but the leadership for the writing came from outside the project or from Africare HQ.

3. The majority of the technical specialists on the currently funded project have participated in the preparation of a proposal for a food security project with the major technical assistance/leadership for proposal preparation coming from Africare HQ's regional and/or OFFD.
4. The majority of the technical specialists on the currently funded project have participated in the preparation of a proposal for a food security project with the major technical assistance/leadership for proposal preparation coming from the country representative, project coordinator, or project staff, Africare HQ's regional and/or OFFD and staff on the current project AND some members of the food security project (not country rep) staff have prepared proposals for non-Title II funding that would complement the Title II project.
5. The majority of the technical specialists on the currently funded project have participated in the preparation of a proposal for a Title II project with the major technical assistance/leadership for proposal preparation coming from the country representative, project coordinator, or project staff, Africare HQ's regional and/or OFFD and staff on the current project AND some members of the Title II project (not country rep) staff have prepared proposals for non Title II funding that would complement the food security project AND at least one non-Title II project proposal prepared by the project has been funded.

Sub-Element 5.2: Reporting through writing text portion of annual results and resource requests.

1. Neither project coordinator nor technical assistants associated with the project have experience with writing the results report or the resource request.
2. Country director was the primary person responsible for writing the project proposals and resource requests, but the majority of rewriting and final editing was done in Washington at HQ.
3. Country director (with input from the project coordinator) is/was the primary person responsible for preparing the resource request/results report with extensive input from OFFD, but final editing of multiple revisions (incorporating input) resting with the country director's office.
4. Project coordinator (and technical specialists of project) is/are the primary person(s) responsible for preparing the resource requests/results report drafts sent to OFFD during the FY in question with major input on revision provided by the country director and HQ.
5. Project coordinator (and technical specialists of project) is/are the primary person(s) responsible for preparing the resource requests/results report drafts sent to OFFD during the FY in question with major input on revision provided by the country director and very minor input from OFFD.

Sub-Element 5.3: Reporting financial activities.^{ix}

1. Neither the project coordinator nor the technical assistants associated with the project have experience with writing the CSR4.
2. Country representative for the NGO is the primary person responsible for writing the financial sections of the project proposals and resource requests, but the majority of changes and finalization was done in the NGO's HQ office.
3. Country representative for the NGO (with input from the project coordinator) is/was the primary person responsible for preparing the resource request/results report financial sections with extensive input from the NGOs HQ office, but final editing of multiple revisions (incorporating input) rests with the country director's office.
4. Project coordinator and technical specialists of project are the primary persons responsible for preparing the financial sections of the resource requests/results report drafts sent to OFFD, but these sections still require major editing and revision by the NGO country representative and HQ office to comply with official guidance.
5. Project coordinator and technical specialists of project are the primary persons responsible for preparing the financial sections of the resource requests/results report drafts sent to NGO's HQ Office. Although the NGO's country representative or head of programming may review these, the financial sections of these reports generally don't require extensive editing before they are submitted.

Sub-Element 5.4: Reporting IPTT tables.

1. No one on the staff, including the project coordinator, has enough understanding of the IPTT table to use it as an effective tool for writing quarterly and annual reports.
2. The project coordinator and a few of the staff are familiar with the IPTT table, but are just beginning to be able to use the IPTT as a tool for presenting the project.
3. Project coordinator and technical specialists use IPTT in project M&E discussions and presentations, but could benefit from more information on the restrictions/options for modifying the IPTT.
4. Project coordinators, technical specialists, and extension staff have a good general understanding of the IPTT and its role in their reporting.
5. Project coordinators, technical specialists, and extension staff has a good general understanding of the IPTT and its role in their reporting AND technical specialists are conversant enough with the form to analyze the data needed to update the IPTT in reports and write sections of a technical report that inform/are informed by the IPTT.

Element 6. Orientation of Staff to Specificities of Title II Programming

Sub-Element 6.1: Quality and effectiveness of orientation of new national technical specialists and administrators.

(Please rank the adequacy of the orientation being given to people during the different time periods. Note that one goal of the ICB is to strengthen training by providing "canned" curricula to the OFFD staff that they could use in training staff.)

