



FFP Indicators Handbook

Part II: Annual Monitoring Indicators

April 2015

This publication was produced for review by the U.S. Agency for International Development. It was prepared by the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA) managed by FHI 360. The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.



This publication is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the support of the Office of Food for Peace, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, and the Office of Health, Infectious Diseases, and Nutrition, Bureau for Global Health, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), under terms of Cooperative Agreement No. AID-OAA-A-12-00005, through the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA), managed by FHI 360.

The contents are the responsibility of FHI 360 and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

April 2015

Recommended Citation

FFP Indicators Handbook Part II: Annual Monitoring Indicators. April 2015. Washington, DC: Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA III), 2015.

Contact Information

Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA III)
FHI 360
1825 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009-5721
T 202-884-8000
F 202-884-8432
fantamail@fhi360.org
www.fantaproject.org

Part II: FFP Annual Monitoring Indicators

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | ii |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Organization of Part II..... | 2 |
| How to Use Part II | 3 |
| Module A. Agriculture and Livelihoods..... | 6 |
| Performance Indicator Reference Sheets | 6 |
| Module B. Resilience | 38 |
| Performance Indicator Reference Sheets | 38 |
| Module C. Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition (MCHN) | 42 |
| Performance Indicator Reference Sheets | 42 |
| Module D. Gender | 54 |
| Performance Indicator Reference Sheets | 54 |
| Annex 1. Overview of FFP Indicators | 56 |
| Annex 2. List of Changes to FFP Indicators | 57 |

Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|--------|--|
| BDS | business development services |
| CBO | community-based organization |
| CNA | Child no Adults |
| CSO | civil society organizations |
| EWR | early warning and response |
| FFP | USAID's Office of Food for Peace |
| FFPMIS | Food for Peace Management Information System |
| FNM | Adult Female no Adult Male |
| FTE | full time-equivalent |
| GMP | growth monitoring and promotion |
| IC | input costs |
| IPTT | Indicator Performance Tracking Table |
| kg | Kilogram(s) |
| MCHN | maternal and child health and nutrition |
| MNF | Adult Male no Adult Female |
| MSME | micro, small and medium enterprises |
| mt | metric ton |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| ODF | open defecation free |
| PIRS | Performance indicator reference sheet |
| QS | quantity of sales |
| R | required |
| RiA | required if applicable |
| SAPQ | Standard Annual Performance Questionnaire |
| TP | total production |
| UP | units of production |
| USAID | U.S. Agency for International Development |
| USD | U.S. Dollar |
| USG | U.S. Government |
| VS | value of sales |
| WASH | Water, sanitation, and hygiene |

Introduction

The *FFP Indicators Handbook* provides details and guidance for the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Food for Peace (USAID/FFP) list of indicators. The handbook is divided into two parts: *Part I: FFP Indicators for Baseline and Final Evaluation Surveys* and *Part II: FFP Annual Monitoring Indicators*.

Part I: FFP Indicators for Baseline and Final Evaluation Surveys, covered in a separate document, is designed to provide third-party survey firms with the information necessary to collect and tabulate data on FFP indicators for baseline and final evaluation surveys. It provides the definitions, questionnaires, and tabulation instructions for each indicator. For simplicity, the handbook uses the second person (you) to refer to the reader.

Part II: FFP Annual Monitoring Indicators, covered in this document, is designed to provide FFP development food assistance projects with the information necessary to collect and tabulate data on FFP annual monitoring indicators.

Organization of Part II

Part II: Food for Peace (FFP) Annual Monitoring Indicators is designed to provide FFP development food assistance projects with the information necessary to collect and tabulate data on FFP annual monitoring indicators.

The FFP list of indicators contains 37 annual monitoring indicators. This document contains performance indicator reference sheet (PIRS) for 32 indicators. The PIRS summarizes the indicator definition and methodology for data collection, including required disaggregation level, and a link to the source document when applicable.

The following indicators are only applicable for projects awarded on or before FY 2013 that are already collecting and reporting on these indicators:

- No. 30. *Number of communities with disaster early warning and response (EWR) systems working effectively. FFP awardees should develop their own PIRS.*
- No. 59. *Number of additional USG-assisted community health workers (CHWs) providing family planning (FP) information and/or services during the year.*
- No. 72. *Percent of cases of acute malnutrition in children under 5 (6–59 months) detected who are referred for treatment.*
- No. 73. *Percent of villages in catchment area that hold to regular maintenance schedules for sanitation facilities.*
- No. 74. *Number of women receiving postpartum family planning counseling.*

This handbook does not have PIRS for these indicators. FFP projects that are currently reporting on these five indicators should continue using their own methodology for data collection.

How to Use Part II

FFP annual monitoring indicators are either *required* (required for all FFP development food assistance projects) or *required if applicable* (required for all development projects that have relevant interventions). Before reviewing the content of the handbook, FFP awardees should first identify all the FFP annual monitoring indicators that they are required to report on based on the applicability criteria. Refer to the following table, which presents the indicators grouped by categories.

Table 1. FFP Annual Monitoring Indicators

| No. | INDICATOR TITLE PER CATEGORY | Required (R) or Required if Applicable (RiA) | APPLICABILITY CRITERIA |
|--|---|--|---|
| Module A. Agriculture and Livelihoods | | | |
| 8 | Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting value chain activities for selected commodities |
| 9 | Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting improved technologies or management practices |
| 10 | Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for projects promoting improved technologies or management practices collectively as an organization, enterprise, group or association |
| 11 | Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training |
| 12 | Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for projects assisting organizations, enterprises, groups and associations to achieve objectives collectively |
| 13 | Number of people implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for projects implementing risk reduction activities and/ or promoting resilience to climate change |
| 15 | Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting improved technologies or management practices |
| 16 | Value of incremental sales (collected at farm level) attributed to USG implementation | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting value chain activities for selected commodities |
| 18 | Total increase in installed storage capacity (m ³) | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting construction or rehabilitation of storage space |

| | | | |
|---|--|-----|---|
| 19 | Kilometers of roads improved or constructed | RiA | Applicable for all projects constructing or improving roads |
| 20 | Number of market infrastructures rehabilitated and/or constructed | RiA | Applicable for projects rehabilitating and/or constructing market infrastructures |
| 23 | Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting increased access to credit through financial institutions |
| 24 | Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans | RiA | Applicable for projects facilitating MSMEs' access to loans from formal or informal financial institutions |
| 25 | Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG-assisted sources | RiA | Applicable for projects providing business development services to MSMEs |
| 26 | Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving FFP assistance to access savings programs | RiA | Applicable for projects facilitating MSMEs' access to savings |
| 27 | Number of farmers who practiced the value chain activities promoted by the project | RiA | Applicable for projects implementing value chain activities for selected commodities |
| 51 | Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions | R | All projects |
| 73 | Percent of villages in catchment area that hold to regular maintenance schedules for sanitation facilities | RiA | Applicable only for projects awarded on or before FY 2013 that are already collecting and reporting on this indicator |
| Module B. Resilience | | | |
| 30 | Number of communities with disaster early warning and response (EWR) systems working effectively* | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting community based EWR systems |
| 31 | Number of people trained in disaster preparedness as a result of USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting EWR systems |
| 32 | Number of people benefiting from USG-supported social assistance programming | RiA | Applicable for all projects providing cash, food, or other in-kind assistance |
| 33 | Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting conditional safety nets |
| 34 | Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance | R | All projects |
| Module C. Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition (MCHN) | | | |
| 46 | Percent of physically improved sanitation facilities with feces visibly present on the floor, wall, or area immediately surrounding the facility | RiA | Applicable for projects promoting safe sanitation behaviors |
| 47 | Number of people gaining access to an improved drinking water source | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting infrastructure-related WASH interventions |
| 48 | Number of people gaining access to an improved sanitation facility | RiA | Applicable for all projects promoting infrastructure-related WASH interventions |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----|---|
| 49 | Number of improved toilets provided in institutional settings | RiA | Applicable for projects providing toilets in institutional settings |
| 50 | Number of communities certified as “open defecation free” (ODF) as a result of USG assistance | RiA | Applicable for projects promoting open defecation free certification |
| 53 | Number of live births receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy | RiA | Applicable for projects implementing health, nutrition and/or family planning activities targeting women of reproductive health and/or children 6 months and under. |
| 54 | Number of children under 2 (0-23 months old) participating in growth monitoring and promotion | RiA | Applicable for projects that include nutrition |
| 56 | Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs | RiA | Applicable for any projects with a MCHN component |
| 57 | Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs | RiA | Applicable for any projects with a MCHN component |
| 58 | Number of children under five years of age who received vitamin A from USG-supported programs | RiA | Applicable for any projects facilitating vitamin A distribution |
| 59 | Number of additional USG-assisted community health workers (CHWs) providing family planning (FP) information and/or services during the year** | RiA | Applicable only for projects awarded on or before FY 2013 that are already collecting and reporting on this indicator |
| 72 | Percent of cases of acute malnutrition in children under 5 (6–59 months) detected who are referred for treatment** | RiA | Applicable only for projects awarded on or before FY 2013 that are already collecting and reporting on this indicator |
| 74 | Number of women receiving postpartum family planning counseling | RiA | Applicable only for projects awarded on or before FY 2013 that are already collecting and reporting on this indicator |
| Module D. Gender | | | |
| 60 | Proportion of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources (assets, credit, income or employment) | R | All projects |

* PIRS not available for this indicator. FFP projects need to develop their own PIRS.

** PIRS not available for this indicator. Indicator is only applicable to projects awarded on or before FY 2013. FFP projects currently reporting on this indicator should continue using their own methodology.

Once awardees determine which indicators to report on, they should use the PIRS below to collect the indicators.

Module A. Agriculture and Livelihoods

Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

8. INDICATOR: Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING VALUE CHAIN ACTIVITIES FOR SELECTED COMMODITIES

DEFINITION:

The gross margin is the difference between the total value of small-holder production of the agricultural product (crop, milk, eggs, meat, live animals, fish) and the cost of producing that item, divided by the total number of units in production (hectares of crops, number of animals for milk, eggs; pond area in hectares for pond aquaculture or cage count for open water aquaculture). Gross margin per hectare, per animal, or per cage, is a measure of net income for that farm/livestock/fisheries-use activity.

