Community-Level Program Information Reporting for HIV/AIDS Programs

Tools and Processes for Engaging Stakeholders

Module 2: Rapid Situation and Needs Assessment

MEASURE Evaluation is a MEASURE program project funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) through Cooperative Agreement GHA-A-00-08-00003-00 and is implemented by the Carolina Population Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, in partnership with Futures Group, ICF Macro, John Snow, Inc., Management Sciences for Health, and Tulane University. The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States government.

November 2010 **MS-10-40-M2**

MEASURE Evaluation
www.cpc.unc.edu/measure

Acknowledgments

CLPIR is presented as a "beta" version, a work in progress that continues to evolve based upon users' experiences. The current version has been shaped by stakeholder input and field testing in several countries and is a culmination of lessons learned from the review of community-level HIV programs and information systems from several countries.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments ii

Introduction 1

Orientation to CLPIR's Module Design 1

Intended Users of Module 2 1

Assessment Objectives 1

Methods and Tools 2

Three Phases 3

Conducting a Rapid Assessment 5

Phase 1: Pre-assessment 5

Phase 2: Stakeholders' Workshop 5

Phase 3: Post-assessment 12

Appendix A: Rapid Situation and Needs Assessment Discussion Guide 13

Appendix B: Types of Community-Level Information Systems 23

Appendix C: Form for Developing an Action Plan 25

Introduction

The Community-Level Program Information Reporting for HIV/AIDS Programs (CLPIR) rapid situation and needs assessment component applies a simple, participatory methodology to understand the environment in which community-level information systems operate, determine a desired situation, identify gaps, and define an action plan. The assessment should help foster an understanding of what works, and build upon that understanding. The proposed assessment can be applied at national or sub-national levels to build a shared vision of the kind of a community-level program reporting and monitoring system stakeholders are seeking. In the process of answering questions on what is the current situation and what it should ideally become, gaps and solutions are identified that lead to a formulation of a plan for building or strengthening a national/sub-national information system.

Orientation to CLPIR's Module Design

The purpose of the CLPIR tool kit is to provide countries with the tools and material resources they need in order to build or strengthen an information system to collect, report, store, analyze and use information from community-level HIV/AIDS programs. CLPIR is organized into five documents — an introduction booklet and separate documents for each of four modules. This module (module 2) explains the rapid situation and needs assessment process (module 1 contains the CLPIR tools, module 3 addresses the indicator harmonization process, and module 4 involves program-level rollout).

Intended Users of Module 2

This assessment guide is designed to provide the necessary direction and supporting materials to the CLPIR steering committee (or a task force of the steering committee). The task force is charged with leading the planning, organizing, and facilitating the assessment. In general, a rapid needs and situation assessment should be highly participatory, involving host country government agencies, donors, and implementing partners supporting community-level HIV/AIDS programs. If deemed appropriate, additional stakeholders should also be invited to participate.

Assessment Objectives

The objectives of a rapid situation and needs assessment are to:

- determine the status of community-level information systems at national/sub-national level;
- if a system exists, determine gaps in performance of the existing system, ; and
- formulate an action plan to build or strengthen a national/sub-national information system for community-level programs that is appropriate for the country context.

The assessment should take about two days (the exact time frame will depend upon the agenda that is set. During the planning process, the assessment task force should review the objectives and develop an agenda that meets the specific needs of the country context.

Methods and Tools

The assessment is a multifaceted process that uses information from several sources, including observations and discussions with stakeholders. Qualitative information from participants on their perceptions, opinions, and desires are collected using a structured stakeholder discussion. The approach of using an issue-based guide, as opposed to general exploratory guide, is expected to offer relatively quick feedback on the status of the system, identify and build upon what works, and address identified gaps.

One way to assess an information system is to deconstruct it into its characteristic features and components. While doing the formative research and fieldwork that led to the development of the CLPIR tool kit, many of the systems for community-level HIV/AIDS programs that were observed shared common features or characteristics. These common features (found in Appendix A) have been used as the basis for developing a structured discussion guide for the assessment.