1. No orientation (verbal or written) usually given on this aspect of the Title II programs during general orientation.
2. Verbal orientation that cross references some written materials on this topic was given largely on an as-needed basis during the course of the project.
3. New staff member(s) given a fixed period of time in which to be provided a broad overview on this topic during their orientation by a staff member designated for that purpose. Instruction was on an "as-available" basis mixed in with other types of orientation activities.
4. New staff were presented with a written curricula of materials/issues that they needed to be familiar with as part of their involvement in the OFFD programs AND this curricula referred to written materials they were provided AND position descriptions that describe roles of the person, background materials needed to oversee a Title II program, and critical professional networks (for Title II programming in the project intervention area and/or the country) exist and are used in orientation.
5. New staff were presented with a written curricula of materials/issues that they needed to be familiar with as part of their involvement in the food security programs AND this curricula referred to written materials they were provided AND position descriptions exist and are used in orientation AND project has developed a system for verifying the quality/impact of the orientation packet (such as ranking staff by level of understanding) AND monitoring the impact of the training on project efficiency and effectiveness.

Sub-Element 6.2: Orientation of new international technical specialists and administrators (at the level of the project or the country office).

1. No orientation (verbal or written) usually given on this aspect of the Title II programs during orientation.
2. Verbal orientation that cross references some written OFFD materials on this topic was given largely on an as-needed basis during the course of the project.
3. New staff member(s) given a fixed period of time in which to be provided a broad overview on this topic during their orientation by a staff member designated for that purpose. Instruction was on an "as-available" basis mixed in with other types of orientation activities.
4. New staff were presented with a written curricula of materials/issues that they needed to be familiar with as part of their involvement in the OFFD programs AND this curricula referred to

- written materials they were provided AND position descriptions that describe roles of the person, background materials needed to oversee a Title II program, and critical professional networks (for Title II programming in the project intervention area and/or the country) exist and are used in orientation.
5. New staff were presented with a written curricula of materials/issues that they needed to be familiar with as part of their involvement in the OFFD programs AND this curricula referred to written materials they were provided AND position descriptions that describe roles of the person, background materials needed to oversee a Title II program, and critical professional networks (for Title II programming in the project intervention area and/or the country) exist and are used in orientation AND the program has developed a system for verifying the quality/impact of the orientation packet (such as ranking staff by level of understanding) AND monitoring the impact of the training on project efficiency and effectiveness.

Element 7. Project Staff Access to Critical Information

Sub-Element 7.1: Basic project bibliography (list of written documents of project that follows standard form for references used by USAID and UN system).

1. No complete, written bibliography on project activities past/present is available.
2. A partial written bibliography on project activities past/present exists, but is not widely known/accessed by the staff.
3. Each technical specialist has prepared a bibliography of project activities (past and present) of the technical component that they supervise that is written in a standard bibliographic form (i.e., author, date, title, place of publication, publisher/organization publishing) AND these technical bibliographies are compiled for the entire project with separate subsections by technical component.
4. Each technical specialist has prepared a bibliography of project activities (past and present) of the technical component that they supervise that is written in a standard bibliographic form (i.e., author, date, title, place of publication, publisher/organization publishing) AND these technical bibliographies are compiled for the entire project with separate subsections by technical component AND the bibliographies are widely known and used by all staff and regularly (biannually or annually) updated.
5. Each technical specialist has prepared a bibliography of project activities (past and present) of the technical component that they supervise that is written in a standard bibliographic form (i.e., author, date, title, place of publication, publisher/organization publishing) AND these technical bibliographies are compiled for the entire project with separate subsections by technical component AND the bibliographies are widely known and used by all staff and regularly (biannually or annually) updated AND the updated versions of the bibliographies are regularly sent to OFFD, which makes them available in a central form to all the other Title II projects.

Sub-Element 7.2: Project documents past and present.

1. No central base of project documents that is regularly monitored and cross-referenced to a project bibliography exists.
2. A central documentation center exists, but is poorly monitored and poorly cross referenced to the project bibliography.
3. A library of project documents (hard copy) exists AND is overseen by the project coordinator.
4. A library of project documents (hard copy) exists AND is overseen by the project coordinator and/or other technical specialists who supervise the team that updates the bibliography and the collection regularly AND the project has completed a CD and/or hard drive copy of these documents (electronic versions) as a backup AND all of the technical assistants associated with the project are familiar with the existence of the documentation centers (electronic and hard copy).
5. A library of project documents (hard copy), that is fairly complete, exists AND is overseen by the project coordinator and/or other technical specialists who supervise the team that updates the bibliography and the collection regularly AND the project has completed a CD and/or hard drive version of these documents (electronic versions) as a backup AND all of the technical assistants

associated are familiar with the existence of the documentation centers (electronic and hard copy) AND these documents and bibliographies are organized so that someone from another program could email a request to the project coordinator for a document on a particular subject and/or reference from the bibliography and then receive an electronic version of the document via email from the project site and/or country office.