Gross margin is calculated from five data points, reported as totals across all IM direct beneficiaries:

1. Total Production by direct beneficiaries during reporting period (TP)
2. Total Value of Sales (USD) by direct beneficiaries during reporting period (VS)
3. Total Quantity (volume) of Sales by direct beneficiaries during reporting period (QS)
4. Total Recurrent Cash Input Costs (USD) of direct beneficiaries during reporting period (IC)
5. Total Units of Production: Hectares planted (for crops); Number of Animals in herd/flock/etc. (for milk, eggs, meat, live animals); Area in hectares (for aquaculture ponds) or Number of Cages (for open water aquaculture) for direct beneficiaries during the production period (UP)

Partners should enter disaggregated values for the five gross margin data points, disaggregated first by commodity, then by the sex disaggregate categories: male, female, joint and association-applied, as applicable. Commodity-sex layered disaggregated data are required because the most meaningful interpretation and use of gross margin information is at the specific commodity level, including the comparison of gross margins received by female and male farmers. The average commodity-specific Gross Margin and the average commodity-specific Gross Margin for each sex disaggregate are calculated as follows:

Gross margin per ha, per animal, per cage = $[(TP \times VS/QS) - IC] / UP$

For example, for the total production data point, partners should enter total production during the reporting year on plots managed by female, maize-producing, direct beneficiaries; total production on plots managed by male, maize-producing, direct beneficiaries; total production during the reporting year on plots managed jointly by female and male maize-producing, direct beneficiaries, if applicable; and total production on plots managed by groups ("association-applied") of maize-producing, direct beneficiaries; if applicable. And so forth for total value and total quantity of sales; total cash recurrent input costs; and total hectares, animals or cages for maize. And so forth for other commodities. Average gross margin per ha, animal or cage for the overall commodity (e.g., gross margin/hectare for maize) and for each sex disaggregate category (e.g., gross margin/hectare for female maize-producing direct beneficiaries) should be weighted (by total hectares, animals or cages).

If a direct beneficiary sample survey is used to collect gross margin data points, the sample survey estimates must be extrapolated to total beneficiary estimated values to ensure accurate calculation of weighted average gross margin per commodity across all FFP projects in one country and for overall FFP reporting across host countries.

Note: Gross margin targets should be entered at the commodity level. Targets do not need to be set for each of the five data points.

If there is more than one production cycle in the reporting year, farmer's land area should be counted (and summed) each time it is cultivated, and the other four data points (Total Production, Value and Quantity of Sales, Recurrent Cash Input Costs) summed across production cycles if the same crop was planted.

If the production cycle from soil preparation/planting to sales starts in one fiscal year and ends in another, report gross margin in the second fiscal year, once all data points are available. Since the four key agricultural indicators (gross margins, number of farmers applying improved technologies, number of hectares under improved technologies, and incremental sales) are all related, report all four indicators in the second fiscal year in these cases.

The unit of measure for Total Production (e.g., kg, mt, liter) must be the same as the unit of measure for Total Quantity of Sales, so that the average unit value calculated by dividing sales value by sales quantity can be used to value total production (TP x VS/QS). If sales quantity was recorded in a different unit of measure than the unit used for total production, sales quantity must be converted to the equivalent quantity in production units. For example, if Total Production was measured in metric tons, and Total Quantity of Sales was measured in kg, Total Quantity of Sales should be divided by 1,000.

Also, if the form of the commodity varies between how it was harvested/produced and how it was sold, e.g., shelled peanuts are harvested but unshelled peanuts are sold, the sales form must be converted to its equivalent in the harvested/produced form. For example, in Malawi, the extraction rate for shelled from unshelled peanuts is 65 percent. So if 1,500 kg of shelled peanuts were sold, this is equivalent to 2,304 kg of unshelled peanuts, and 2,304 should be entered as sales quantity, not 1,500, assuming that total production was measured in kg of unshelled peanuts. Country-specific extraction rates for a range of value-added commodities may be found at <http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/ess/documents/methodology/tcf.pdf>.

Input costs included should be those significant cash costs that can be easily ascertained. Attention should be focused on accounting for cash costs that represent at least 5 percent of total cash costs. Note, it is not necessary to calculate actual percent contribution of specific inputs to total input costs to determine which inputs account for at least 5 percent of total cash costs. Partners may simply estimate which inputs would qualify. Most likely cash input cost items are: purchased water, fuel, electricity, seed, feed or fish meal, fertilizer, pesticides, hired labor, hired enforcement, and hired machine/veterinary services. Capital investments and depreciation should not be included in cash costs. Unpaid family labor, seed from a previous harvest and other in-kind inputs do not have to be valued and should not be included in costs.

RATIONALE:

Improving the gross margin for farm commodities for small-holders contributes to increasing agricultural gross domestic product, will increase income, and thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the goal indicator of reducing poverty. Gross margin of fisheries is an appropriate measure of the productivity of a fishery and the impacts of fisheries management interventions.

UNIT: dollars/hectare (crops, aquaculture in ponds); dollars/animal (milk, eggs, live animals, meat); or dollars/cage (open-water aquaculture)

Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.

For the IPTT: use the following five data points to calculate and enter indicator value by commodity and by sex of farmer under each commodity.

1. Hectares planted (for crops); Number of animals (for milk, eggs); or Area (ha) of ponds or Number of crates (for fish)

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Targeted commodity (type of crop, type of animal or animal product, or type of fish – freshwater or marine).

Gross margin should be reported separately for horticultural products; the general "Horticulture" category should not be used. If a large number of horticultural crops are being produced and tracking gross margin for each is too difficult, gross margins may be reported for the five (5) most commonly produced horticultural products.

| | |
|--|---|
| 2. Total Production 3. Value of Sales (USD) 4. Quantity of Sales 5. Purchased input costs For the SAPQ: Enter the five data points above into FFPMIS for baseline and actual year reporting. Enter unit of measure of quantity for total production and volume of sales data points. Data should be disaggregated to the lowest level, i.e., by commodity then by sex under each commodity. FFPMIS will calculate gross margin per ha, animal or cage automatically. However, this calculation cannot be done without all five data points. | <u>Sex of farmer:</u> Male, Female, Joint, Association-applied. <i>Note, before using the “Joint” sex disaggregate category, partners must determine that decision-making about what to plant on the plot of land and how to manage it for that particular beneficiary and targeted commodity is truly done in a joint manner by male(s) and female(s) within the household. Given what we know about gender dynamics in agriculture, “joint” should <u>not</u> be the default assumption about how decisions about the management of the plot are made.</i> |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5 (16,17,18) | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries, targeted commodity, fisheries, and/or livestock product. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Direct beneficiary farmer/fisher/rancher sample surveys; data collection through producer organizations or farm records, routine project records. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Feed the Future Agricultural Indicators Guide (http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-the-future-ag-indicators-guide) for additional guidance on collecting and interpreting the data required for this indicator. | |

9. INDICATOR: Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the total number of **direct** beneficiary farmers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (of food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products), as well as individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, traders, natural resource managers, etc., that applied improved technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USG assistance during the reporting year. This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, marketing, sustainable land management, forest and water management, managerial practices, and input supply delivery. Technologies and practices to be counted here are agriculture-related, including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including, but not limited to, carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Significant improvements to existing technologies and practices should be counted.

Examples for listed technology type disaggregates include:

- **Crop Genetics:** e.g., improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding, higher in nutritional content (e.g., through bio-fortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or drought tolerant maize, or stress tolerant rice) and/or more resilient to climate impacts; improved germ plasm.
- **Cultural Practices:** e.g., seedling production and transplantation; cultivation practices such as planting density, moulding; mulching.
- **Livestock Management:** e.g., improved livestock breeds; livestock health services and products such as vaccines; improved livestock handling practices.
- **Wild Fishing Technique/Gear:** e.g., sustainable fishing practices; improved nets, hooks, lines, traps, dredges, trawls; improved hand gathering, netting, angling, spearfishing, and trapping practices.
- **Aquaculture Management:** e.g., improved fingerlings, improved feed and feeding practices, fish disease control, pond culture, pond preparation, sampling & harvesting, carrying capacity & fingerling management.
- **Pest Management:** e.g., Integrated Pest Management, improved insecticides and pesticides, improved and environmentally sustainable use of insecticides and pesticides.
- **Disease Management:** e.g., improved fungicides, appropriate application of fungicides.
- **Soil-related Fertility and Conservation:** e.g., Integrated Soil Fertility Management; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g., soil organic matter); improved fertilizer; improved fertilizer use practices; erosion control.
- **Irrigation:** e.g., drip, surface, and sprinkler irrigation, irrigation schemes.
- **Water Management - non-irrigation-based:** e.g., water harvesting, sustainable water use practices, improved water quality testing practices.
- **Climate Mitigation or Adaptation:** e.g., conservation agriculture; carbon sequestration through low- or no-till practices; increased use of climate information for planning, risk reduction, and increasing resilience; increased energy efficiency; natural resource management practices that increase resilience to climate change.

- **Marketing and Distribution:** e.g., contract farming technologies and practices, improved input purchase technologies and practices, improved commodity sale technologies and practices, improved market information system technologies and practices.

- **Post-harvest - Handling & Storage:** e.g., improved packing house technologies and practices, improved transportation, decay and insect control, temperature and humidity control, improved quality control technologies and practices, sorting and grading.

- **Value-Added Processing:** e.g., improved packaging practices and materials including biodegradable packaging, food and chemical safety technologies and practices, improved preservation technologies and practices.

- **Other:** e.g., improved mechanical and physical land preparation, non-market-related information technology, improved record keeping, improved budgeting and financial management.

Note there is some overlap between the disaggregates listed here and those listed under *4.5.2(2) Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance*. This overlap is limited to the technologies and practices that relate to activities focused on land. The list of disaggregates here is much broader because with this indicator we are aiming to track efforts focused on individuals (as opposed to land area) across the value chain in land **and** non-land based activity.

For the Sex disaggregate and the Total with one or more improved technology/practice disaggregate category, a beneficiary is counted **once regardless of the number of technologies applied during the reporting year**. If **more than one beneficiary in a household** is applying improved technologies, count each beneficiary in the household who does so.

However, under the **Technology Type Disaggregation**, if the beneficiary applied more than one improved technology, count the beneficiary under each technology type (i.e., double-count). In addition, count the beneficiary once under the total w/one or more improved technology category. Since it is very common for FFP projects to promote more than one improved technology, not all of which are applied by all beneficiaries at once, this approach allows FFP to accurately track and count the uptake of different technology types, **and** to accurately count the total number of farmers applying improved technologies. See *4.5.2(2)* for an example of how to double-count hectares and farmers.

If a beneficiary **cultivates a plot of land more than once in the reporting year**, s/he should be counted once under each type of technology if s/he applied the improved technology during any of the production cycles during the reporting year. S/he should not be counted each time the same improved technology is applied. For example, because of new access to irrigation as a result of a FFP project, a farmer can now cultivate a second crop during the dry season in addition to her/his regular crop during the rainy season. If the farmer applies FFP promoted improved seed to her/his plot during one season and not the other, or in both the rainy season and the dry season, s/he would only be counted once under the Crop Genetics technology type disaggregate category. However, the area under improved seed should be counted each time it is cultivated under *4.5(16, 17, 18) Gross margin per unit of land* and *4.5.2(2) number of hectares of land under improved technologies*.

Beneficiaries who are part of a group and apply improved technologies on a demonstration or other **common plot** with other beneficiaries, **are not counted as having individually applied an improved technology**. The group should be counted as one (1) beneficiary group and reported under *4.5.2(42) Number of private enterprises, producers organizations...and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies*. The area of the communal plot should be counted under *4.5(16, 17, 18) Gross margin per unit of land* and *4.5.2(2) Number of hectares of land under improved technologies*.