Common elements and components that have been observed in community-level program information systems include:

- a host country government's national/sub-national strategic plan and monitoring and evaluation framework for HIV/AIDS programs;
- degree of harmonization and national/sub-national agreement on indicators for community-based HIV/AIDS programs;
- data collection, reporting tools, and procedures used by various community-based HIV/AIDS programs;
- degree of collaboration among donors supporting community-based programs and the host country government in the production and use of HIV/AIDS information;
- degree of decentralization of the health system and degree to which local units or authorities address issues related to community-based HIV/AIDS programs;
- degree of collaboration between donor-supported implementing partners (IPs) and local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), and community-based organizations (CBOs) to implement community-based HIV/AIDS programs;
- degree of collaboration between local NGOs, CBOs, and FBOs and local government units or authorities;
- role of donor-supported IPs in managing and implementing community based HIV/AIDS programs; and
- degree of autonomy among local NGOs, FBOs, and CBOs to manage and implement community-based HIV/AIDS programs.

Other areas of assessment that may be co-opted to complement a rapid assessment, depending on country context and resources, include organizational capacity assessments, data quality assessments, and an assessment of information-use constraints.

The existence of these characteristics within an information system will depend on many factors. These include the stakeholders that were involved in developing the system, the needs that the system was developed to address, and the processes by which the system was developed. Unfortunately, systems to meet the accountability needs of a donor are too often developed unilaterally, without broad stakeholder participation. This leads to the development of parallel systems and a lack of coordination at the national and sub-national levels. A more sustainable option is a system that is developed with broad stakeholder participation that synchronizes and harmonizes the data and accountability needs of multiple stakeholders. This type of system is more desirable not only from a national and sub-national coordination point of view, but also from a service provider point of view, because it streamlines the reporting burden and, consequently, may improve data quality and use of information at the service delivery and program levels.

The task of building or strengthening a national or sub-national information system is not one that can be accomplished quickly. It is a long-term process that will involve careful planning and implementation over a period of time. The rapid situation assessment component is the first step of a longer planning process.

Three Phases

Rapid situation and needs assessment for community-level information systems is conducted in three phases — pre-assessment, assessment through a stakeholders' workshop, and post assessment.

The first phase, pre-assessment, involves:

- establishing an assessment task force and structure;
- identifying potential uses of the assessment (specify its goals, objectives, tasks);
- identifying stakeholders; and
- determining strategies and information collection methods.

The stakeholder's workshop phase involves:

- adapting a group discussion guide (the guide in Appendix A);
- collecting data on the situation, desired outcome, and gaps;
- analyzing and prioritize gaps; and
- determining solutions and drawing an action plan.

The final phase, post-assessment, involves:

- translating solutions and plans into policy;
- communicating assessment results; and
- collaborating with advocacy groups to foster policy support for implementation.

Outputs from this process include completing a current situational analysis, identifying gaps and solutions for addressing such gaps in a community-level monitoring and reporting system, developing an action plan for each solution, and developing a post assessment follow-up plan.

Conducting a Rapid Assessment

Phase 1: Pre-assessment

The pre-assessment phase is the first of three phases in conducting a CLPIR rapid situation and needs assessment. The following steps are recommended during this phase.

Establish an assessment task force and structure: The CLPIR steering committee or smaller task force should take the lead in planning and executing the assessment. Right from the start, it will be important to be clear about the structure of the team that is coordinating the assessment, including identifying the specific individuals who will be responsible for directing day-to-day operations.

Identify potential uses of the assessment — specify goals, objectives, tasks: Even though this guide stipulates the goals and objectives of the assessment, the assessment task force has to embrace them. In the initial stages, the task force will need to undergo a process of making sure the members understand and agree upon the goals, objectives, and uses of what they want to do. They will do this by answering questions such as, "Why are we doing an assessment?" "Who will be involved?" and "How will the results be used?"