Sub-Element 7.3: Staff access to internet resources.

1. Staff access to internet almost non-existent.
2. Access to internet limited due to somewhat reliable phone lines, but there is a huge expense for internet time which requires project administrators to restrict individuals' access to internet.
3. Good access to internet resources due to reliable phone lines and relatively inexpensive connection fees, but only for one project computer, which means that project has to restrict access to that computer, which is usually designated for this purpose. Usage concentrated among members of the staff.
4. Good access to internet resources due to reliable phone lines and relatively inexpensive connection fees, but only for one project computer, which means that project has to restrict access to that computer, which is usually designated for this purpose AND usage is widespread among all technical specialists and even some extension staff, but primarily to access email accounts.
5. Good access to internet resources due to reliable phone lines and relatively inexpensive connection fees, but only for one project computer, which means that project has to restrict access to that computer, which is usually designated for this purpose AND usage is widespread among all technical specialists and even some extension staff for email accounts AND several staff have used the internet as a tool in the last year to research technical issues related to their programs and shared this information with their colleagues.

Sub-Element 7.4: Staff access to email.

1. Email access almost non-existent due to lack of reliable phone lines.
2. Access to email limited due to huge expense of internet time which requires project administrators to restrict individuals' access to internet.
3. Good access to internet resources due to reliable phone lines and relatively inexpensive connection fees but project has to restrict access on one project computer that is usually designated for this purpose AND internet is used by about 1/2 of the staff members.
4. Good access to internet resources due to reliable phone lines and relatively inexpensive connection fees but project has to restrict access on one project computer that is usually designated for this purpose AND usage is widespread among all technical specialists and even some extension staff, but primarily for personal emails.
5. Good access to internet resources due to reliable phone lines and relatively inexpensive connection fees but project has to restrict access on one project computer that is usually designated for this purpose AND usage is widespread among all technical specialists and even some extension staff for email accounts AND several staff have used the internet as a tool in the last year to communicate with Africare colleagues in other countries about information that has improved the efficiency and impact of project interventions.

Sub-Element 7.5: Access to information about "best practice" from other Africare programs (programming).

1. Almost no information regarding best practices is shared by other Africare programs.
2. Small amounts of information gained largely from the country director, project director, or Africare food security manual.
3. Technical specialists in all the major project components have some basic information on "lessons learned" from other Africare Title II programs that are relevant to their technical area thanks to informal and formal exchanges between programs and OFFD (facilitated by workshop).
4. Technical specialists in all the major project components have some basic information on "lessons learned" from other Africare Title II programs that are relevant to their technical area thanks to

- informal and formal exchanges between programs and OFFD AND some of these "lessons learned" for program design, implementation, and M&E from other donor programs have been implemented and have had a positive impact on this program's efficiency and impact.
5. Technical specialists in all the major project components have some basic information on "lessons learned" from other Africare Title II programs that are relevant to their technical area thanks to informal and formal exchanges between programs and OFFD AND some of these "lessons learned" for program design, implementation, and M&E from other programs have been implemented and have had a positive impact on this program's efficiency and impact AND some of the "lessons learned" from this program's success/failures have been used to inform the design, implementation and M&E of another Africare project in another country.

Sub-Element 7.6: Access to information about "best practice" from other cooperating sponsors (programming).

1. Almost no information is available for that country regarding best practices from other cooperating sponsors.
2. A limited amount of information about best practices from other cooperating sponsors is available through Africare guidance on project design and implementation and/or through active participation with other NGO's.
3. The technical specialists in this project have access to some of the documents being produced by Washington-based working groups which distill lessons learned from the different FFP cooperating sponsor programs through the Africare working groups (mostly in English).
4. The technical specialists in this Africare Title II project have access to some of the documents being produced by the technical working groups (in Washington) which distill lessons learned from the different FFP cooperating sponsor programs through the Africare working groups (mostly in English) AND some of the specialists are aware of the documents from FANTA and how to request copies of these documents from FANTA.
5. The technical specialists in this Africare Title II project have access to some of the documents being produced by the technical working groups (in Washington) which distill lessons learned from the different FFP cooperating sponsor programs through the Africare working groups (mostly in English) AND some of the specialists are aware of the documents from FANTA and how to request copies of these documents from FANTA AND the staff are informed about the activities of the other FFP cooperating sponsors in that particular country and lessons learned from these experiences through various members participating in various inter-NGO networking groups for that country and/or inter-project visits and/or workshops/training sessions.