If a **lead farmer cultivates a plot used for training**, e.g., a demonstration plot used for Farmer Field Days or Farmer Field School, the beneficiary farmer should be counted under this indicator, and the area of the demonstration plot counted under *4.5(16) Gross margin per unit of land*, if applicable and *4.5.2(2) number of hectares of land under improved technologies*. However, if the demonstration or training plot is cultivated by

extensionists or researchers, e.g., a demonstration plot in a research institute, neither the area nor the extensionist/researcher should be counted under the respective indicators.

This indicator, 4.5.2(5), counts **individuals** who applied improved technologies, whereas indicator 4.5.2(28) *Number of private enterprises, producers organizations...and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices* counts firms, associations, or other **group entities** applying association- or organization-level improved technologies or practices. 4.5.2(5) *Number of farmers and others applying technologies/practices* individual-level indicator should not count all members of an organization as having applied a technology or practice just because the technology/practice was applied by the group entity. For example, a producer association implements a new computer-based accounting system during the reporting year. The association would be counted as having applied an improved technology/practice under 4.5.2(42) *Number of private enterprises, producers organizations...applying* indicator, but the members of the producer association would not be counted as having individually-applied an improved technology/practice under 4.5.2(5) *Number of farmers and others applying technologies/practices* individual-level indicator. However, there are scenarios where both the group entity and its members can be counted, the group counted once under 4.5.2(42) and individual members that applied the technology/practice under 4.5.2(5). For example, a producer association purchases a dryer and then provides drying services for a fee to its members. The producer association can be counted under 4.5.2(42) and any association member that uses the dryer service can be counted as applying an improved technology/practice under 4.5.2(5).

RATIONALE:

Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the agricultural supply chain will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity, which is the Intermediate Result under which this indicator falls.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Value chain actor type:

- Producers (e.g., farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products)
- Others (e.g., individual processors [but not firms], rural entrepreneurs, traders, natural resource managers, extension agents).

Technology type (see explanation in definition, above): Crop genetics, Cultural practices, Livestock management, Wild fishing technique/gear, Aquaculture management, Pest management, Disease management, Soil-related fertility and conservation, Irrigation, Water management-non-irrigation based, Climate mitigation or adaptation, Marketing and distribution, Post-harvest – handling & storage, Value-added processing, Other; Total w/one or more improved technology/practice.

Sex: Male, Female

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (5)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiaries.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Sample survey of direct beneficiaries, activity or association records, and farm records.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually reported.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Please refer to the Feed the Future Agricultural Indicators Guide (<http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-the-future-ag-indicators-guide>) for additional guidance on collecting and interpreting the data required for this indicator.

10. INDICATOR: Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS PROMOTING IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES COLLECTIVELY AS AN ORGANIZATION, ENTERPRISE, GROUP OR ASSOCIATION

DEFINITION:

Total number of private enterprises (processors, input dealers, storage and transport companies) producer associations, cooperatives, water users associations, fishing associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), including those focused on natural resource management, that applied new technologies or management practices at the organization level during the reporting year. Organization-level technologies and management practices include those in areas such as management (financial, planning, human resources), member services, procurement, technical innovations (processing, storage), quality control, marketing, etc., as a result of USG assistance in the current reporting year.

Only count the entity once per reporting year, even if multiple technologies or management practices are applied. Any groups applying a technology that was first applied in the previous reporting year and continues to be applied in the current reporting year should be included under "Continuing." However, if the organization added a new technology or management practice during the reporting year to the ones they continued to apply from previous year(s), they would be counted as "New." No organization should be counted under both New and Continuing.

Application of a new technology or management practice by the enterprise, association, cooperative or CBO is counted as one and not as applied by the number in their employees and/or membership. **For example, when a farmer association incorporates new corn storage innovations as a part of member services, the application is counted as one association and not multiplied by the number of farmer-members.**

RATIONALE:

Tracks private sector and civil society behavior change to increase agricultural sector productivity.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types)

Duration: New, Continuing

--New = entity applied a targeted new technology/management practice for the first time during the reporting year

--Continuing = entity applied new technology(ies)/practice(s) in a previous year and continues to apply in the reporting year

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (42)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiary organization.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Observation, project records, etc.• FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. |

11. INDICATOR: Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING SHORT-TERM AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY OR FOOD SECURITY TRAINING

DEFINITION:

The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted. The indicator includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc., and training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management.

There is no pre-defined minimum or maximum length of time for the training; what is key is that the training reflects a planned, structured curriculum designed to strengthen capacities, and there is a reasonable expectation that the training recipient will acquire new knowledge or skills that s/he could translate into action. Count an individual only once, regardless of the number of trainings received during the reporting year and whether the trainings covered different topics. Do not count sensitization meetings or one-off informational trainings.

In-country and off-shore training are included. Training should include food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments as they relate to agriculture resilience, but *should not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator 3.1.9(1) instead.*

Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.

This indicator is to count *individuals* receiving training, for which the outcome, i.e., individuals applying new practices, should be reported under 4.5.2(5).

RATIONALE:

Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, which is key to transformational development.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Type of individual:

- Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)
- People in government (e.g., policy makers, extension workers)
- People in private sector firms (e.g., processors, service providers, manufacturers)
- People in civil society (e.g., NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations)

Note: While producers are included under MSMEs under indicators 4.5.2(30) and 4.5.2(37), only count them under the Producers and not the Private Sector Firms disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double-counting.

Sex: Male, Female

| | |
|--|---|
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (7) | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Program training records. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

12. INDICATOR: Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS ASSISTING ORGANIZATIONS, ENTERPRISES, GROUPS AND ASSOCIATIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES COLLECTIVELY

DEFINITION:

Total number of private enterprises, producers' associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, fishing associations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations, including those focused on natural resource management, that received FFP assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. "Organizations assisted" should only include those organizations for which FFP awardees have made a targeted effort to build their capacity or enhance their organizational functions.

In the case of training or assistance to farmer's association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity.

RATIONALE:

Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types)

New/Continuing:

--New = the entity is receiving USG assistance for the first time during the reporting year

--Continuing = the entity received USG assistance in the previous year and continues to receive it in the reporting year

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (11)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiary organizations.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Project records of training and various FFP assistance for these specific types of organizations/associations.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually reported.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: <http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions>.

13. INDICATOR: Number of people implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS IMPLEMENTING RISK REDUCTION ACTIVITIES AND/ OR PROMOTING RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

DEFINITION:

Existing practices and technologies may not be well suited to perform under emerging climate stresses. Improved management and new technologies are available and others are being developed to perform better under climate stresses and risks.

There is strong scientific and evidence-based information that people involved in sectors such as agriculture, livestock, health, and areas of natural resource or urban management reduce the risk of climate change by implementing appropriate new and tested practices or measures. For example, risk-reducing practices in agriculture and livestock might include changing the exposure or sensitivity of crops (e.g., switching crops, using a greenhouse, or changing the cropping calendar), better soil management, or adjusting the management of other aspects of the system. Risk reducing measures might include applying new technologies like improved seeds or irrigation methods, diversifying into different income-generating activities or into crops that are less susceptible to drought and greater climatic variability. Any adjustment to the management of resources or implementation of an adaptation action that responds to climate-related stresses and increases resilience can be considered.

Risk-reducing practices/actions may be in the following sectors:

- Agriculture – practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.
- Water – practices and actions will aim to improve water quality, supply, and efficient use under anticipated climate variability and change.
- Health – practices and actions will aim to prevent or control disease incidence and outcomes under anticipated climate variability and change outcomes.
- DRR – practices and actions will aim to reduce the negative impacts of extreme events associated with climate variability and change.
- Urban – practices and actions will aim to improve the resilience of urban areas, populations, and infrastructure under anticipated climate variability and change.

The narrative accompanying the indicator should indicate the climate change vulnerability being addressed by the intervention, and how implementing the risk-reducing practice/action reduces that vulnerability.

RATIONALE:

While many management practices and technologies exist and can be diffused, others may not be well suited to perform under emerging climate stresses. Improved management and new technologies are available and others are being developed to perform better under climate stresses. Resource management experiences from other parts of the world may be useful as climate conditions shift geographically. The more individuals demonstrating increased capacity to adapt to climate change, the more resilient “people” and “livelihoods” will likely be.

UNIT: Number of people

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Type of Risk reducing practice:

- Agriculture risk-reducing practices/actions
- Water risk-reducing practices/actions
- Health risk-reducing practices/actions
- Disaster risk-reducing (DRR) practices/actions
- Urban risk-reducing practices/actions

| | |
|---|---|
| | -Other risk-reducing practices/actions <u>Sex</u> : Male, Female |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: Field surveys by local project partners, including extension agents and farmer/producer organizations (and other types of organizations). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (34) | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Via FFP awardees records, survey or other applicable method. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

15. INDICATOR: Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the area (in hectares) of land cultivated using USG-promoted improved technology(ies) or management practice(s) during the current reporting year. USG in this context refers only to FFP-supported activities. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related, **land-based** technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. The indicator does not count application of improved technologies in aquaculture ponds, even though area of ponds is measured in hectares for *4.5 (16,17,18) Gross Margins*. Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted.

Examples of relevant technologies include:

- Crop genetics: e.g., improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding, higher in nutritional content (e.g., through biofortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize) and/or more resilient to climate impacts; improved germ plasm.
- Cultural Practices: e.g., seedling production and transplantation; cultivation practices such as planting density, moulding; mulching.
- Pest management: e.g., Integrated Pest Management; appropriate application of insecticides and pesticides
- Disease management: e.g., improved fungicides, appropriate application of fungicides
- Soil-related fertility and conservation: e.g., Integrated Soil Fertility Management, soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g., soil organic matter); fertilizers, erosion control
- Irrigation: e.g., drip, surface, sprinkler irrigation; irrigation schemes
- Water management: non-irrigation-based e.g., water harvesting
- Climate mitigation or adaptation: e.g., conservation agriculture, carbon sequestration through low- or no-till practices no-till practices
- Other: e.g., improved mechanical and physical land preparation

If a beneficiary **cultivates a plot of land more than once in the reporting year**, the area should be counted each time it is cultivated with one or more improved technologies during the reporting year. For example, because of access to irrigation as a result of a FFP project, a farmer can now cultivate a second crop during the dry season in addition to her/his regular crop during the rainy season. If the farmer applies FFP promoted technologies to her/his plot during both the rainy season and the dry season, the area of the plot would be counted twice under this indicator. However, the farmer would only be counted once under *4.5.2(5) number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies*.

If a group of **beneficiaries cultivate a plot of land as a group**, e.g., an association has a common plot on which multiple association members cultivate together, and on which improved technologies are applied, the area of the communal plot should be counted under this indicator and recorded under the sex disaggregate “association-applied,” and the group of association members should be counted once under *4.5.2(42) Number of private enterprises, producers organizations...and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies*.