Identify stakeholders: The task force will identify the stakeholders who will be part of the assessment. Keep in mind that the more participatory the approach is from the beginning, the easier it will be to get buy-in from stakeholders who will be involved in the systems building/ strengthening plan. Stakeholders identified to take part in the assessment need to be invited well in advance, to help ensure their attendance. The process of identifying who should take part is a complex one and sometimes the most political. To ensure that the process has the necessary credibility, it is important to maintain an open door policy, at least during early stages of the process.

Determine strategies and information collection methods: Consistent with ensuring that this process remains rapid, some comparative needs have been determined based on literature and consultations with experts. These elements form the basis for the structured guide found in Appendix A. Depending on a country's situation, the guide can be adapted to consider additional areas of need (subject to available time, resources, and staff).

At this stage, different methodological and operational strategies will be addressed, including how the stakeholder workshop will be organized and managed, how the sessions will be run, how to manage conflicts, and how to reach consensus.

Phase 2: Stakeholders' Workshiop

The actual data collection takes place in a workshop setting consisting of the invited stakeholders identified in the pre-assessment stage. The workshop typically is conducted over two days in four sessions (a total of about 12 hours). A description of each session follows.

Session 1: Review the Assessment Objectives and Outcomes

Session objectives: By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

- explain the purpose of the rapid situation and needs assessment;
- state the expected outcomes of the assessment; and
- discuss reasons why it is important to strengthen the collection, reporting, storage, analysis, and use of information from community-level HIV/AIDS programs.

Exercise 1.1: Review Meeting Objectives, Agenda, and Expected Outcomes

Recommended time: Thirty minutes.

Materials needed: Meeting agenda.

Instructions:

- Introduce participants to each other.
- Review the objectives of the meeting.
- Review the agenda and the expected outcomes.
- Encourage participants to provide feedback on the agenda. Revise the agenda if there is a group consensus to do so. However, make sure that the objectives of the rapid situation and needs assessment will still be met at the end of the meeting.

Exercise 1.2: Presentation on Strengthening the Information System for Community-Level Programs

Recommended time: Thirty minutes.

Materials needed: Handouts of a Microsoft Powerpoint presentation on this topic (a suggested presentation is under development and will be added to a revised edition of this module).

Instructions:

- Use the presentation to highlight the reasons why it is important to strengthen the information system for collecting, reporting, storing, analyzing, and using data generated by community-level HIV/AIDS programs and activities.
- Describe the components of the CLPIR tool kit and discuss how the country can utilize CLPIR to build a national/sub-national system for community-level programs.

Session 2: Collecting Data on Situations, Desires, and Gaps

Session objectives: By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

- understand the rapid situation assessment approach;
- adapt this module’s discussion guide (found in Appendix A) as necessary; and

- conduct a rapid situation and needs assessment discussion to identify community-level information system situations, desires, and gaps.

Exercise 2.1: Review the Discussion Guide in Appendix A

Recommended time: One hour.

Materials needed: Handouts of the guide (appendix A) and the table in appendix B that lists possible types of community-level information systems.

Instructions:

- Facilitate a discussion on the assessment guide (Appendix A). Discuss each question in detail, including its implications on data collection, reporting, management, analysis, coordination, and data use. Facilitate a general discussion so that participants understand what they are trying to achieve with the rapid assessment (i.e., instead of discussing specifics at this point, discuss matters in general terms).
- Discuss one question at a time and ask participants if they think the guide needs to be adapted to suit local needs. If yes, discuss what needs to be changed, added, deleted, etc. If there is consensus, adapt the guide accordingly.

Exercise 2.2: Conduct the Assessment

Recommended time: Four hours.

Materials needed: Laptop computer and projector, if available, or a flipchart and markers; handouts of the assessment guide (found in Appendix A).

Instructions:

- Ask participants to assign a moderator and note taker. Explain that the role of the moderator will be to act as the group leader and work with facilitators to ensure that questions are answered completely and in an orderly fashion before moving on to the next question. The note taker will record the key points of the discussion, as well as any conclusions reached. If a laptop computer is available, the group may find it useful to have the note taker type up the notes on the laptop and project it for the rest of the group to see. As an alternative, flipcharts and markers can be used.
- Go through the assessment guide, facilitating a focused discussion on each question. Remind participants that the purpose of the assessment is to identify the present situation, desired situation, and gaps, and to define solutions. This information will then be used to develop a systems-strengthening plan that is appropriate for the country.