Sub-Element 7.7: Access to information about Africare colleagues/experts in other programs (programming).

1. Almost no access to information about other Africare Title II programs (outside this country) their training, technical background, or expertise in project design or administration.
2. Some limited access to information about OFFD staff, but almost nothing on other Africare Title II programs (outside the country) in Africa aside from informal meetings with staff from other programs at Africare meetings.
3. Some limited knowledge about and exchange of personnel from other Africare programs in response to requests for technical assistance in project design, implementation, and M&E that reinforces the informal exchanges between programs at Africare regional and Africare OFFD seminars.
4. Increasing formalization of exchange of information between programs by means of creation of a Title II staff directory (draft) AND creation of technical networks that unite technical specialists from different programs with OFFD and HQ regional staff.
5. Increasing formalization of exchange of information between programs by means of creation of a Title II staff directory (draft) AND creation of technical networks that unite technical specialists from different programs with OFFD and HQ regional staff AND creation of a centralized data bank that includes resumes (c.v.'s) and a Title II staff directory that are updated regularly and available (via internet and/or CD) to all project staff and/or projects.

Sub-Element 7.8: Africare food security manual.

1. No manual at project site in local administrative language.
2. Manual exists, but the majority of the technical specialists and administrators have not read it although individuals may have consulted it as part of the preparation of their M&E plans and/or reports.
3. All technical specialists/administrators at the project site have access to the Africare food security manual.
4. All technical specialists/administrators at the project site have access to the Africare food security manual AND use it regularly in the development of M&E plans and reports.
5. All technical specialists/administrators at the project site have access to the Africare food security manual AND use it regularly in the development of M&E plans and reports, AND are sufficiently familiar with the proposed techniques to critique them based on their experience in this particular project.

Element 8. Training Opportunities for Staff

Sub-Element 8.1: Distance learning activities.

1. No access by staff to distance learning activities.
2. Access to some information, but no one is engaged in the distance learning.
3. Access to information AND at least two members of staff engaged in some type of distance learning and/or certificate accreditation.
4. Access to information AND at least two staff members engaged in distance degree granting courses.
5. Access to information AND at least one staff member has received some sort of certificate/degree from a distance learning institution/program.

Sub-Element 8.2: Inter-Africare Project-Mentoring for programming.

(To what extent has project benefited from technical assistance/training by a staff member from another field project for programming [i.e., not from headquarters and not for monetization].)

1. No training ever provided.
2. Staff have communicated between Africare programs or between HQ and field project regarding specific technical issues and/or reporting.
3. At least one on-site visit from a staff member of another Africare project that has provided broad based "on the job" training for the project.
4. Two or more on site visits from staff members of other Africare projects have provided broad based "on the job" training for the project.
5. Two or more on site visits from staff members of other Africare projects OR a major workshop have provided broad based "on the job" training for the project AND the projects linked by these individuals continue to maintain communication (via key individuals) that helps improve project impact, efficiency, and prospects for sustainability.

Element 9. Ability to Analyze and Manage Risk

Sub-Element 9.1: Capacity of the program to backstop community-based early warning and emergency response systems.

1. Program has no capacity with early warning systems and is not aware of any CS-specific or non-CS tools for helping build this capacity.
2. Senior staff is aware of various tools that communities can use to build their capacity for early warning and response systems (such as the revised FSCCI guidance), but have not engaged in this.

3. Senior staff have trained field agents in the use of tools, such as the revised FSCCI guidance, to help communities build their capacity to identify potential risks and to develop plans for dealing with risk and shocks if they occur.
4. Senior staff have trained field agents in the use of tools, such as the revised FSCCI guidance, to help communities build their capacity to identify potential risks and to develop plans for dealing with risk and shocks if they occur AND these plans are regularly monitored by the project administration.
5. Senior staff have trained field agents in the use of tools, such as the revised FSCCI guidance, to help communities build their capacity to identify potential risks and to develop plans for dealing with risk and shocks if they occur AND these plans are regularly monitored by the project administration AND the project has helped coordinate responses to problems identified by these plans/early warning systems.