If a lead **farmer cultivates a plot used for training**, e.g., a **demonstration plot** used for Farmer Field Days or Farmer Field School, the area of the demonstration plot should be counted under this indicator, and the farmer counted under *4.5.2(5) number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies*. However, if the demonstration or training plot is cultivated by extensionists or researchers, e.g., a demonstration plot in a research institute, neither the area nor the extensionist/researcher should be counted under the respective indicators.

Technology Type Disaggregation: If more than one improved technology is being applied on a hectare, count the hectare under each technology type (i.e., double-count). In addition, count the hectare under the total w/one or more improved technology category. Since it is very common for FFP projects to promote more than one improved technology, not all of which are applied by all beneficiaries at once, this approach allows FFP to accurately track and count the uptake of different technology types, and to accurately count the total number of hectares under improved technologies.

For example: A project supports dissemination of improved seed, Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and drip irrigation. During the reporting year, a total of 1,000 hectares were under improved technologies: 800 with improved seed, 600 with IPM and 950 with drip irrigation. Technology Type disaggregate data should be as follows:

| Technology type | |
|---|------|
| crop genetics | 800 |
| cultural practices | |
| pest management | 600 |
| disease management | |
| soil-related | |
| irrigation | 950 |
| water management | |
| climate mitigation or adaptation | |
| other | |
| total w/one or more improved technology | 1000 |

RATIONALE:

Tracks successful application of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity, agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate impacts.

UNIT: Hectares.

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Technology type (see explanation in definition, above): Crop genetics, Cultural practices, Pest management, Disease management, Soil-related fertility and conservation, Irrigation, Water management, Climate mitigation or adaptation, Other; total w/one or more improved technology

Sex: Male, Female, Joint, Association-applied

Note, before using the “Joint” sex disaggregate category, partners must determine that decision-making about what to plant on the plot of land and how to manage it for that particular beneficiary and targeted commodity is truly done in a joint manner by male(s) and female(s) within the household. Given what we know about gender dynamics in agriculture, “joint” should not be the default assumption about how decisions about the management of the plot are made.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <i>Note: The sum of hectares under the Sex disaggregate should equal the total under the "Total w/one or more improved technology" Technology Type disaggregate.</i> |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees will collect this data through census or survey of direct beneficiaries, direct observations of land, farm records, and project documents. | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (2) | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries; only those hectares affected by FFP assistance, and only those newly brought or continuing under improved technologies/management during the current reporting year. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Via survey or other applicable method. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Feed the Future Agricultural Indicators Guide (http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-the-future-ag-indicators-guide) for additional guidance on collecting and interpreting the data required for this indicator. | |

16. INDICATOR: Value of incremental sales (collected at farm level) attributed to USG implementation (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING VALUE CHAIN ACTIVITIES FOR SELECTED COMMODITIES

DEFINITION:

This indicator will collect both volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from small-holder direct beneficiaries of targeted commodities for its calculation. This includes all sales by the small-holder direct beneficiaries of the targeted commodity(ies), not just farm-gate sales. Only count sales in the reporting year attributable to the FFP investment, i.e., where FFP assisted the individual farmer directly. Examples of FFP assistance include facilitating access to improved seeds and other inputs and providing extension services, marketing assistance or other activities that benefited small-holders.

The value of incremental sales indicates the value (in USD) of the total amount of targeted agricultural products sold by small-holder direct beneficiaries relative to a base year and is calculated as the total value of sales of a product (crop, animal, or fish) during the reporting year minus the total value of sales in the base year.

The number of direct beneficiaries of FFP projects often increases over time as the project rolls-out. Unless a project has identified all prospective direct beneficiaries at the time the baseline is established, the baseline sales value will only include sales made by beneficiaries identified when the baseline is established during the first year of implementation. The baseline sales value will not include the “baseline” sales made prior to their involvement in the FFP project by beneficiaries added in subsequent years. Thus the baseline sales value will underestimate total baseline sales of all beneficiaries, and consequently overestimate incremental sales for reporting years when the beneficiary base has increased. To address this issue, FFP requires reporting the number of direct beneficiaries for each value chain commodity along with baseline and reporting year sales. For this indicator, the baseline sales and baseline number of beneficiaries are needed to establish average sales per beneficiary at baseline. The average sales per beneficiary should be multiplied by the number of beneficiaries in each reporting year to create an adjusted baseline sales value. To accurately estimate out-year targets for incremental sales, targets for number of beneficiaries are also required.

It is absolutely essential that a Baseline Year Sales data point is entered. The Value of Incremental Sales indicator value cannot be calculated without a value for Baseline Year Sales. If data on the total value of sales of the value chain commodity by direct beneficiaries prior to FFP project implementation started is not available, do not leave the baseline blank or enter ‘0.’ Use the earliest Reporting Year Sales actual as the Baseline Year Sales. This will cause some underestimation of the total value of incremental sales achieved by the FFP project, but this is preferable to being unable to calculate incremental sales at all.

If a direct beneficiary sample survey is used to collect incremental sales data, sample **survey estimates must be extrapolated** to total beneficiary estimated values to accurately reflect total sales by the project’s direct beneficiaries.

Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator 4.5(16,17,18) *Gross margins*, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value reported here.

RATIONALE:

Value (in US dollars) of purchases from small-holders of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those small-holders. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by subsistence and semi-subsistence small-holders. Improving markets will contribute to the Key Objective of increased agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will reduce poverty and thus achieve the goal. Lower level indicators help set the stage to allow markets and trade to expand.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>UNIT: US dollars</p> <p>Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.</p> <p>For the IPTT: enter the following values.</p> <p>Totals for indicator (for all commodities):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total Baseline Sales 2. Total Number of Direct Beneficiaries 3. Total Reporting Year Sales 4. Total Volume of Sales (MT) <p>For each commodity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Baseline Sales 6. Number of Direct Beneficiaries 7. Reporting Year Sales 8. Volume of Sales (MT) 9. Baseline Sales per Beneficiary 10. Adjusted Baseline Sales <p>For the SAPQ: Enter all data points above with the exception of data points 9 and 10 (which are automatically calculated by FFP MIS). FFP projects will, however, need to calculate this information for the IPTT.</p> | <p>DISAGGREGATE BY:</p> <p><u>Commodity</u></p> <p><i>Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for the Incremental Sales indicator; the overall "Horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired. Partners may also choose to report only on sales of the five most important horticultural products, but this is not recommended.</i></p> |
| <p>TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):</p> <p>Outcome</p> | <p>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</p> <p>Higher is better</p> |
| <p>DATA SOURCE:</p> <p>FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes".)</p> | |
| <p>FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (23)</p> | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project level; direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? Ideally, FFP awardee will collect in a census of all target beneficiaries. Sample survey-based approaches are also acceptable. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? The value of incremental sales can be collected directly from a census or sample of farmer beneficiaries, from recorded sales data by farmer's associations, from farm records. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Feed the Future Agricultural Indicators Guide (http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-the-future-ag-indicators-guide) for additional guidance on collecting and interpreting the data required for this indicator. | |

| 18. INDICATOR: Total increase in installed storage capacity (m ³) (RiA) | |
|--|---|
| APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING CONSTRUCTION OR REHABILITATION OF STORAGE SPACE | |
| DEFINITION: <p>This indicator measures total increase during the reporting year in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through FFP programming and leverage. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.</p> | |
| RATIONALE: <p>Post-harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products are typically a significant proportion of overall initial production in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could therefore substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas as well.</p> | |
| UNIT: Cubic meters. | DISAGGREGATE BY: <u>Storage type:</u> Dry, cold |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: <p>FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").</p> | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5 (10) | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? On-farm and off-farm – only direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Copies of sales receipts for construction, equipment and installation services; IP records. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annual. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

| 19. INDICATOR: Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) | |
|---|---|
| APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS CONSTRUCTING OR IMPROVING ROADS | |
| <p>DEFINITION:</p> <p>A road opens up transport from rural spaces where rural-based production activities such as agriculture are taking place, and connects, either directly or indirectly, with population centers and market activity.</p> <p>A road “improvement” indicates that the FFP intervention significantly improved the ease of commercial transport along that road, while “constructed” refers to a new road.</p> <p>In general, a road need not necessarily be paved with cement or asphalt but should significantly facilitate the transport of goods compared to the previous situation without the road or without the road improvement.</p> <p>Please only count those road improved or constructed during the reporting year.</p> | |
| <p>RATIONALE:</p> <p>The linkage of rural communities to markets is considered a crucial means of increasing agricultural and other rural-based production as well as the access of rural communities to food at reasonable prices as well as greater off-farm employment opportunities and access to health and nutrition services.</p> | |
| UNIT: Kilometers | <p>DISAGGREGATE BY:</p> <p><u>Construction type:</u> Improved, Constructed (new)</p> |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| <p>DATA SOURCE:</p> <p>FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).</p> | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.1 (17) | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level; only those roads constructed with FFP assistance. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Direct measurement, project records. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

20. INDICATOR: Number of market infrastructures rehabilitated and/or constructed (RiA)**APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS REHABILITATING AND/OR CONSTRUCTING MARKET INFRASTRUCTURES****DEFINITION:**

This indicator sums the number of market infrastructures that are rehabilitated and/or constructed through FFP assistance. Market infrastructure is defined as any physical market structure where people meet in person to buy and sell goods. The indicator excludes investments in construction or rehabilitation of storage facilities integrated or co-located with the market structures (because those are captured by Indicator 18, total increase in installed storage capacity).

A rehabilitated and/or constructed market infrastructure is a physical structure used directly and primarily for the purpose of facilitating trade. Market infrastructures may be rehabilitated, which includes enhancing market structures (e.g., when existing market infrastructure material is replaced with higher quality material); and/or newly constructed (which includes expansion to already existing market infrastructure).

Market infrastructures that are in progress but remain incompletely rehabilitated and/or constructed should not be reported. Market infrastructures that are rehabilitated and/or constructed to usable function in a given year as a result of FFP assistance should be reported for that year only.

For a market infrastructure to be in usable function it may need more than one component to be fully rehabilitated and/or constructed. The following are examples of components of market infrastructures: physical structures in the market of varying size and quality such as roof, floor, wall of market buildings; establish product collection points; raising market sites or building retention walls for flood risk reduction; water points or toilets for markets, abattoir, and drainage system in the market. If more than one component is constructed/rehabilitated in a market infrastructure, the market infrastructure should only be counted once per reporting year.