Session 3: Analyze and Prioritize Gaps

Session objectives: By the end of the session, the participants will have increased their understanding of the gaps involved, and prioritize them by order of importance.

Exercise 3.1: Analysis of What Works and Gaps

Recommended time: Ninety minutes.

Instructions: In a plenary session, based on information collected during Session 2, discuss the following:

- What key aspects of the current system work well?
- What is emerging as the desired situation of the community-level program reporting and monitoring system in the country?
- What key issues must be addressed to strengthen the community-level program reporting and monitoring system? What are the consequences of not addressing each of those issues?
- What factors stand in the way of achieving the desired situation?

Outcomes: Vetted lists of what works well and key gaps in the system are the outcomes of this session.

Exercise 3.2: Prioritizing What Works Well and the Existing Gaps in the System through a Ranking Exercise

Recommended time: Seventy-five minutes.

Materials needed: Laptop computer and projector, if available, or flipchart and markers; and lists developed during the previous exercise of what works and gaps.

Instructions:

- On a flip chart or using a laptop with a projector, the moderator will list all of the identified gaps (not yet in any order of importance).
- Ask each participant to rank each of the gaps using a numerical score. The ranking should range from "1" for the most pressing gap to the least pressing gap.
- The moderator then tabulates the rankings from all participants to produce a summary ranking.

Alternative (but well-proven) rankings or other ways of achieving such a group consensus can also be used.

Repeat the same exercise to prioritize the list of what works.

Outcomes: Prioritized lists of the important areas of the system that work well and the existing gaps are produced.

Session 4: Determine Solutions — Building on What Works and Fixing the Gaps

Session objective: By the end of the session, the participants will have identified feasible solutions to the identified gaps, and will have developed a draft action plan to fix the gaps and build on what works.

Exercise 4.1: Determining Solutions

Recommended time: Two hours.

Instructions: The moderator will group gaps into four or five categories and divide the participants into small groups, based on the gap categories. Ask the groups to come up with feasible solutions for their sets of gaps.

Specific criteria for developing the best possible solutions for the prioritized gaps will vary, depending upon local situations. A general guide is that a good solution should meet the following criteria:

- ***Effective:*** Will the solution actually solve the problem?
- ***Efficient:*** What is the cost-benefit of the solution?
- ***Acceptability:*** Will it be acceptable to all stakeholders involved, including policy-makers?
- ***Authority:*** Is this solution within the purview of the participating stakeholders mandate or will they need to advocate to others for its implementation?

In a plenary session, the moderator will receive group solutions, lead a plenary discussion, and consolidate solutions into one list.

Outcome: A list of solutions to the most pressing gaps in a community-level program reporting and monitoring system will be produced.

Exercise 4.2: Developing an Action Plan for Each of the Solutions Identified and What Works, Including Specific Activities, Costs, Resources, Time Frames, Responsible Parties, and Indicators of Success

Recommended time: Two hours.

Materials needed: Handouts of the form found in Appendix C, Developing an Action Plan (figure 1), a flip-chart, and markers.

Instructions: The moderator will provide a brief overview of action planning, emphasizing that an action plan ensures that everyone involved has a clear understanding of what needs to be done, when steps in the plan need to be achieved, and has an awareness of the practical problems and opportunities that may arise.

The moderator will divide participants into discussion groups, based on the list of solutions produced in the previous exercise. Participants are asked to develop an action plan for their assigned solution by completing the form shown in Figure 1 (the form is provided in full size in Appendix C, allowing printouts to be made from that page).