Sub-Element 9.2: Existence of a formal project plan/strategy for assisting communities in identifying and coping with risks.

1. Project has an oral plan (for helping communities identify and cope with different types of risk and shock and/or for developing and managing a community-based early warning and response system), but has no capacity to implement the plan.
2. Written plan exists, but no community capacity was built (training of leaders, associations, and/or committees).
3. Written plan exists AND preparations were made AND community capacity was built, but no monitoring systems exists.
4. Written plan exists AND preparations were made AND community capacity was built AND a monitoring system exists.
5. Written plan exists AND preparations were made AND community capacity was built AND a monitoring system exists AND annual review of all aspects of the plan is carried out and discussed with entire staff.

Sub-Element 9.3: Participation in local and regional early warning and response networks.

1. No senior project staff participates in the regional networks that exist for monitoring risk and responding to shocks in the project area.
2. Project staff participate sporadically in regional networks that exist for monitoring risk and responding to shocks in the project area.
3. Project staff are official members of the most important local, regional, and (when appropriate) district level networks that exist for monitoring risk and responding to shocks.
4. Senior project staff are active members (i.e., have or currently hold leadership roles) of the most important local, regional, and (when appropriate) district level networks that exist for monitoring risk and responding to shocks AND have helped coordinate the network's response to community-based problems in their project villages, as well as (if relevant) non-project villages.
5. Senior project staff are active members (i.e., have or currently hold leadership roles) of the most important local, regional, and (when appropriate) district level networks that exist for monitoring risk and responding to shocks AND have helped coordinate the network's response to community-based problems in their project villages, as well as (if relevant) non-project villages AND this participation in the local and/or regional networks has helped identify ways to strengthen the project's own early warning systems.

Sub-Element 9.4: Project capacity to assist community to access resources needed to respond to emergencies.

1. No capacity/strategy for organizing emergency response has been developed.
2. When crises/emergencies are identified these are responded to on a case-by-case basis.
3. The project has organized protocols (agreements) with at least one emergency program (such as the World Food Program or other donor-funded reserve food banks) that it can, in theory, access during emergencies, but this has just started.

4. The project has organized protocols (agreements) with at least one emergency program (such as the World Food Program or other donor-funded reserve food banks) that it can access during emergencies and this system has functioned well for at least one year.
5. The project has organized protocols (agreements) with two or more emergency programs (such as the World Food Program or other donor-funded reserve food banks) that it can access during emergencies and this system has functioned well for at least one year AND there is an operational M&E plan.

Sub-Element 9.5: *Household vulnerability (based on the MAHFP or other criteria for vulnerability) is incorporated in technical outreach program and M&E strategy for these technical outreach programs.*

1. No discussion or analysis of vulnerability in project documents or strategies.
2. The concept of vulnerability is discussed in project strategies (for agriculture, health/nutrition/HIV/AIDS, food access, etc.), but no systematic means of measuring it or assessing the impact of specific strategies is outlined other than tracking the “% of households in the most food insecure category” (based on the MAHFP), which is calculated for the entire project.
3. The concept of vulnerability is discussed in project strategies and the project trains villages to use the MAHFP-PRA to identify vulnerable groups, current risk management strategies, and ways that the risk management strategies (for specific groups) could be strengthened by project interventions.
4. The concept of vulnerability is discussed in project strategies and the project uses the MAHFP-PRA to identify vulnerable groups, current risk management strategies, and ways that the risk management strategies (for specific groups) could be strengthened by project interventions AND the results of this analysis are discussed with senior project managers as part of the annual planning process and in annual reports.
5. The concept of vulnerability is discussed in project strategies and the project uses the MAHFP-PRA to identify vulnerable groups, current risk management strategies, and ways that the risk management strategies (for specific groups) could be strengthened by project interventions AND the results of this analysis are discussed with senior project managers as part of the annual planning process and in annual reports AND this discussion has led projects to reorient technical strategies in order to better address vulnerability.

Element 10. Capacity to Identify and Address Risks Associated with HIV/AIDS

Sub-Element 10.1: *Incorporation of HIV/AIDS across technical sectors.*

1. No work plan exists to incorporate HIV/AIDS messages across technical sectors.
2. Work plan developed to incorporate HIV/AIDS messages across technical sectors.
3. Training provided to all project staff to incorporate HIV/AIDS messages across technical sectors.
4. At least 50% of all technical outreach strategies are revised to incorporate HIV/AIDS messages.
5. 100% of all technical outreach strategies are revised to incorporate HIV/AIDS messages AND results are monitored.