To calculate this indicator sum the number of market infrastructures that were rehabilitated and/or constructed in the current reporting year by the infrastructure status and by number of vendors using each market infrastructure. Number of vendors can be estimated by averaging the observed number of vendors at the marketplace through site visit(s) on a market day. If observing on a market day is not possible, information can be estimated through contact with local vendors.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Infrastructure Status: rehabilitated, constructed
Number of vendors using the infrastructure: Less than 5, 6 to 10, and 11 or more

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):
Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): N/A

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, targeted areas where market infrastructure development interventions occur.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's routine project monitoring system or activity tracking system.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders.

| 23. INDICATOR: Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) | |
|--|---|
| APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING INCREASED ACCESS TO CREDIT THROUGH FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS | |
| <p>DEFINITION:</p> <p>This indicator sums <u>cash</u> loans made (i.e., disbursed) during the reporting year to <u>direct beneficiary</u> producers (farmers, fishers, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, and loans to other MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain, as a result of FFP assistance. The indicator counts loans <u>disbursed to the recipient</u>, not loans merely made (e.g., in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.</p> <p>This indicator only counts cash loans; do not include in-kind loans. It also <u>only counts loans made by financial institutions</u>, and not informal groups such as village savings and loan groups that are not formally registered as a financial institutions.</p> | |
| <p>RATIONALE:</p> <p>Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This in turn will help expand markets and trade, which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive (the MSMEs) agriculture sector growth (with agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production). In turn this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.</p> | |
| <p>UNIT: US Dollars</p> | <p>DISAGGREGATE BY:</p> <p><u>Type of loan recipient:</u> producers, local traders/assemblers, wholesalers/processors, others.</p> <p><u>Sex of recipient:</u> male, female, joint, n/a</p> <p><i>For producers, the sex of the loan recipient should be used.</i></p> <p><i>For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available).</i></p> |
| <p>TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):</p> <p>Outcome</p> | <p>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</p> <p>Higher is better</p> |
| <p>DATA SOURCE:</p> <p>FFP awardee.</p> | |
| <p>FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (29)</p> | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Bank/lending institution records or survey of targeted beneficiaries. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

24. INDICATOR: Number of MSMEs, including farmers receiving USG assistance to access loans (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS FACILITATING MSMEs' ACCESS TO LOANS FROM FORMAL OR INFORMAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

DEFINITION:

This indicator sums the number of MSMEs, including agricultural producers (including farmers), input suppliers, traders (including wholesalers, middlemen, and retailers), processors, non-agriculture enterprises, artisans, transporters, and others, that received FFP assistance to access loans.

Classification of the size of an MSME is based on the number of employees that worked a FTE. An employee is an individual that is remunerated in-cash or in-kind for their labor. The way FTE employees are counted is different depending on whether the MSME is an agricultural producer (i.e., a farmer) or another type of MSME. MSMEs that are not agricultural producers (input suppliers, traders, processors, non-agriculture enterprises, artisans, transporters, etc.) are classified by the number of FTE employees that worked in the past month. MSMEs that are agricultural producers (i.e., farmers) are classified by the number of FTE workers (permanent or seasonal) hired in the past 12 months. MSMEs are classified as micro if they employed 1-10 individuals, small if they employed 11-50 individuals, and medium if they employed 51-100 individuals. If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise.

One FTE equals 260 days or 12 months. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE and a job that lasts for 130 days should be counted as 1/2 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as work hours may vary greatly. The FTE criteria described in this paragraph is only used to determine the size of the MSME.

To be counted, an MSME must have received FFP assistance to access loans that resulted in the receipt of a loan from any financial institution, formal or informal, including micro-finance institutions, commercial banks or informal lenders, as well as from in-kind lenders of equipment (e.g., tractor, plow), other agricultural inputs (e.g., fertilizer or seeds) or transport, with repayment in cash or in kind.

FFP assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs, linking with the credit providers, assistance with the loan application process, training on loan management, training on potential business ideas or any other support facilitating the receipt of a loan.

The indicator does not measure the quantity or value of the loans, but the number of MSMEs that received FFP assistance and accessed loans. Only count the MSME once in the reporting year they accessed the loan, even if they received multiple loans in that year. For multi-year loans, count the MSMEs for each year that it received the loan.

To calculate this indicator sum the number of MSMEs that received a loan in the past reporting year, disaggregated by size of the MSME and sex of its owner/producer.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Size: Micro, Small, Medium

Sex of owner/producer: Male, Female, Joint, n/a

If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available).

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

| |
|--|
| FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”). |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 - 30 |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Data should be collected through the FFP awardee’s routine project monitoring system, and/or activity tracking system. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually. |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. |

25. INDICATOR: Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS PROVIDING BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO MSMES

DEFINITION:

This indicator sums the number of MSMEs, including agricultural producers (including farmers), input suppliers, traders (including wholesalers, middlemen, and retailers), output processors, non-agriculture enterprises, artisans, transporters, and others, which receive business development services (BDS) from FFP supported projects.

Classification of the size of an MSME is based on the number of employees that worked a FTE. An employee is an individual that is remunerated in-cash or in-kind for their labor. The way FTE employees are counted is different depending on whether the MSME is an agricultural producer (i.e., a farmer) or another type of MSME. MSMEs that are not agricultural producers (input suppliers, traders, processors, non-agriculture enterprises, artisans, transporters, etc.) are classified by the number of FTE employees that worked in the past month. MSMEs that are agricultural producers (i.e., farmers) are classified by the number of FTE workers (permanent or seasonal) hired in the past 12 months. MSMEs are classified as micro if they employed 1-10 individuals, small if they employed 11-50 individuals, and medium if they employed 51-100 individuals. If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise.

One FTE equals 260 days or 12 months. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE and a job that lasts for 130 days should be counted as 1/2 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as work hours may vary greatly. The FTE criteria described in this paragraph is only used to determine the size of the MSME.

BDS may include support related, but not limited to, income generating activities, business planning, procurement, management, production, packaging, processing, quality control, and marketing.

Additional examples of services provided for MSMEs include, but are not limited to:

Market Access: These services identify/establish new markets for MSMEs products; facilitate the creation of links between actors in a given market (e.g., enable buyers to expand their outreach to, and purchases from, MSMEs).

Input supply: These services help MSMEs improve their access to raw materials and production inputs; facilitate the creation of links between MSMEs and suppliers; and enable the suppliers to both expand their outreach to MSMEs and develop their capacity to offer better, less expensive inputs.

Technology and Product Development: These services research and identify new technologies for MSMEs and look at the capacity of local people to produce, market, and service those technologies on a sustainable basis, and develop new and improved MSMEs products that respond to market demand requirements and specifications.

Training and Technical Assistance: These services develop the capacity of enterprises to better plan and manage their operations and improve their technical expertise, develop sustainable training and technical assistance products that MSMEs are willing to pay for, and foster links between service enterprise development providers and MSMEs.

Infrastructure: These services establish sustainable infrastructure (e.g., refrigeration, storage, processing facilities, transport systems, loading equipment, communication centers, improved roads and market places) that enables MSMEs to increase sales and income.

Policy/Advocacy: These services carry out subsector analyses and research to identify policy constraints and opportunities for MSMEs, and facilitate the organization of coalitions, trade organizations, or associations of business people, donors, government officials, academics, and others to effect policies that promote the interests of MSMEs.

| | |
|--|---|
| To calculate this indicator sum the number of MSMEs that received BDS in the current reporting year by size of the MSME, sex of its owner/producer and type of MSME. | |
| UNIT: Number | DISAGGREGATE BY: Size: Micro, Small, Medium Sex of enterprise owner(s): Male Female, Joint, n/a <i>If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available).</i> MSME Type: Agricultural producer, Input supplier, Trader, Output processors, Non-agriculture, Other. |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes"). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 - 37 | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: In the case that an individual MSME participates in multiple trainings or technical assistance services in one year, it should be counted as <u>one</u> MSME enterprise. This indicator should count MSMEs receiving trainings or development services within the reporting year, not an accumulation of all trainings that MSME received in the life of FFP project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiary MSME; only those MSMEs receiving trainings/service within the scope of the FFP project in the reporting year. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's routine project monitoring system, and/or activity tracking system. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

26. INDICATOR: Number of MSMEs, including Farmers, receiving FFP assistance to access savings programs (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS FACILITATING MSMEs' ACCESS TO SAVINGS

DEFINITION:

This indicator sums the number of micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs), including agricultural producers (including farmers), input suppliers, traders (including wholesalers, middlemen, and retailers), processors, non-agriculture enterprises, artisans, transporters, and others, that received FFP assistance to access to a savings program.

Classification of the size of an MSME is based on the number of employees that worked a FTE. An employee is an individual that is remunerated in-cash or in-kind for their labor. The way FTE employees are counted is different depending on whether the MSME is an agricultural producer (i.e., a farmer) or another type of MSME. MSMEs that are not agricultural producers (input suppliers, traders, processors, non-agriculture enterprises, artisans, transporters, etc.) are classified by the number of FTE employees that worked in the past month. MSMEs that are agricultural producers (i.e., farmers) are classified by the number of FTE workers (permanent or seasonal) hired in the past 12 months. MSMEs are classified as micro if they employed 1-10 individuals, small if they employed 11-50 individuals, and medium if they employed 51-100 individuals. If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise.

One FTE equals 260 days or 12 months. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE and a job that lasts for 130 days should be counted as 1/2 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as work hours may vary greatly. The FTE criteria described in this paragraph is only used to determine the size of the MSME.

A savings account is an objective verifiable measure of access to a savings program. A savings account refers to any type of an account in a financial institution that serves as a store of an MSME's financial wealth. This includes formal financial institutions, such as microfinance institutions and commercial banks, as well as traditional institutional structures such as community savings groups, saving and loan facilities with producer associations, village savings and loans groups, and other types of communal/social funds.

The indicator does not measure the value of the savings, but the number of MSMEs that received FFP assistance and enrolled in a savings account. Only count the MSMEs once in the reporting year they enrolled in a savings account, even if the same MSME enrolls in multiple savings accounts.

To calculate this indicator, sum the number of MSMEs that enrolled in a savings account in the past reporting year by size of the MSME and sex of its owner/producer.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Size: Micro, Small, Medium

Sex of owner/producer: Male, Female, Joint, n/a

If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available).

TYPE (OUTPUTS/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): N/A

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiaries.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's routine project monitoring system and/or activity tracking system.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders.

27. INDICATOR: Number of farmers who practiced the value chain activities promoted by the project (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS IMPLEMENTING VALUE CHAIN ACTIVITIES FOR SELECTED COMMODITIES

DEFINITION:

Farmers: Farmers, including herders and fishers, are: 1) men and women who have access to a plot of land (even if very small) about which they *make decisions* about what to grow, how to grow, and how to dispose of the harvest; AND/OR 2) men and women who have animals and/or aquaculture products over which they have *decision-making power*.

Farmers produce food, feed, cash crop, and fiber, where “food” includes agronomic crops (crops grown in large scale, such as grains), horticulture crops (vegetables, fruit, nuts, berries, and herbs), animal and aquaculture products, as well as natural products (e.g., non-timber forest products, wild fisheries). These farmers may engage in processing and marketing of food, feed, and fiber, and may reside in settled communities, mobile pastoralist communities, or refugee/internally displaced person camps.

For the purposes of this indicator, a farmer will only be counted if he or she practiced value chain activities that are directly related to *the plot, animals, and/or aquaculture products over which he or she makes decisions*. For the purpose of this indicator, an individual who does farm work but does *not* have *decision-making responsibility* over the plot OR animals would *not* be considered a “farmer.” For instance, a woman working on her husband’s land who does not have the authority to make decisions over that plot would not be counted for any value-chain activities applied on her husband’s land.

