



# ETHIOPIA STAFF AND PARTNER EFSA CAPACITY ANALYSIS

SOMALIA REGION, ETHIOPIA (ONLY)

Skills Gap Analysis  
and  
Recommendations

Prepared by Jeremy Loveless, SKAT Consultancy

February, 2007

© World Food Programme, Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN) & Ethiopia Country Office

The opinions and views contained in this report reflect those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme.

**United Nations World Food Programme**

Headquarters: Via C.G. Viola 68, Parco de' Medici, 00148, Rome, Italy

*This document has been produced with financial assistance from the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.*

## **Contents**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Current Assessment and Monitoring Practice</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Improvement of Assessment Methodologies</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Capacity of WFP and Partners</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Training Needs</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6. Training in Jigjiga and God</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. Recommendations</b>	<b>11</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the observations, conclusions and recommendations from my visit to Ethiopia between 30<sup>th</sup> January and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007. A detailed itinerary is included in the Annex to the report, but (briefly) the schedule was as follows:

- Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> January to Monday 5<sup>th</sup> February: Addis Ababa.
- Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> February to Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> February: Jigjiga.
- Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> February to Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> February: Gode.
- Monday 19<sup>th</sup> February to Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> February: Addis Ababa.

The original objective of the mission was to help the Country Office with preparation for an assessment in Somali Region in late February or early March. This would have included:

- Identification of key issues.
- Input into the assessment design.
- Training of WFP staff and partners who would participate in the assessment.

The mission was changed at the last minute because of Government reservations. The Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Agency (DPPA) questioned the need for assessment training, on the basis that Save the Children (SC) are already undertaking training in the Household Economy Approach (HEA).

The mission objectives were therefore adjusted to include the following:

- Recommendations for improved assessment, including collaboration with partners.
- Appraisal of the capacity of WFP and its partners to undertake assessment and monitoring.
- Recommendations for training of WFP staff.
- Provision of training to WFP field staff, as appropriate.

***The focus of this mission was assessment in Somali Region.*** Analysis and recommendations are based on these parameters.

## 2. CURRENT ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING PRACTISE

This section provides a brief account of the ways in which assessment and monitoring are currently applied in Somali Region.

### 2.1 Seasonal assessment

The main determinants of food security (and hence DPPA/WFP food aid response) are the bi-annual seasonal needs' assessments. These take place after the Deyr and Gu rains (November and June respectively). The process in Somali Region is as follows:

- DPPA at federal level designs the methodology and passes it to the regions.

- DPPA appoints assessment team leaders. Often these people are insufficiently skilled, are not Somalis and are not familiar with Somali Region.
- Assessment teams are set up. These consist of representatives of a variety of organisations (WFP, SCUK etc.). In some cases personnel have little relevant expertise and are included in the team simply to demonstrate “collaboration” and “buy-in”.
- Assessment teams receive little or no training on the methodology devised by DPPA.
- Assessment teams meet with regional, zone and woreda officials, who provide information about the situation in their respective areas. From this information, priority kebeles are identified and visited.
- Field assessment is undertaken using a checklist, with sections on weather; water; pasture; livestock; crops; markets; income sources; human health; coping mechanisms; relief food; and prospects for the coming year.
- Teams draw conclusions about whether the situation in each kebele is better, the same, or worse than the previous year.
- Judgement is applied to determine the number of people who should be added or subtracted from the previous year’s food aid beneficiary list; no rigorous methodology is used to determine this figure.
- Hence the “needy population” is defined.
- The teams’ recommendations are submitted to the woreda, zone, and regional administrations.
- If the administrations do not agree with the teams’ recommendations, they enter a process of negotiation whereby each party justifies their position.
- If the disagreement still cannot be resolved, the issue is referred to the DPPA in Addis Ababa.
- DPPA produces final figures for the needy population; these do not always accord with those submitted by the regions.