Sub-Element 10.2: *Level of HIV/AIDS collaboration with other service providers.*

1. Field staff knows where to access up-to-date HIV/AIDS technical information at an organization or facility within the country.
2. Field staff work informally with a person or organization for each technical area of HIV/AIDS (VCT, Home-based care, peer education, and treatment).
3. Protocols negotiated with at least one HIV/AIDS service provider within the program area to share technical information.
4. Protocols negotiated with two HIV/AIDS service providers within the program area, including joint field missions and pooling of resources.

5. Collaboration between Africare and HIV/AIDS service provider includes joint funding to support on-going field work.

Sub-Element 10.3: *Capacity to backstop community action plans for PLWHA.*

1. Field staff have not had any special training to help them facilitate community-based action plans for HIV/AIDS.
2. The PRA process used to identify food security problems and potential risks and shocks considers HIV/AIDS, but no action plan for Persons Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) is required or monitored.
3. The standard PRA process used to identify food security problems and risks includes special targeting of assistance for PLWHA.
4. The standard PRA process used to identify food security problems and risks includes special targeting of assistance for PLWHA AND these action plans are updated annually and discussed publicly.
5. The standard PRA process used to identify food security problems and risks includes special targeting of assistance for PLWHA AND these action plans are updated annually and discussed publicly in the communities and with other area service providers AND the project has facilitated networking with other HIV/AIDS service providers within the program area to respond to these needs.

Sub-Element 10.4: *Project capacity to train staff in HIV/AIDS awareness messages.*

1. Staff have not been trained in delivering HIV/AIDS awareness messages.
2. All technical and extension (e.g., community-based or working in the community) staff have received one basic training, but there is no systematic plan to update this training in order to train new staff and retrain existing staff.
3. The project has a plan for baseline training and annual updates of training in HIV/AIDS awareness messages.
4. The project has a plan for baseline training and annual updates of training in HIV/AIDS awareness messages AND the training messages are adapted to staff needs (in order to respond to misconceptions and/or emerging needs).
5. The project has a plan for baseline training and annual updates of training in HIV/AIDS awareness messages AND the training messages are adapted to staff needs (in order to respond to misconceptions and/or emerging needs) AND the project has facilitated networking with other HIV/AIDS service providers within the program area to conduct these training programs.

Element 11: Other New Capacities Being Developed by the Specific Project or the ICB (tracked separately)

Africare will complete a series of new financial modules in FY08. Once these modules are completed, various variables can be added for teams to self-assess their familiarity with and use of the modules. To facilitate comparisons between years, these capacities should be tracked a part from the main FSPCI under Element 11. Other capacities that are new and/or specific to a project may be tracked here as well.

Sub-element 11.1. *Knowledge and ability to report on the Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ) indicators.*

1. Technical staff and project administrators not aware of SAPQ indicator requirements.
2. Staff have seen the requirements, but play no direct role in filling them out (CR or OFFD does).
3. Staff have seen the requirements AND have experience completing the form at the project site.
4. Staff have seen the requirements AND have experience completing the form at the project site AND have incorporated forms to collect the data into their project M&E system.

5. Staff has seen the requirements AND have experience completing the form at the project site AND have incorporated forms to collect the data into their project M&E system AND the system works well so that routine reporting on these indicators is done entirely at the project site.

Sub-element 11.2. Staff capacity for and understanding of pre-evaluation planning.

(NOTE for new projects—i.e. projects that have not yet been evaluated—the capacity/understanding of the concept and its potential is being ranked.)

1. Staff have no experience with pre-evaluation planning and don't understand the concept.
2. Staff have heard of the concept, but has never organized a pre-evaluation mission on their own or with a consultant or someone from HQ (*or for new projects*) and would be hard placed to organize one on their own.
3. Staff understand the concept of pre-evaluation planning and how it can help make evaluations more effective AND have organized a pre-evaluation mission for a mid-term or final evaluation (on their own or with the assistance of a consultant) OR (*for new projects*) understand the concept sufficiently well to work it into the timeline and planning process of an evaluation.
4. Staff understand the concept of pre-evaluation planning and how it can help make evaluations more effective AND have organized a pre-evaluation mission for a mid-term or final evaluation OR (*for new projects*) are aware of the critical guidance (like the ARC/CRS pre-evaluation training module) that can help them prepare.
5. Staff understand the concept of pre-evaluation planning and how it can help make evaluations more effective AND have organized a pre-evaluation mission for a mid-term or final evaluation OR (*for new projects*) are aware of the ARC/CRS pre-evaluation training module (and have a copy of it) AND have organized a pre-evaluation exercise using the standard tables recommended in the module so that updates at a later date will be easier.