Value chain: All the actors (including producers, processors, distributors, and retailers) that participate in bringing a product or service from its conception to its end use in the market, as well as the extent and type of relationships between these value chain actors.

Value chain activities: Activities that improve the quantity/quality of a product for the purposes of generating higher returns and improved profits from sales (e.g., subsistence agriculture-focused interventions/agricultural interventions designed to increase staple crop production for home consumption would not qualify as value chain activities). These include, but are not limited to, pre- and post-harvest activities such as joint purchase of inputs, activities to increase productivity while maintaining quality, bulk transporting, sorting, grading, processing, and trading/marketing (wholesale, retail, export).

Practice: To practice a value chain activity means to take part in value chain activities on a regular, frequent, repeated, or habitual basis.

Projects for which this indicator is applicable must identify a list of value chain activities that the project will promote during the life of the programs so that the number of farmers that are already practicing these specific value chain activities can be recorded through routine annual monitoring. More on value chain activities can be found at the USAID’s value chain wiki link:

<http://www.microlinks.org/good-practice-center/value-chain-wiki>

Please also refer to *Field Guide: Integrating Very Poor Producers into Value Chains* available at:

<http://agrilinks.org/library/integrating-very-poor-producers-value-chains-field-guide>

Promoted by the project: Actively supported with specific project interventions (e.g., agricultural extension services).

To be counted, a farmer must have practiced the value chain activity at least once in the past reporting year. If a farmer is participating in value chain activities in more than one value chain stage, participation within a single value chain stage should be based on the commodity that s/he is doing more of.

To calculate this indicator, sum the number of farmers that practiced at least one value chain activity in the past reporting year by sex and stage of the value chain activity.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex of Farmer: Male, Female

| | |
|---|--|
| | <u>Value Chain Stages:</u> Use of improved inputs (quality seeds, fertilizer etc.), post-harvest handling (storage, distribution, and transport), value-added processing (drying, grading, etc.), marketing/trading. |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): N/A | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Data should be collected through the FFP awardee’s routine project monitoring system, activity tracking system or through a beneficiary-based survey. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders. | |

51. INDICATOR: Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (R)**REQUIRED FOR ALL FFP DEVELOPMENT FOOD ASSISTANCE PROJECTS****DEFINITION:**

A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a direct beneficiary if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by a project through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as beneficiary. Individuals who receive training or benefit from project-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. (An indirect beneficiary, on the other hand, does not necessarily have direct contact with the project but still benefits, such as the population who uses a new road constructed by the project or the individuals who hear a radio message but don't receive any other training or counseling from the project.)

The definition of "rural" should be the definition used by the respective national statistical service. This indicator can include vulnerable households if they are in rural areas.

RATIONALE:

Tracks access and equitable access to services in targeted area.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Duration: New, Continuing
Rural households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but were not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."

Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2(13)**MEASUREMENT NOTES:**

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiary organization, attributable to FFP investment.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually reported.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. *Objective 4 Economic Growth Indicators and Definitions.* Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101765.pdf>.

Module B. Resilience

Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

| 31. INDICATOR: Number of people trained in disaster preparedness as a result of USG Assistance (RiA) | |
|--|---|
| APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING EARLY WARNING AND RESPONSE (EWR) SYSTEMS | |
| <p>DEFINITION: Disaster preparedness includes: risk identification, analysis, prioritization, and reduction activities; the design and implementation of regional, national, local, or community level hazard reduction policies and plans; early warning systems, as appropriate; and identification of roles and responsibilities in preventing, responding to, and recovering from disasters.</p> <p>Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards, when these exist. Trainings must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Only participants who complete a full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one topic, individuals should only be counted once for that training course. If a training course is conducted in more than one session/training event, only individuals who complete the full course should be counted; do not sum the participants for each training event. If individuals are retrained within the reporting period, having received training prior to the project or reporting period, they should be included in the count.</p> | |
| UNIT: Number | DISAGGREGATE BY: <u>Sex:</u> Male, Female |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| <p>DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").</p> | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 5.2.1- 2 | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Tally the number of people trained in disaster preparedness. Ensure that there is no double-counting. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. <i>Objective 4 Economic Growth Indicators and Definitions</i>. Available at http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101765.pdf. | |

32. INDICATOR: Number of people benefitting from USG-supported social assistance programming (RiA)**APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROVIDING CASH, FOOD, OR OTHER IN-KIND ASSISTANCE****DEFINITION:**

Number of people receiving assistance (cash, food, or other in-kind) from programs supported in whole or in part through FFP resources.

Simple output measure to enable the roll up of USG-supported programming addressing social assistance needs.

UNIT: Number**DISAGGREGATE BY:**Sex: Male, Female**TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):**

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.3.3-9**MEASUREMENT NOTES:**

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiaries.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's routine project monitoring system and/or activity tracking system.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually reported.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. *Investing in People Indicators and Definitions*. Available at: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101764.pdf>.

33. INDICATOR: Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING CONDITIONAL SAFETY NETS

DEFINITION:

The number of people participating in FFP-supported social assistance programming with productive components aimed at increasing community assets, household assets, or strengthening human capital.

Productive safety nets are programs that protect and strengthen food insecure households' physical and human capital by providing regular resource transfers in exchange for time or labor. Generally there are three kinds of activities that can provide the foundation of a "productive safety net" program. These are:

- Activities which strengthen community assets (e.g., public works);
- Activities which strengthen human assets (e.g., literacy training, HIV, prenatal, and well-baby visits); and/or
- Activities which strengthen household assets (e.g., livelihood diversification, agriculture extension, micro savings, and credit)

What sets productive safety nets apart from other social assistance programs is that the assistance—a predictable resource transfer—is provided in exchange for labor or to offset the opportunity cost of an investment of time. For this reason they are sometimes referred to as "conditional" safety net programs. Another difference is an expectation that, over time, individuals or households enrolled in a productive safety net program will "graduate" from that program.

RATIONALE:

Provides information on FFP assistance aimed at increasing self-sufficiency in vulnerable populations.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Type of Asset strengthened: community assets, human assets/capital, and household assets

Duration:

--New = this is the first year the beneficiary participated in a productive safety net

--Continuing = this beneficiary participated in the previous reporting year and continues to participate in the current reporting year

Sex: Male, Female

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.3.3 (15)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiaries.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Project records.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annual.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: <http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions>.

| 34. INDICATOR: Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance (R) | |
|---|---|
| REQUIRED FOR ALL FFP DEVELOPMENT FOOD ASSISTANCE PROJECTS | |
| <p>DEFINITION:</p> <p>A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a direct beneficiary if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by a project through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as beneficiary. Individuals who receive training or benefit from project-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. (An indirect beneficiary, on the other hand, does not necessarily have direct contact with the project but still benefits, such as the population who uses a new road constructed by the project or the individuals who hear a radio message but don't receive any other training or counseling from the project.)</p> <p>FFP defines vulnerable people/household as "people/households who are at risk of food insecurity because of their physiological status, socioeconomic status or physical security; or whose ability to cope has been temporarily overcome by a shock."</p> | |
| <p>RATIONALE:</p> <p>Inclusive agriculture sector growth is dependent on equitable access, and it is a key tenet of FFP to bring in typically marginalized groups.</p> | |
| <p>UNIT: Number</p> | <p>DISAGGREGATE BY:</p> <p><u>Duration:</u> New, Continuing <i>Vulnerable households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but were not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."</i></p> <p><u>Gendered Household type:</u> Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)</p> |
| <p>TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):</p> <p>Output</p> | <p>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</p> <p>Higher is better</p> |
| <p>DATA SOURCE:</p> <p>FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").</p> | |
| <p>FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 4.5.2 (14)</p> | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Project records or survey. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

Module C. Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition (MCHN)

Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

46. INDICATOR: Percent of physically improved sanitation facilities with feces visibly present on the floor, wall, or area immediately surrounding the facility (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS PROMOTING SAFE SANITATION BEHAVIORS

Definition:

This indicator measures the percentage of sanitation facilities that meet the criteria of “physically improved,” and that have feces visibly present on the floor, walls, or the area immediately surrounding the facility.

A “physically improved” sanitation facility is any washable facility, including:

- A washable pit latrine with a slab
- A washable ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrine
- A flush or water-seal toilet or flush/pour flush toilet connected to a piped sewer system, a septic tank, or a pit latrine

Washable facilities may have a slab and/or platform made out of material that allow water to run-off to the side when washed. The slab and/or platform are tight fitting and not cracked and should be made out of non-porous material (e.g., concrete and/or plastic).

To be counted in this indicator, the facility must meet the criteria of a physically improved sanitation facility and have visible feces on the floor, wall, or area immediately surrounding the facility. Visible presence of feces must be verified through direct observation of the facility.

To calculate this indicator: (a) sum the number of sanitation facilities with feces visibly present on the floor, wall, or area immediately surrounding the facility out of the total number of sanitation facilities directly observed; then divide by (b) the total number of sanitation facilities directly observed; and multiply by 100.

UNIT: Percent

1. Percent of sanitation facilities with feces visibly present on the floor, wall or area immediately surrounding the facility
2. Total number of sanitation facilities directly observed

For the IPTT: FFP awardees will enter data point 1.

For the SAPQ: FFP awardees will enter all data points above.

DISAGGREGATE BY: None

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): N/A

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, targeted communities.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's routine project monitoring system, activity tracking system, or survey.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders.

47. INDICATOR: Number of people gaining access to an improved drinking water source (RiA)**APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING INFRASTRUCTURE-RELATED WASH INTERVENTIONS****DEFINITION:**

Persons are counted as “gaining access” to an improved drinking water source if two conditions are met.

One, if the source is either newly established or rehabilitated from a non-functional state within the reporting fiscal year as a result of FFP assistance, and these persons did not previously have similar “access” to an improved drinking water source prior to the establishment or rehabilitation of the FFP-supported improved source.

And two, if the “time to collect” water from this source, i.e., the time it takes going to the water source from their dwelling, waiting, collecting water and returning home, does not exceed 30 minutes. Given this definition, the number of people considered to have “gained access” to an improved source will be limited by the physical distance to the source from beneficiaries’ dwellings, the amount of time typically spent queuing at the source, and the production capacity of the source.

Estimates of the number of persons gaining access to a particular improved source are further limited by the minimum amount of water that this source will plausibly produce in a typical year. Specifically, the improved source must be able to consistently produce 20 liters per day for each person counted as “gaining access.” This amount is considered the daily minimum required to effectively meet a person’s drinking, sanitation, and hygiene needs.

“Improved” drinking water sources are further defined by the quality of the water they produce, and are protected from fecal contamination by the nature of their construction or through an intervention to protect from outside contamination. Such sources include: piped water into dwelling, plot, or yard; public tap/standpipe; tube well/borehole; protected dug well; protected spring; or rainwater collection. Unprotected dug well, unprotected spring, cart with small tank/drum, tanker truck, surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal, irrigation channel), and bottled water are not considered improved sources. Bottled water is only considered to be improved when the household uses water from an improved source for cooking and personal hygiene.