The assessment involves a variety of governmental, UN and non-governmental agencies. It therefore has a fair degree of “buy in”. However, there are significant weaknesses:

- Assessment teams do not receive training before the assessment.
- There is no system for estimating numerical data. The previous year’s food-aid beneficiary list is used as a baseline from which the current year is judged to be better, worse, or the same. The quantity by which this year’s beneficiary list differs from that of last year’s is determined by the teams on the basis of speculation.
- Such a system is vulnerable to compound errors. If the original beneficiary list is inaccurate, every subsequent list will also be inaccurate.
- The system is food-aid orientated. The starting point is the question: “how many people should get food-aid this year?”

The weakness of the assessment approach makes the negotiation of beneficiary numbers especially difficult. Without a robust method for estimating needs, the assessment teams do not have a strong argument to balance against those of the political authorities.

## 2.2 WFP food aid monitoring

WFP employs 8 field monitors in Somali Region (3 in Jigjiga, 5 in Gode). Their job is to monitor the distribution and use of food aid, and to provide regular situation analysis. During the visits to Jigjiga and Gode, the activities of the monitors were observed in the field. Extensive discussions were held with the monitors in order to understand their perceptions and opinions.

When the monitors visit the field they collect the following information:

- Quantity of food aid received and how it is distributed. This is crosschecked at different levels: woreda, district, food distribution committee, beneficiaries.
- Situation analysis: pasture and livestock conditions; crop production; health; water; markets
- Observations of particular sub-groups within the population (e.g. IDPs).

Information is compiled in a narrative report after each visit.

The field monitors do a good job of collecting information. However they are working within a system that does not work effectively. For example:

- District authorities often report figures for food distribution that differ from those reported by the beneficiaries. Monitors report these discrepancies to the DPPB but nothing changes, even if problems are persistent. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to see the point in monitoring.
- There is an impression that information goes into a “black hole”; lots of information is collected but not much use is made of it.
- There may be a danger of assessment fatigue. Continually asking the same questions to the same people (district officials and food distribution committees) may result in deterioration in the quality of the information.

The monitoring system is supposed to evaluate the impact of food aid. At present, at the household level, impact seems to be low. Whilst food aid allocations are based on the “needy population”, blanket distribution is normally applied (everyone receives food). This means that the quantity of food received by vulnerable people is often too small to make a meaningful contribution. Some suggest that food aid has a positive impact, in that it stabilises markets and keeps prices down. This seems to be the case, at least in the period immediately following a distribution. However, several people interviewed during the field trips indicated that food aid has a negative effect on farmers’ incentive to produce. This is a complex issue that merits in-depth analysis. *The forthcoming review of market data is therefore highly pertinent.*

It would also be interesting to look into the sharing culture that exists within Somali communities. It is often claimed that this culture ensures that vulnerable people receive help, even when targeting systems do not function. This issue is crucial to food aid effectiveness. If, as Stephen Devereux suggests (“Vulnerable Livelihoods in Somali Region” IDS, 2006), the sharing culture is declining among Somali communities, the implications for food aid would be serious: with no targeting and no sharing, the access of vulnerable people to food aid would be severely curtailed.

### 2.3 DPPB/SCFUK early warning

Save the Children have been working on early warning systems in Somali Region since 2001. These systems utilise Household Economy baselines, and indicators that are monitored regularly against these. Monthly and quarterly food security reports are produced for the zone. These briefly cover: water, pasture and livestock conditions; human health; market analysis; specific crises (e.g. floods); and predictions for the future.

Technically the system is good, but SCUK report that its effectiveness has been constrained by lack of capacity within DPPB (SCUK's partner in the project). SCUK are working on the capacity issue with the DPPB. Meanwhile, they are updating their baselines and monitoring indicators. *It is recommended that WFP engage actively with this process.* A monitoring approach that is coordinated between SCUK, DPPB, and WFP has great potential.

## **3. IMPROVEMENT OF ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES**

### 3.1 Long term developments

There is a consensus within the Government and amongst international agencies that the existing assessment methodology is not good enough. Donors now question the data that is used to justify appeals for food aid. Such concerns are warranted, as the above discussion shows.