Sub-Element 11.3. Staff understanding of and familiarity with the themes and information associated with the financial training modules being developed by the Africare Food Security Management Working Group.

0. No experience or knowledge of the financial training modules.
1. Familiar with the modules, but no one from the CR or field project is aware of what they are likely to contain.
2. One person in the country program participated in the design of the modules, but this person has not debriefed other members of the program.
3. Staff is familiar with the proposed modules and who in the country program is going to be working on one or more of them.
4. Relevant staff have been trained on at least one of the financial modules.
5. Relevant staff have been trained on all of the financial modules.

Recommended Citation Format

Africare. 2007. Draft Guidance: How to Measure the Food Security Program Capacity Index. *Africare Food Security Review*, No. 3, September, <http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php#paper3>. Washington DC: Africare.

Africare Food Security Review
Managing Editor: Leah A.J. Cohen

Editorial Advisors: Della E. McMillan, Harold V. Tarver, and Bonaventure B. Traoré
<http://www.africare.org/news/tech/ASFR-intro.php>

For comments or questions about this series please contact Office of Food for Development at Africare/Washington at offd@aficare.org.

ⁱ This revision of the FSPCI was conducted by a joint committee of the Africare Food Security Monitoring and evaluation Working Group and the Africare Food Security Management Working Group during a USAID/FFP workshop in Niamey, Republic of Niger, September 2007. This joint committee was chaired by **Ahmed Moussa N'Game** (Africare/Burkina Faso). He was assisted with the revision of the health/nutrition/HIV/AIDS indicators by **Della E. McMillan** (Consultant, Africare/Headquarters) a sub-committee of the Africare food security health/nutrition/HIV/AIDS working group that included **Alassane Aguilu** (Africare/Mali) and **Aklou Sidi Sidi** (Africare/Niger). It is this team that is overseeing the final revisions, as well as monitoring staff feedback on the tool. For additional information contact the director of the Africare/Headquarters Office of Food for Development (OFFD), offd@africare.org.

The current guidance is the third major revision of Africare's FSPCI guidance since 1999. The original version of the guidance was developed by **Della E. McMillan** in conjunction with the mid-term evaluation of the Africare ISA (Institutional Support Assistance) grant. During the final evaluation of the ISA (in 2003) the number of sub-elements for element 6, Orientation of Staff, was reduced. During two ICB workshops in 2004 (in Burkina Faso and Mozambique) the field staff identified two new elements (9 and 10). Based on feedback from the field, the joint committee (of the Africare Food Security M&E and Management Working Groups) recommended reworking some of the sub-elements in 9 and 10 that focused on community based changes rather than changes in the program administration and technical staff. A small number of other changes were made to specific rankings to make them clearer. It is the 2007 revision that is presented here.

ⁱⁱ USAID/FFP did not require either impact indicators or an IPTT (Indicator Performance Tracking Table) in the original guidance for the grant.

ⁱⁱⁱ See FSCCI guidance in this series for more information on that tool (Africare 2007).

^{iv} As a result of this identified threat, the FSPCI guidance has been translated into French.

^v Regulation 11 also called Reg. 11 is the compilation of all the principles that guide the execution of projects sponsored by Title II resources with USAID/FFP (i.e., the do's and the don'ts, program implementation, monetization, how to handle food losses, reports submission, legal rights of the PVOs, obligation of the US government). OMB Circulars are Office of Management and Budget instructions to federal agencies (see <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/index.html>).

^{vi} Formulation of this indicator changed in October 2007 to incorporate minimum package recommended by the Niger workshop and new USAID/FFP requirements.

^{vii} Formulation of this indicator changed in October 2007 to incorporate minimum package recommended by the Niger workshop and new USAID/FFP requirements.

^{viii} Formulation of this indicator changed in October 2007 to incorporate minimum package recommended by the Niger workshop and new USAID/FFP requirements.

^{ix} Monetization reporting is rated separately as part of the monetization capacity indexing exercise.