The actual quality of source water is not measured directly and instead only assumed and thus may vary based on how well a specific source is protected.

Providing “access” does not necessarily guarantee beneficiary “use” of an improved drinking water source and thus potential health benefits are not certain to be realized from simply providing “access.”

Although, the chosen definition of “access” does attempt to define standard ease of use/accessibility and minimum volume of water to meet potential user needs, this definition does not capture the water source’s reliability or its affordability--two other important factors that influence the likelihood that those defined as having “access” will actually use the source.

This indicator can be difficult and time consuming to measure accurately and requires robust data quality assurance on the part of USAID.

RATIONALE:

Use of an “improved” drinking water source, as defined, is strongly linked to decreases in the incidence of waterborne disease especially among children under age five. Diarrhea remains the second leading cause of child deaths worldwide. While not guaranteeing “use” of the improved drinking water source, this indicator measures progress in making high quality drinking water available/ “accessible” in a manner that typically leads to use of the improved source.

UNIT: Number**DISAGGREGATE BY:**Sex: Male, Female**TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):****DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Outcome | Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.8.1-2 | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Upon completion of construction or rehabilitation of an improved water source, the FFP grantees implementing activities makes observations on and/or interviews initial users of the water source regarding the “time to collect” in relationship to the distance to their dwelling, and water source production volume measurements. This information is used to estimate the maximum distance from the source where “time to collect” among potential users would likely be 30 minutes or under. The number of persons living within that radius of the source currently not using an improved drinking water supply source according the baseline is the initial estimate of those “gaining access” to the source. This number might be further reduced, however, depending upon the measured production volume of the source in comparison to the 20 liters/capita/day minimum standard. These estimates would then be summarized and reported on an annual basis. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. <i>Investing in People Indicators and Definitions</i>. Available at: http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101764.pdf. | |

48. INDICATOR: Number of people gaining access to an improved sanitation facility (RiA)**APPLICABLE FOR ALL PROJECTS PROMOTING INFRASTRUCTURE-RELATED WASH INTERVENTIONS****DEFINITION:**

An improved sanitation facility is defined as one that hygienically separates human excreta from human contact and includes: a flush or pour/flush facility connected to a piped sewer system; a septic system or a pit latrine; pit latrines with a slab; composting toilets; or ventilated improved pit latrines.

Unimproved sanitation includes: flush or pour/flush toilets without a sewer connection; pit latrines without slab/open pit; bucket latrines; or hanging toilets/latrines. Members of households that use a facility shared with other households are not counted as using an “improved sanitation facility.”

A household is defined as a person or group of persons that usually live and eat together.

Persons are counted as “gaining access” to an improved sanitation facility, either newly established or rehabilitated from a non-functional or unimproved state, as a result of FFP assistance if their household did not have similar “access,” i.e., an improved sanitation facility was not available for household use, prior to completion of an improved sanitation facility associated with FFP assistance. This assistance may come in the form of hygiene promotion to generate demand. It may also come as programs to facilitate access to supplies and services needed to install improved facilities or improvements in the supply chain(s).

RATIONALE:

Use of an improved sanitation facility by households is strongly linked to decreases in the incidence of waterborne disease among household members, especially among those under age five. Diarrhea remains the second leading cause of child deaths worldwide.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex: Male, Female

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.8.2-2

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION:** Project-level, direct beneficiaries.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Direct count of beneficiary households and estimates (from sample survey) of the number of people living in those households by FFP awardee and summarized on a quarterly or annual basis. This method would be most appropriate when the technical approach being pursued involves some direct household engagement by the FFP awardee, e.g., when a household is provided a subsidy for the construction of an improved sanitation facility. If a sample survey is used to estimate the number of those “gaining access,” then a baseline must be established before the start of project implementation through an initial household survey.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Annually reported.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. *Investing in People Indicators and Definitions*. Available at: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101764.pdf>.

| 49. INDICATOR: Number of improved toilets provided in institutional settings (RiA) | |
|--|---|
| APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS PROVIDING TOILETS IN INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS | |
| <p>DEFINITION: Institutional settings are defined as schools and health facilities. Schools in the context of this indicator are day schools for children 6 to 18 years of age who return home after school. Schools may be public or private. Health facilities may provide different levels of service, but it is anticipated that sanitation facilities will be installed in health facilities at the lower echelons of the service hierarchy. Health facilities may be public or private.</p> <p>A “toilet” is defined as an improved sanitation facility provided as a result of FFP assistance that provides privacy and separates human excreta from human contact. Each toilet should have a squat hole. For latrine blocks with several squat holes, the “toilet” count is the number of squat holes in the block. Toilets that are repaired in order to meet set local government standards will also be counted. Toilets counted are only those that have hand washing facilities within or near the toilets. In school settings, there must be gender-specific toilets and host country standards regarding the ratio of students per squat hole must be met.</p> | |
| <p>RATIONALE: Per WHO guidelines, “Schools with poor water, sanitation and hygiene conditions, and intense levels of person-to-person contact, are high-risk environments for children and staff, and exacerbate children's particular susceptibility to environmental health hazards.” Health facilities, like any other public space, must have sanitation facilities to reduce the possibility of spreading disease. Per WHO guidelines, “hospitals and health centers have special requirements for sanitation as they may have to deal with patients who are infected with diseases such as cholera, typhoid and hepatitis.”</p> | |
| UNIT: Number | DISAGGREGATE BY: Type of institution: School, Health facility |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| <p>DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).</p> | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.8.2-3 | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, targeted institutional setting sites. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Direct observations of all institutional setting sites targeted by FFP assistance conducted on an annual basis. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually reported. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. <i>Investing in People Indicators and Definitions</i>. Available at: http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101764.pdf. | |

50. INDICATOR: Number of communities certified as “open defecation free” (ODF) as a result of USG assistance (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS PROMOTING OPEN DEFECATION FREE CERTIFICATION

DEFINITION:

The Handbook on Community Led Total Sanitation produced by Kamal Kar and Robert Chambers in 2008 suggests a qualitative approach to determining open defecation free status. This may include: visiting former open defecation sites at dawn and dusk, determining whether open/hanging latrines are being used as well as paths to installed latrines, and observing existing community sanctions for infringements to ODF rules, etc.

To facilitate inspection and safeguard against fraud when rewards to communities are used as incentives, verification of ODF may require involving a committee of inspectors made up of government officials, NGO staff, community residents, and residents from neighboring towns that have achieved ODF status. Kar and Chambers even suggest withholding certification of ODF status for a six-month period to ensure that sanitation coverage has been sustained.

Qualitative methods, such as those mentioned above, may also be combined with quantitative measures. Households in a village labeled as ODF may be visited to count how many households in the village have a latrine. This may also be achieved through a mapping exercise.

RATIONALE:

Poor access to adequate sanitation will result in the practice of open defecation. Three harmful impacts may result from open defecation: the spread of diarrheal disease, loss of privacy and human dignity, and environmental pollution.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY: None

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.6.8-5

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, targeted communities.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Observation, project records, etc.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually reported.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- F Indicator Handbook Updated 2011. *Investing in People Indicators and Definitions*. Available at: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101764.pdf>.

53. INDICATOR: Number of live births receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy (RiA)**APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS IMPLEMENTING HEALTH, NUTRITION AND/OR FAMILY PLANNING ACTIVITIES TARGETING WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH AND/OR CHILDREN 6 MONTHS AND UNDER****DEFINITION:**

This indicator sums the number of women ages 15 to 49 with a live birth who attended antenatal care (ANC) four or more times during their most recent pregnancy as a result of FFP assistance.

The ANC should be provided by skilled health personnel. Skilled health personnel refer to a doctor, nurse, midwife, skilled birth attendant, or clinical officer. Visits to either trained or untrained traditional birth attendants (TBA) are excluded.

Live birth is the birth of one or more fetus after 22 weeks gestation or weighing 500 g or more that shows signs of life—breathing, cord pulsation, or with audible heartbeat.

This indicator does not measure the quality of the ANC visit and does not require that a minimum number of services are received during ANC. For reference, the following are the four main categories of care and examples of services for each category that may be provided during ANC: identification of pre-existing health conditions (e.g., check for weight and nutrition status, anemia, hypertension, syphilis, HIV status); early detection of complications arising during pregnancy (e.g., check for pre-eclampsia, gestational diabetes); health promotion and disease prevention (e.g., tetanus, vaccination, prevention and treatment of malaria, nutrition counseling, micronutrient supplementation, family planning counseling); and birth preparedness and complication planning (e.g., birth and emergency planning, breastfeeding counseling, antiretroviral for HIV positive women, and reducing mother to child transmission of HIV).

If a woman delivered more than one live birth in the current reporting period, only count the most recent live birth. If a woman delivers more than one child from a single pregnancy, it counts as a single live birth. To be counted for this indicator, a woman needs to show evidence of attending ANC visits on a health card.

When counting the number of ANC visits per pregnancy, count all that happened throughout the period of gestation, even if some of the ANC visits occurred during the year prior to the year of delivery. Visits by pregnant women to skilled health personnel for reasons other than ANC (e.g., illness in the family) should not be counted as an ANC visit.

To calculate this indicator sum the number of live births during the current reporting year that received four ANC visits during pregnancy.

UNIT: Number**DISAGGREGATE BY:** None**TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):**
Outcome**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**
Higher is better**DATA SOURCE:**

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): N/A**MEASUREMENT NOTES:**

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiaries.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's routine program monitoring system, activity tracking system or through a beneficiary-based survey.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annually.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders.

54. INDICATOR: Number of children under 2 (0-23 months old) participating in growth monitoring and promotion (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR PROJECTS THAT INCLUDE NUTRITION

DEFINITION:

This indicator sums the number of children 0-23 months old that are participating in growth monitoring and promotion program(s), as a result of FFP assistance.

Growth monitoring and promotion (GMP) is a preventive approach that generally involves:

- 1) Regular measurement (usually monthly) of the weight and/or height of children, comparison to age/sex specific growth standards, and plotting of the repeated measures as a means of identifying growth faltering.
- 2) Tailored discussions with each mother and caregiver about her/his child's growth, congratulating and encouraging behavior that promotes good growth, and counseling to improve infant and young child feeding practices and health for those whose children's growth has faltered. Tailored counseling does not necessarily have to occur at the same site where growth monitoring is provided.

GMP takes place in communities, homes, health facilities, or rally posts.

Growth faltering is defined as inadequate gain between two consecutive growth monitoring sessions.

Tailored counseling, or growth promotion, is based on each individual child's growth monitoring results. It involves follow-up discussion with caregivers to identify good practices and problems and to encourage good care practices. Counseling should focus on achievable actions/improved practices, and negotiating with caregivers to gain their commitment to these actions. Participation in health and nutrition activities should be encouraged and referrals to health providers made when needed.