In recognition of the problem the Government has, over the last few years, worked closely with SCUK and USAID to develop a standard assessment and monitoring methodology. The result has been the adoption of the Household Economy Approach (HEA) as the official food security assessment methodology. This has been extensively tested in SNNPR and is now being introduced in Tigray. Ultimately the Government plans to apply this methodology in all regions. In Somali Region, HEA will almost certainly form the basis for the next Gu assessment in June 2007.

WFP have reservations about HEA. These include:

#### ***HEA demands a high level of expertise, and is analytically "heavy".***

This is true. However, the number of people who need to have full HEA training is small. Moreover, it must be recognised that any effective assessment methodology will be complex. Analysis in an area like Somali Region is difficult; there is no quick fix here. HEA is food-access orientated and does not encompass other issues of interest such as water supply, health services, education etc.

Also true. But HEA is a methodology designed to address food access; like other specialist methodologies, it cannot be expected to provide analysis of all issues. A constructive approach would be to look at the ways agencies are currently addressing other important issues, and see how their analyses can complement HEA (for example, the nutritional surveillance carried out by the Ministry of Health, UNICEF, and Save the Children).

### ***HEA is not statistically rigorous***

HEA does not depend upon a statistically relevant sample. In an area like Somali Region this is an advantage; it would be impossible to gain such a sample in the region as a whole (it would be possible in small, clearly defined areas such as IDP camps). Indeed, HEA was developed in part to address the impracticality of implementing traditional survey approaches in this type of environment.

There is validity to each of WFP's concerns. HEA does not cover all information needs. However, WFP seems to be engaging with the process rather late. As explained above, the Government has already adopted HEA as its preferred methodology and WFP is therefore presented with a "fait accompli". Although WFP was involved with the debate at the start, over the last few years the organisation disengaged and cannot now expect to change the Government's position.

This is not to say that there is no room for methodological development. There is scope to find complementarities between HEA and other assessment systems. Possibilities include:

- Consolidation of information from other sectors with that produced by HEA within a common framework.
- Development of complementary food security assessment systems (for example, household surveys in IDP camps).

WFP is urged to pursue these options through the "Methodology Task Force" that has been established within the "Early Warning Working Group". This task force includes DPPA, WFP, FEWS NET, SCUK, OCHA, and FAO.

It is recommended that WFP embrace the HEA for the following reasons:

- It is appropriate to Somali Region, which represents precisely the type of environment for which HEA was designed.
- It provides an effective (though imperfect) solution to the problems inherent in the existing methodologies.
- HEA has been officially adopted by the Government; it would be difficult (if not impossible) for WFP to implement a parallel assessment and monitoring methodology.

Endorsement of HEA does not mean that WFP should abandon its legitimate concerns about the approach. By engaging with other organisations, WFP can put itself in the position of change-agent, rather than reluctant observer.

### **3.2 Immediate needs**

There is an urgent need for an improved methodology that can be applied at the next Gu assessment in Somali Region. It is expected that the DPPA will select HEA as the basis for this assessment. Within the HEA framework there is scope for variation and the most appropriate application of the approach must be defined. There may also be a need to supplement the HEA activities with assessment methods that capture other aspects of the

situation and needs' analysis. The Methodology Task Force should address these questions immediately. The 3-month time frame (assuming that this begins in March) is tight. However, a substantial improvement over the existing methodology could be achieved in this time and the Gu assessment would give an opportunity to test the new approach. Subsequently, further adaptation could be applied in time for the Deyr assessment in November.

SCUK, in collaboration with the Food Economy Group, plan to run 2 training sessions in Jigjiga in preparation for the Gu assessment:

- April/May: HEA utilisation.
- June: HEA methodology.

*It is highly recommended that all field monitors from both Jigjiga and Gode attend these training sessions.*

## **4. CAPACITY OF WFP AND PARTNERS**

### **4.1 WFP**

The capacity appraisal was done in the sub-offices of Jigjiga and Gode. The focus was on those staff members who are most closely involved with assessment and monitoring: the programme assistants and field monitors. All of these people demonstrated high levels of commitment, enthusiasm, and professionalism. They are eager to improve their skills.

However, the programme assistants and field monitors work within a system that does not allow them to contribute to their full potential. For example:

- The bi-annual needs' assessment is methodologically flawed (see above). It is designed and managed at the Federal level and WFP field staff members currently have little influence over the process.
- A lot of information is collected but much of it is not used. Monitors explain that when they report leakage of food aid no change is made in the allocation process.

These two examples illustrate the limits of the influence of field staff; even if their skills are improved they will still be working within an imperfect system.

### **4.2 WFP partners**

Within the time available it was not possible to undertake a full appraisal of the capacity of WFP's partners. Discussions were held with the two main partners in Somali Region: the Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau (DPPB) and Save the Children UK (SCUK).

- DPPB works closely with WFP and SCUK. Both organisations second people to DPPB. In general, DPPB lacks financial and human resources (hence the need for secondments). SCUK identified DPPB weaknesses in the implementation of the Early Warning System. Several people mentioned the issue of staff turnover within DPPB. Apparently this is high, meaning that new people constantly have to learn the

system anew. Apparently some of the DPPA staff appointed to the seasonal assessments lack the requisite skills.

- SCUK have a strong capacity in the field of HEA. They provide most of the resources for the baseline and monitoring system that is currently in the process of deployment in Somali Region.

## 5. TRAINING NEEDS

The WFP programme assistants and food monitors have a high capacity for further training. With such training and strong support from management they could take on significantly more responsibility with regard to assessments. They have a good general understanding of assessment, but there are gaps in their knowledge. For example, their limited experience of assessments makes it difficult for them to appraise a context and apply the appropriate assessment methodology. At present the field staff feel that they have little influence over assessment design and planning. This impression is justified, as the bi-annual needs' assessments are planned at the Federal level and then instructions are issued to the regions and zones.

The first step towards the development of a comprehensive training programme is the improvement of the operating environment. This includes:

- Definition of assessment methodology.
- Improvement of the assessment system, including empowerment of staff members based in Somali Region (e.g. by making them team leaders during seasonal assessments).

Within this framework, the skills of WFP staff members and partners could be developed. A "capacity building strategy" was developed during this mission; draft 2 of the strategy is included in the annex to this report.

## 6. TRAINING IN JIGJIGA AND GODE

Training needs were discussed extensively with the Jigjiga staff; the assessment approaches currently used were appraised; and the work of the food monitors was observed in the field. Hence topics relevant to the WFP field staff were identified and a schedule was developed. The schedule for the Jigjiga training is shown below. In Gode, training issues were discussed with the staff, who agreed that the Jigjiga schedule would suit their needs. There were some slight variations in the Gode programme (indicated in ***bold italics*** in the table below).

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Reason for inclusion Contents of the session</b>	<b>Sessions (FTK*)</b>
Assessment planning	Demonstrate the importance of planning an assessment systematically <i>Planning process – choice of methodology – information needs</i>	4.1, 4.2
Ways of collecting information	Explain the differences and relative merits of alternative approaches to information collection <i>Qualitative and quantitative approaches – questionnaires and semi structured interviews</i>	4.1
Fieldwork principles  <b><i>Not included in Gode because not very useful in Jigjiga</i></b>	Present some key operating principles that should be observed during all assessments <i>Consultation – disaggregation – reliability of information – bias – marginalisation – trends – unexpected issues – holistic analysis – use of information - timing</i>	
Sampling	Explain different approaches to sampling and their application (this is one of the key issues for assessment in Somali Region) <i>Definitions – random sampling (simple, systematic, cluster) – purposive sampling – use of probability and non probability sampling</i>	4.4
Field information collection tools	Introduction of some assessment tools <i>Proportional piling – pair-wise ranking – calendars – food frequency and diversity</i>	
Analysis	Describe the process of analysis and give some advice on practical problems faced in Somali Region <i>Descriptive, causal, and temporal analysis + response options – estimation of the number of people in need</i>	4.1

		<b><i>In Gode a brief introduction to Household Food Security Profiling was given (intended for Jigjiga but time expired)</i></b>	
Household Economy Analysis		Introduction to the basic principles of HEA (this is becoming institutionalised by the Ethiopian government as the official assessment approach)  <i>Outcome analysis – 5 steps of HEA – food energy units – collecting the information – checking the accuracy</i>	6.3

\* Facilitators' Toolkit

The training lasted for 1½ days in each location. Of course this did not allow time to go into any of the subjects in depth. The approach taken was as follows:

- Subjects were addressed in broad terms. The intention was to introduce ideas and processes, rather than to provide a step-by-step guide to assessment.
- The sessions were based on 2-way communication and continual reference to the real issues faced by the staff members during their work.
- Participants were continually asked to explain concepts in their own words and to provide examples from their experience.
- Sessions included numerous exercises during which participants were able to practise tools and familiarise themselves with ideas.

From the perspective of the facilitator, both training programmes were extremely satisfactory. All of the participants were enthusiastic and debates were lively and stimulating. However, the limitations of such a short programme must be recognised.

*These programmes provide a platform for further training; they should be followed up with regular in-depth training and practise in the field.*

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides recommendations for action by WFP

### 7.1 Assessment methodology: short-term

- Work with the Methodology Task Force to ensure that an improved assessment methodology is developed in time for the next Gu assessment (June 2007).
- Empower staff based in Somali Region by giving them a role in the design and management of the next Gu assessment.
- Ensure that the members of assessment teams have relevant skills.

### 7.2 Assessment methodology: long-term

- Embrace the HEA; act as change-agent within the HEA system.
- Identify other assessments that provide complementary information to that collected through HEA; where necessary design additional assessment systems.

- Working with partners, develop an integrated information system. This should provide a common framework within which the information from different assessments (HEA, nutrition, water etc.) can be compiled.

### 7.3 Monitoring

- Merge WFP monitoring activities with those of SCUK and DPPB. Collaborate with these agencies in the definition of Indicators.
- Lobby DPPB and DPPA to ensure that monitoring is linked to action (i.e. problems identified during monitoring lead to a response).

### 7.4 Training: short-term

- Working with partners, develop a training programme for the Gu assessment (June 2007).
- Send all WFP field monitors (Jigjiga and Gode) on the SCUK/FEG HEA training in Jigjiga in April/May and June

### 7.5 Training: long-term

- Develop a comprehensive training programme in line with the approved assessment methodology (see strategy in Annex 2 of this document).

## ANNEXES

### Annex 1: Itinerary and people met

Date	Location	People met
30 January	Addis Ababa	Sonali Wickrema* Elliot Vhurumuku*
30 January	Addis Ababa	Methodology Task Force
31 January	Addis Ababa	Rainier van Hoffen* (SCF coordinator, livelihood and nutrition information systems) Demeke Eshete (SCF advisor, food security information systems) Esayas Tadiwos (SCF advisor, household economy analysis)
1 February	Addis Ababa	Sarah Wilson (ICRC economic security coordinator) Jürg Eglin (ICRC deputy head of delegation)
	Addis Ababa	Jane MacAskill (Livelihood Integration Unit, chief of party)
2 February	Addis Ababa	Abdi Abdulahi, Alistair Scott-Viliers (Pastoral Communication Initiative)
5 February	Addis Ababa	Methodology Task Force
6 February	Addis Ababa - Harar	Travel
7 February	Harar Jigjiga	Travel
	Jigjiga	Mahamed Barud* (WFP, field monitor)
	Jigjiga	Abdulahi Mahamed (DPPB, deputy head) Bashir Sheik (DPPB, food security specialist) Ahmed Omar (DPPB, disaster prevention and preparedness deputy head)
8 February	Kebribeyah	Mohamed Ahmed Hajir*, Mowlid Abdi* (WFP, field monitors)
	Jigjiga	Abdifatah Ahmed (SCF, senior project manager, early warning)

9 February	Jigjiga	Abdirahman Kassim (WFP, programme assistant)
	Jigjiga	Ahmed Abdirahman (SCF, zonal food security officer)
10 February	Harshin	District officials and food distribution committee
	Lankeyrta	District officials and food distribution committee
12 February	Jigjiga	Frederick Asamoah* (WFP, head of sub-office)
		Preparation for training
13 February	Jigjiga	Training (head of sub-office, programme assistants, food monitors)
14 February	Jigjiga	Training
15 February	Jigjiga Gode	- Travel
	Gode	Nadia Badr (WFP, head of sub-office), Ahmed Abdi (WFP, programme assistant), Ahmed Ibrahim, Mustafa Abdullahi, Mohamed Mohamud, Mohamed Aden, Shukri Mohamud (WFP, field monitors)
	Gode	Ahmed Waco (Pastoral Communication Initiative)
16 February	Bohol Xagare	Woreda and district officials
	Malkasalax	Elders and community members
	Gode	Training (head of sub-office, programme assistants, food monitors)
17 February	Gode	Training
18 February	Gode – Addis Ababa	Travel
19 February	Addis Ababa	Mark Lawrence (Food Economy Group)
20 February	Addis Ababa	Sue Lautze (The Livelihoods Programme)

\* first of numerous meetings

## **Annex 2: Capacity building strategy**

### **ETHIOPIA CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY: DRAFT 2** **(22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007)**

#### **1. Note on terminology**

Throughout this document the term “assessment” should be understood to include both assessment and monitoring.

#### **2. Basis of the project**

The standard of assessment in Ethiopia is currently unacceptable. This is the consequence of:

1. Lack of consistency in the application of technical standards.
2. Inadequate levels of skills amongst people managing and implementing assessments.

As a response to these problems the Government of Ethiopia is now institutionalising standard assessment processes. This is being done in collaboration with key stakeholders such as WFP and Save the Children.

Once assessment approaches have been defined, the issue of skills will assume paramount importance. The staff-members of WFP and other partners will need to be trained in the application of the assessment methodologies.

This project will address the capacity building and training needs of WFP and its partners with regard to assessment. The project will be run as a collaborative venture, with full involvement of the Government and other stakeholders.

The project is planned for an initial one-year period. However, if full potential is to be achieved, it is expected that total project duration will be 2-3 years.

#### **3. Project objectives**

- To improve the quality of assessments through skills development.

#### **4. Project outcomes**

- Establishment of a system that provides continual training and support and is specific to the Ethiopian contexts.
- Staff members (WFP and partner) attain high-level assessment skills.

#### **5. Project stages**

The project will be run in three stages:

Stage 1: Clarification of assessment and monitoring methodologies

This is essential in order to identify the training needs. Whilst the details of the methodology will vary from assessment to assessment, the broad framework should be consistent.

- It is suggested that assessments be grouped in three categories: *seasonal assessment; rapid assessment; and monitoring.*

The development of standard methodologies is already underway, via the working group. It is hoped that substantial progress will have been made by the time of the Gu assessment (June 2007).

#### Stage 2: Appraisal of existing capacities and identification of skills' gaps

Having decided upon the methodologies to be used, the capacity of key stakeholders (WFP and partners) to *implement* those methodologies must be appraised. This will lead to the identification of *skills' gaps*.

#### Stage 3: Design of training programme(s)

Training programmes will be developed on the basis of the skills' gaps. The training activities of partner organisations will be taken into account: duplication will be avoided and complementarities will be sought. It is probable that a series of trainings will result, as a consequence of the variety of capacities and needs within WFP and partners.

### **6. Training philosophy**

This project aims to ensure context-relevant training. This means that lessons should be directly applicable to assessments undertaken in Ethiopia by WFP and its partners. Initially, this will be ensured through Stage 2 of the project (section 5). Thereafter, it will depend upon a continuous process of feedback from field-staff and managers and consequent adjustments to the training activities. Workshop training will *always* be followed up by practise in the field; hence the importance of including mid-level managers in the training schedule (section 7). A series of workshops is envisaged, with 4-6 month intervals between each. This can be characterised as follows:

- Training → practise → training → practise ..... and so on, as required.