Instruct the group to use a new form for each solution. If needed, go through the line-by-line instructions below for clarification:

1. State the solution
2. Write the goals of the solution on the lines provided.
3. Write objectives for each goal.
4. List activities for each objective.
5. Identify costs for each activity (financial).
6. Identify resources for carrying out each activity (non-financial).
7. Identify the time frame for each activity.
8. Identify the person, agency, group, etc. responsible for carrying out each activity.
9. Develop an indicator for measuring each activity and objective.

Facilitator's notes: The group should be asking: How can we achieve the goals and objectives of the solution? First instruct the group to brainstorm as many activities as possible, without considering resources and other potential constraints. This is an opportunity to be creative with

Developing an Action Plan

Solution: ____

Goal	**Objectives**	**Activities**	**Cost**	**Resources**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	**Indicator**

Figure 1. Form for developing an action plan (in Appendix C).

ideas. Then, after the initial brainstorming, instruct the group to refine their list of activities by merging duplicate activities or grouping similar activities together, by prioritizing them, by removing unrealistic activities, etc.

Instruct the group to discuss the cost, resources, time frame, responsible party, and indicators for each activity. The following questions can be used to think through these issues:

- ***What will each activity cost?*** Estimate the cost of each activity. What additional resources are needed? Discuss which agency, donor, etc. may be able to provide those resources. When, how, and by whom will potential funders be approached?
- ***What non-financial resources will be needed for each activity?*** The CLPIR steering committee is responsible for leading the overall advocacy, planning, and implementation of this process, but the committee cannot execute each and every activity on its own. The committee's members will need to reach out to organizations to provide support on specific activities and tasks. For example, they will need to identify master trainers who will be responsible for planning and facilitating the workshops that are a part of the program-level roll-out component of the CLPIR tool kit (module 4). They may be able to approach an implementing partners for the use of space for meetings or a venue for a workshop. The committee should be as resourceful as possible.
- ***How long will each activity take?*** Estimate how long each activity will take. Make sure to factor in the time for planning and preparation. Be realistic with the time frame and anticipate events that could cause delays. When scheduling activities like workshops, make sure that the time frame identified does not conflict with other activities and events. It is advisable to develop milestones with associated time frames, as well as final product deadlines, to ensure that progress is checked at various points in the process, not just near the end of the process.
- ***Who will be responsible for each activity?*** As outlined elsewhere in the CLPIR tool kit, it is recommended that the CLPIR steering committee form task forces organized around the different components of the tool kit. This is an opportunity to identify specific individuals and ask them to commit to leading specific activities. Any needs for external technical assistance should also be identified at this point.
- ***What indicator will be used for each activity?*** Devise an indicator for each activity that will show whether or not the objective has been achieved.

Exercise 4.3: Next Steps and Wrap-up

Recommended time: One hour.

Instructions: By the end of this meeting, the CLPIR steering committee should have a clear idea of what kind of information system the members want to establish for community-level HIV/AIDS activities, the solutions they need to plan and implement to create the system, the CLPIR components they will utilize to carry out the solutions, and detailed action plans for each solution including the activities, cost of each activity, resources available, time-frames, responsible individuals, and indicators of success. If there are any aspects that are unclear, use this exercise time to clarify the plan so that everyone has a common understanding of what the next steps are, and how to move forward.

Outline the immediate next steps and discuss how each step will be accomplished. For example, if the next step is to start the indicator harmonization process, an indicator harmonization task force should agree upon a meeting day and time to start planning for that process. In addition to task force meetings, the steering committee should establish a regular meeting schedule for the entire committee to meet. This time can be used for individual task forces to update the entire committee on progress made, challenges encountered, etc., so that problems, if encountered, can be addressed quickly and the momentum for the process is maintained. The frequency of these meetings depends on the time frame the group sets for the process; but, especially in the beginning, twice-a-month meetings should be adequate.