Infants and young children who receive growth monitoring without promotion (tailored counseling services) should not be counted in this indicator. Only count children under two years old who participated with their mothers or caregivers in 80 percent of the sessions during the reporting year, or 80 percent of the sessions since the time they registered in the GMP program during the reporting year. Only count a child that participates in a GMP program once, even if the child attends multiple GMP programs. If the child is receiving growth monitoring at one site and is receiving promotion at different site, the child should only be counted once.

To calculate this indicator sum the number of children 0-23 months old that participated in GMP in the current reporting year by sex.

| | |
|--|---|
| UNIT: Number | DISAGGREGATE BY: <u>Sex:</u> Male, Female |
| TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes"). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): N/A | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Data should be collected through the FFP awardee's activity tracking system and/or through a beneficiary-based survey. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders. | |

56. INDICATOR: Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ANY PROJECTS WITH A MATERNAL-CHILD HEALTH AND NUTRITION COMPONENT

DEFINITION:

Number of participants (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, mothers/caregivers, policy-makers, researchers, and other non-health personnel) in child health care and child nutrition training provided through FFP-supported programs during the reporting year.

For this indicator, count the training attendance numbers without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple trainings. Counting individuals multiple times is acceptable for this indicator. Counting training attendance numbers rather than individuals is not acceptable for 4.5.2(7) *Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training.*

RATIONALE:

Development of human capacity through training is a major component of FFP-supported health and nutrition programs in this element.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex: Male, Female

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees; service statistics from FFP activities.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.9 (1)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level, direct beneficiaries; only those trained through FFP activities.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Through project records.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annual.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: <http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions>.

| 57. INDICATOR: Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (RiA) | |
|--|---|
| APPLICABLE FOR ANY PROJECTS WITH A MATERNAL-CHILD HEALTH AND NUTRITION COMPONENT | |
| DEFINITION: Number of children under five years of age reached during the reporting year by FFP-supported activities with nutrition objectives, which can include behavior change communication interventions, home or community gardens, micronutrient fortification or supplementation, anemia reduction packages, growth monitoring and promotion and management of acute malnutrition. Implementing mechanisms should count children reached by the mechanism only once regardless of the number of interventions the child received from the project. | |
| RATIONALE: Good coverage of nutrition programs is essential to prevent and treat malnutrition and improve child survival. | |
| UNIT: Number | DISAGGREGATE BY: <u>Sex:</u> Male, Female |
| TYPE: Output | DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better |
| DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”). | |
| FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.9 (15) | |
| MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries; only those children reached by FFP intervention. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Project records, service statistics. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annual. | |
| FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. | |

58. INDICATOR: Number of children under five who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (RiA)

APPLICABLE FOR ANY PROJECTS FACILITATING VITAMIN A DISTRIBUTION

DEFINITION:

Number of children under five years of age who received Vitamin A from FFP-supported programs in the last 6 months from the time this data is collected. In order to reduce Vitamin-A deficiency most effectively, children need two rounds of coverage in one year. *In order to not double count children, please only report the number done in the last 6 months.*

RATIONALE:

Vitamin A supplementation reduces risk of under-five mortality by about one-fourth among the millions of children deficient in this micronutrient.

UNIT: Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex: Male, Female

TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

FFP awardees (see "Measurement Notes").

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): 3.1.9.2 (3)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level; only those children reached by FFP intervention.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** FFP awardees.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Project records, service statistics.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Annual.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions: <http://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions>.

Module D. Gender

Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

| 60. INDICATOR: Proportion of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources (assets, credit, income or employment) (R) | |
|---|---|
| REQUIRED FOR ALL FFP DEVELOPMENT FOOD ASSISTANCE PROJECTS | |
| <p>DEFINITION: This indicator would be used to measure women's participation in USG supported programs that provide access to economic opportunity. USG in this context refers only to FFP-supported activities.</p> <p>Productive economic resources include: assets - land, housing, businesses, livestock, or financial assets such as savings; credit; wage or self-employment; and income.</p> <p>Programs include micro, small, and medium enterprise programs; workforce development programs that have job placement activities; programs that build assets (such as land redistribution or titling; housing titling; agricultural programs that provide assets such as livestock; programs designed to help adolescent females and young women set up savings accounts).</p> <p>This indicator does NOT track access to services – such as BDS or stand-alone employment training (e.g., that does not also include job placement following the training). Indicator narratives should specify type of assets.</p> <p>The unit of measure will be a proportion, expressed in the format of X/Y, where X is the number of females from program participants and Y is the total number of male and female participants in the programs illustrated above (e.g., micro, small, and medium enterprise programs; workforce development programs that have job placement activities; programs that build assets (land redistribution or titling; housing titling; agricultural programs that provide assets such as livestock).</p> <p>This is a new indicator but it builds on information collected for some of the standard (EG) output indicators that track the benefits of economic programs.</p> <p>The lack of access to resources is frequently cited as a major impediment to gender equality and women's empowerment. Tracking the proportion of females among participants in USG funded interventions designed to increase access to economic resources can provide information on the scope of USG efforts to lift women out of poverty.</p> <p>The limitation of this indicator is that it does not track the quality of the program or actual increases or improvements in assets, income, or returns to an enterprise.</p> | |
| <p>UNIT: Percent</p> <p>Overall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proportion of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources 2. Total number of male and female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources <p>By Age Group: 10-29 years</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Proportion of female participants 10-29 years of age in USG-assisted programs designed to | <p>DISAGGREGATE BY: <u>Age</u>: 10-29 years; 30 and over</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>increase access to productive economic resources</p> <p>4. Total number of male and female participants 10-29 years of age in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources</p> <p>30 years and over</p> <p>5. Proportion of female participants over 30 years of age in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources</p> <p>6. Total number of male and female participants over 30 years of age in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources</p> <p>See instructions below on how to enter and/or provide the data points in the IPTT and SAPQ</p> <p>For the IPTT: FFP awardees will enter data points 1, 3, and 5.</p> <p>For the SAPQ: FFP awardees will enter all data points above.</p> | |
| <p>TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output</p> | <p>DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better</p> |
| <p>DATA SOURCE: FFP awardees (see “Measurement Notes”).</p> | |
| <p>FOREIGN ASSISTANCE STANDARDIZED PROGRAM STRUCTURE (SPS): GNDR-2</p> | |
| <p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL OF COLLECTION? Project-level, direct beneficiaries. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? FFP awardees. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Data should be collected through the FFP awardee’s routine project monitoring system, and/or activity tracking system. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Annually. | |
| <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an “F” indicator. The information in this PIRS is obtained from page 36 in the following USG document: http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/101761.pdf. • Additional guidance on this indicator is also available in the following USAID document: http://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/How-To_Note_Gender_and_PPRs_2013_0719.pdf. | |

Annex 1. Overview of FFP Indicators

The updated list of FFP indicators has 74 indicators. Six of these indicators are only applicable to projects awarded on or before FY 2013 (see table of discontinued indicators). The following tables summarize the characteristics of FFP indicators. Please note this includes both annual monitoring indicators and baseline/final evaluation indicators.

| FFP INDICATORS BY FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Annual Monitoring | | Baseline/Final Evaluation | |
| 37 | | 37 | |
| Required | Required if applicable | Required | Required if applicable |
| 3 | 34 | 7 | 30 |

| FFP INDICATORS BY SOURCE | | |
|--------------------------|-----|----------|
| F | FTF | FFP only |
| 15 | 33 | 26 |

Annex 2. List of Changes to FFP Indicators

Below is the list of changes since the April 2013 List of FFP Indicators. FFP added, dropped, discontinued, and changed indicators. See tables below for details. Please note that changes apply to both annual monitoring indicators and baseline/final evaluation indicators.

New indicators

| No. | Indicator title | Frequency of collection BL/FE = baseline/final evaluation A= annually |
|-----|--|--|
| 4 | Proportion of women of reproductive age who are consuming a minimum dietary diversity | BL/FE |
| 44 | Percent of households that can obtain drinking water in less than 30 minutes (round trip) | BL/FE |
| 46 | Percent of physically improved sanitation facilities with feces visibly present on the floor, wall, or area immediately surrounding the facility | A |
| 51 | Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions | A |
| 55 | Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (CPR) | BL/FE |
| 61 | Percentage of men and women who earned cash in the past 12 months | BL/FE |
| 62 | Percentage of men/women in union and earning cash who make decisions alone about the use of self-earned cash | BL/FE |
| 63 | Percentage of men/women in union and earning cash who make decisions jointly with spouse/partner about the use of self-earned cash | BL/FE |
| 64 | Percentage of men and women with children under two who have knowledge of maternal and child health and nutrition (MCHN) practices | BL/FE |
| 65 | Percentage of men/women in union with children under two who make maternal health and nutrition decisions alone | BL/FE |
| 66 | Percentage of men/women in union with children under two who make maternal health and nutrition decisions jointly with spouse/partner | BL/FE |
| 67 | Percentage of men/women in union with children under two who make child health and nutrition decisions alone | BL/FE |
| 68 | Percentage of men/women in union with children under two who make child health and nutrition decisions jointly with spouse/partner | BL/FE |
| 69 | Prevalence of women of reproductive age who consume targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities | BL/FE |
| 70 | Prevalence of children 6-23 months who consume targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities | BL/FE |

Dropped Indicators

| No. | Indicator title | Frequency of collection BL/FE = baseline/final evaluation A= annually |
|-----|----------------------------|---|
| 44 | Time needed to fetch water | A |

Indicators discontinued for new FFP projects, but still applicable for projects awarded on or before FY 2013 and currently reporting on them

| No. | Indicator title | Frequency of collection BL/FE = baseline/final evaluation A= annually |
|-----|--|---|
| 36 | Women's Dietary Diversity Score: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (WDDS) | BL/FE |
| 59 | Number of additional USG-assisted community health workers (CHWs) providing family planning (FP) information and/or services during the year | A |
| 71 | Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index | BL/FE |
| 72 | Percent of cases of acute malnutrition in children under 5 (6–59 months) detected who are referred for treatment | A |
| 73 | Percent of villages in catchment area that hold to regular maintenance schedules for sanitation facilities | A |
| 74 | Number of women receiving postpartum family planning counseling | A |

Changes

| Change | Description |
|--|--|
| Titles for indicators 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 22, 26, 27, 34, 53, 54 | Indicator titles were slightly changed to either align with FTF or because of FFP revisions. |
| Definitions for FTF indicators | Indicators definitions have been updated to align with the October 2014 version of the FTF handbook. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Applicability criteria | Applicability criteria were redefined for many indicators. Check the applicability column in the FFP Indicators list. |
| Standard indicators were relabeled | Standard indicators have been relabeled as required if applicable. There are no standard indicators. |
| Agriculture indicators for baseline and final evaluations | The agricultural module has been updated. Farmers' definition was updated, so that all farmers that share decision making over a plot of land (or set of animals) should be interviewed. The agriculture questionnaire was updated. |
| Data points for baseline and final evaluation indicators | Data points to enter in SAPQ were updated. |
| Disaggregation categories | Disaggregation categories were updated and/or added for most indicators. |
| Household Roster | The household roster was updated. |
| Gender Indicators | Eight gender indicators were developed for BL/FE surveys. |