### **7. Levels of training and awareness building**

Five levels of training and awareness building are planned:

1. **High-level awareness building.** This will be done at the start of the project with the objective of achieving "buy in" from key decision-makers. Senior management from WFP (Country Office, Region, Headquarters) will engage with counterparts from the DPPA and other partners, possibly through a one-day workshop in Addis Ababa. The outcome will be commitment to the project amongst all relevant agencies.
2. **Management training.** It is vital that mid-level managers, particularly in the sub-offices, are fully aware of the project and its objectives. These are the people who will drive the process, by ensuring that: training needs are accurately defined; appropriate staff members receive training; and lessons are incorporated in daily operations. Managers will be trained in the broad principles of assessment and will be given guidance on ways in which staff members can apply these. This training will probably involve an initial one-week workshop in Addis Ababa. Approximate

number of trainees: 11 heads of sub-office, 5 managers from Addis Ababa, and 10 partners.

3. **Practitioner training.** This is the comprehensive training that will be given to people who will actually manage and implement assessments. The ultimate outcome will be the establishment of a cadre of people with full competence in assessment practise. In order to achieve this goal, it is probable that a series of workshops will need to be combined with extensive on-the-job training. The process will probably take 1-2 years. Separate training programmes will take place at each sub-office, with all field monitors and programme assistants participating, as well as representatives of DPPB and other partners (approximately 20 people per workshop).
4. **Enumerator training.** The nature of this training will be dictated by the assessment methodologies that are established (Stage 1, section 6). This is the training that is given to field-staff before each specific assessment. Typically, it would involve 2-5 days training within 2 weeks of the start of fieldwork.
5. **Thematic training.** There are certain skills that are not required by all assessment personnel. For example: market analysis and quantitative data analysis. Gaps in these skills will be highlighted and appropriate recipients for training will be identified.

## **8. Human resources**

The project will be managed by a full-time Project Manager. This person will have the following responsibilities:

- Work with DPPA and other partners to define training needs, taking into account the training programmes of partners.
- Undertake capacity analysis of WFP and partners.
- Develop location-specific training material and schedules for sub-offices according to the philosophy outlined in section 6 of this document.
- Disseminate information about the training programme.
- Recruit and manage consultants as necessary.
- Run training sessions personally and through consultants.
- Work with the heads of sub-office and partners at field level (e.g. DPPB) to ensure that all assessment trainees get the chance to practise their skills during their daily work, and are appraised accordingly.
- Develop systems for performance appraisal and feedback to ensure that progress is monitored, and that lessons are shared and documented.
- Take overall responsibility for the capacity-building programme and ensure that it meets its objectives.

This person will have the following key attributes:

- Strong management and interpersonal skills.
- Facilitation and training skills, including design and management of training programmes.
- A thorough understanding of food security and assessment, and current debates within these disciplines (preferably with experience in Ethiopia / Horn of Africa).

The Project Manager will report to a committee consisting of the head of the Programme Coordination Unit, the Head of the VAM Unit, and other staff members as appropriate. The

role of the committee will be to ensure that the project is implemented as planned and to act as a point of reference for the Project Manager.

Wherever possible, resources will be mobilised from within the Ethiopia Country Office. If training needs can be covered using existing personnel, this is the preferred approach. However, given existing workloads, it is predicted that the capacity to respond internally will not be substantial. Therefore much of the initial training will be provided by personnel from the Headquarters and Regional Office, and by external consultants.

The medium-term objective (within 2 years) will be to gradually move away from dependency on external human resources. This will be done through a “training of trainers” programme, whereby 5-10 local staff members will be trained to provide ongoing support within the Country Office.

For the first year of the project, the following staff requirements are anticipated:

<b>Position</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Role</b>
Project Manager	1 year, full-time	Overall responsibility for ensuring that project objectives are met, and that resources are allocated correctly.
Administrative assistant	1 year, full-time	Provide all necessary administrative support to the Project Manager.
Consultant (WFP-internal and/or external)	20 person-weeks	Capacity appraisal and skills' gap analysis.
	20 person-weeks	Design and implementation of training workshops.
Driver	52 person weeks	Transportation of project staff.

The calendar on the next page gives details of project implementation.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>
Awareness-raising (senior management)												
Assessment design												
Recruitment of Project Manager												
Deployment of Project Manager												
Recruitment/deployment of consultants												
Capacity and skills' gap review												
Design of training												
Management training												
Practitioner training												
On-the-job training												