Phase 3: Post Assessment

After spending considerable time and energy in defining gaps and solutions, a post assessment stage is important for ensuring that all the efforts were not in vain. Among other things, the following will need to be considered and undertaken by the assessment task force:

- ***Translate solutions and plans to policy:*** The solutions identified and the action plans will need to be translated into programs and policies for implementation.
- ***Secure the necessary agency approvals of policy action plans:*** Approvals for the suggested changes (policies or programs) will need to be sought and made before any implementation. If the approving authorities have been involved from the start of the assessment process, this stage will be easier to accomplish.
- ***Communicate assessment results:*** The policy and program changes will need to be communicated effectively to garner support for the policy action plan.
- ***Collaborate with advocacy groups to foster support for implementation:*** In some cases, it will be necessary to collaborate and coordinate with advocacy groups and related agencies to foster support for programs and policy proposals.

Appendix A. Rapid Situation and Needs Assessment Discussion Guide

1. **Does the host country government (national or sub-national) have a strategic plan, and monitoring and evaluation framework for HIV/AIDS programs?**

   a. **If not, find out why, and what efforts have been made. What are the obstacles?**

   b. **Describe the plan and the framework (if they exist).**

   c. **How were the plan and the frameworks developed? Probe: Were they developed through national/sub-national stakeholder consensus?**

   d. **Do the national/sub-national strategic plan, and monitoring and evaluation framework, address community-level HIV/AIDS programs?**

   e. **Does the monitoring and evaluation framework contain a set of agreed-upon indicators for community –level HIV/AIDS programs?**

   f. **How useful are the strategic plan and the framework?**

   g. **What are the future plans?**

   h. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

2. To what degree have indicators for community-based HIV/AIDS programs been harmonized at the national/sub-national levels?

a. **If not, find out why not, and what efforts have been made. What are the obstacles?**

b. **If yes, describe the process used.**

c. **Are the indicators well-defined?**

d. **Were these indicators developed through a national/sub-national stakeholder consensus building process?**

e. **Do they cover the key programmatic areas for community-based programs? If not, which areas are not covered?**

f. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

3. **Does the country have standardized data collection tools, reporting tools and procedures for reporting to the national/sub-national level?**

   a. **If not, find out why not, and what efforts have been made. What are the obstacles?**

   b. **If yes, describe the process used.**

   c. **Are the reporting tools and procedures being used by all stakeholders working on community-level HIV/AIDS programs? If not, why not?**

   d. **Can the indicators mentioned in Question 2 be derived from these tools?**

   e. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

4. What is the degree of collaboration between donors supporting community-based programs and the host country government in the production and use of HIV/AIDS information?

a. **If there is no collaboration, find out why not, and what efforts have been made. What are the obstacles?**

b. **If yes, describe the process used.**

c. **Provide some examples of collaboration (e.g. financial, inter-government forums, etc) in the production and use of health information.**

d. **Is there coordination between donors and the host country government in HIV/AIDS program implementation, research, monitoring, and evaluation? If so, provide examples.**

e. **Is there coordination between donors and the host country government on other public health issues? If so, provide examples. If not, what are the obstacles?**

f. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

5. To what extent is the health system decentralized?

a. **If no decentralization, what is the operating situation?**

b. **If decentralized, what implications does the decentralization have on community-level information systems?**

c. **How has decentralization (or centralization) benefited or hindered community-level programs?**

d. **Do these decentralized units have offices, staff, and designated budgets?**

e. **Is there a focal person at the unit for community-level HIV/AIDS programs?**

f. **What are the responsibilities of the focal person?**

g. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

6. What are the primary implementing partners and local NGOs/FBOs/CBOs that implement community-based HIV/AIDS programs?

a. **How many implementing partners are working on community-level HIV/AIDS programs?**

b. **What is the geographic reach and population coverage of these partners?**

c. **Is the reach sufficient? Where (geographically) are the biggest gaps?**

d. **Are the key programmatic areas for community-based programs covered by the partners? If not, which ones aren't covered?**

e. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

7. What is the degree of collaboration between donor-supported implementing partners and local NGOs/FBOs/CBOs to implement community based HIV/AIDS programs?

a. **What role do these various entities play in community-level HIV/AIDS programs?**

b. **If they do not work in partnership, what are the obstacles? Could those obstacles be overcome? If so, how?**

c. **What benefits would be realized by better partnering?**

d. **Are regular meetings organized between NGOs/FBOs/CBOs and local government units to discuss community-level HIV/AIDS solutions?**

e. **Do formal procedures exist for exchange of information between NGOs/FBOs/CBOs and the local government unit?**

f. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

8. Are the implementing partners working closely with local NGOs/FBOs/CBOs to implement community-level HIV/AIDS programs?

a. **About how many implementing partners are working on community-level HIV/AIDS programs through local NGOs/FBOs/CBOs?**

b. **What is the geographic reach and population coverage of these NGOs/FBO/CBOs?**

c. **Are the key programmatic areas for community-level programs covered by the partners?**

d. *(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)*

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

9. Do local NGOs/FBOs/CBOs manage and implement community-level HIV/AIDS programs with a high degree of autonomy?

a. **Is there a strong NGO/FBO/CBO presence in the country?**

b. **Are civil society organizations operating more or less independently?**

c. ***(Add other appropriate topics as needed.)***

Summary of the situation, including what works:
Key gaps:
Desired situation:
Key comments:

Appendix B: Types of Community-Level Information Systems

The types of community-level programs being implemented (Table B1), and the monitoring, evaluation, and reporting capacity of these programs, vary from country to country. Even within a country, there is wide variation by regions, implementing organizations, or program areas. Some countries may only have donor-supported information systems in place, with weak or no national/sub-national systems. Other countries may have certain elements of a national/sub-national system in place but the system may not be fully functional. And some countries may already have a national/sub-national system in place but will find it useful to identify strengths

Table B1. Types of Community-Level Information Systems

<table>
<tr><th>Type of System</th><th>Information Needed by ...</th><th>Characteristics</th></tr>
<tr><td>1. Entirely donor driven</td><td>Donor</td><td rowspan="3">Compared with types 4-5:
• Lower cost
• Potentially rapid
• Limited information use at the program and service delivery levels
• Questionable data quality
• Inconsistent reporting</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Includes national/sub-national harmonization among donors and host country government (national/ sub-national level)</td><td>Donors,
host country government</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Includes national/sub-national harmonization and involvement of donors, national/sub-national host country government, and implementing partners</td><td>Donors, host country government, implementing partners</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Includes national/sub-national harmonization and involvement of donors; national/sub-national host country government; implementing partners; and local nongovernmental organizations, faith-based organizations, and community-based organizations</td><td>Donors, host country government, implementing partners, nongovernmental organizations, faith-based organizations, comunity-based organizations</td><td rowspan="2">Compared with types 1-3:
• More expensive
• More time intensive
• Improved information use at the program level
• Improved data quality
• Improved reporting
• More sustainable</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Includes national/sub-national harmonization and involvement of donors; national/sub-national host country government; implementing partners; local nongovernmental organizations, faith-based organizations, and community-based organizations; and local government</td><td>Donors, host country government, implementing partners, nongovernmental organizations, faith-based organizations, comunity-based organizations decentralized/sub-national health units</td></tr>
</table>

and weaknesses of the system in order to develop a stronger plan.

Table B1 presents examples of possible types of information systems that may exist in a country based on different characteristic elements. Information system 1 is developed in a more participatory manner with the involvement of a larger number of stakeholders, system 2 addresses the information needs of more of stakeholders, system 3 generates data that are of improving quality, and system 4 facilitate information use at incrementally more levels.

Appendix C: Form for Developing an Action Plan

CLPIR's form for developing an action plan appears on the next page, in a format that allows printing for direct use. This form is also available in a Microsoft Word template that can be adapted to suit a program's specific needs. The template is available on the CLPIR CD-ROM or at the CLPIR page at MEASURE Evaluation's Web site, at:

http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/tools

Developing an Action Plan

Solution: ____

Goal	Objectives	Activities	Cost	Resources	Time Frame	Responsible Party	Indicator

MEASURE Evaluation
Carolina Population Center
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
206 W. Franklin Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27516 USA
919.966.7482 / measure@unc.edu
http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure