

FTF Indicator Handbook Definition Sheets

**FtF/GUA
May 25, 2011**

1

OBJECTIVE: 4 Economic Growth

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

INDICATOR TITLE: 4-1 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day*

**The MDGs define this level as those living in "extreme poverty". Although we do not use the word "extreme" in this title, we are referring to the same measure used by the UN for the MDGs.*

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures Millennium Development Goal Target 1a. Halving extreme poverty refers to the period 1990 to 2015. The applicable poverty line has been updated to \$1.25 dollars per person per day, converted into local currency at 2005 "Purchasing Power Parity" (PPP) exchange rates. The use of PPP exchange rates ensures that the poverty line applied in each country has the same real value. Measurement is based on the value of average daily consumption expenditure per person, where food and other items that a household consumes out of its own production are counted as if the household purchased those items at market prices. For example, all members of a household of four people are counted as poor if its average daily consumption expenditures are less than \$5 per day at 2005 PPP after adjusting for local inflation since 2005. The poverty rate is estimated by dividing the measured number of poor people in a sample of households by the total population in the households in the sample.

RATIONALE:

This measures the first goal of the Feed the Future Initiative as well as a Millennium Development Goal. It is the purpose of the program. All objectives, program elements and projects are designed to reduce poverty.

UNIT:

Percent

Percent calculated from this fraction multiplied by 100:

Numerator: # of people living on <\$1.25/day

Denominator: total # of people in targeted population

(whole country for national level data, or targeted sub-region only for program-level data)

DISAGGREGATE BY:

--by gendered household head type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

TYPE:

Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower = better

DATA SOURCE:

MDG database for national level

Household surveys conducted/coordinated by M&E contractor for sub-regional/targeted population level data

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

This is a contextual indicator, that although not 100% USG-attributable at the national level, should still be measured to assess overall food security situation in a country. Because this is a contextual indicator, no targets will need to be set at the national level.

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** This data is already collected by the UN for measuring progress towards the MDG, and is available at the country and regional levels in the MDG database at <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx>; however, this data should also be collected at the USG program level, i.e. in the targeted population addressed by USG efforts, to contrast results of USG efforts from results at the national level.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The UN already collects this data for the MDGs at the country and regional level; however, the large M&E contractor for the FTF Initiative will do the collection at the program/sub-regional level for targeted areas. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** For the national level data, the M&E contractor should be consistent in pulling the country information from the MDG database, knowing the methods used by UN described in this data collection handbook: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx>. For the targeted population/sub-regional level, the M&E contractor should use household consumption surveys, or build off of already-existing ones. To ensure reliability and comparability with MDG estimates, household consumption expenditure surveys should follow the standard Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) protocol, which is extensively documented by the World Bank. In many cases, the questionnaire used in the latest national household survey can be obtained from the national statistical office; details are available at the World Bank's web sites under PovCalNet or LSMS Dataset Finder. EGAT/EG can provide further technical support.

Surveys should be undertaken at approximately the same time each year, based on a statistically representative sample of households in the program area.

2

SPS Location OBJECTIVE: 3 Investing in People
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

INDICATOR TITLE: 3—1 Prevalence of underweight children under 5

DEFINITION:

Underweight children is a weight-for-age measurement. Underweight is a reflection of acute and/or chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are underweight, as defined by a weight for age Z score < -2.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months with a weight for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for age Z score data.

RATIONALE:

Reducing the prevalence of underweight children under 5 is the goal of the Feed the Future Initiative. The prevalence of underweight children is also an indicator to monitor the Millennium Development Goal 1c8 “Halving the number of people who are hungry”. Monitoring the percent of underweight children 0-59 months therefore allows USAID and its partners to show the contribution of FtF programs to the Millennium Development Goal.

UNIT:
 Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:
 Sex

Note: data has shown there is not a significant difference between sexes

TYPE:
 impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
 Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS survey and/or supplementary survey by central M&E contractor in targeted area (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual “pulse” on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from

the [Nutrition Update 2010](#) booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.

- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at:

http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

3

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5 Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-1 Per Capita expenditures of rural households (proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries.

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures expenditures as a proxy for income per capita, i.e. total household expenditures divided by number of household members. Because of the difficulty in directly measuring income, other indicators are often used to provide an indication of progress toward improving income. Remembering income over a year is difficult, especially if some forms of income might be taxed or require reporting to government officials (for example remittances). Therefore, expenditures over the last 24 hours from the time of survey, divided by the number of household members, will be requested for ease of recall. This includes expenditures on food stuffs, estimated value of household consumption of items they grew.

Households should be sampled in the same areas at the same time of year to compare across years accurately.

RATIONALE:

There is some correlation between increased expenditures and improved food security, reduced poverty and higher nutrition.

UNIT:

USD

Note: To get USD, convert from local currency at the average exchange rate for the reporting period)

DISAGGREGATE BY:

-- --by gendered household head type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

--Food vs. non-food expenditures

TYPE: Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

household surveys conducted or coordinated (if building off of already-conducted LSMS, for example) by the centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** This will only be collected in the area/sub-regions targeted by the USG programs.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** This information may already be collected by survey tools such as the LSMS (www.worldbank.org/lsm), in which case the centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor will coordinate with that tool to ensure inclusion of data collection in the region targeted by USG programs. If no other sufficient survey is being collected, the centrally-funded M&E contractor will collect this info themselves in areas targeted by the USG programs. USAID Missions do not need to collect this information separately.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** The M&E contractor should do a household expenditure survey in the targeted area. This survey should build off of other surveys being conducted, e.g. along with the Household Hunger Survey, prevalence of poverty survey, or LSMS-ISA, as applicable. Surveys should be undertaken at approximately the same time each year, based on a statistically representative sample of targeted beneficiary households in the program area.

4

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5 Agriculture
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-3 Percent change in agricultural GDP

DEFINITION:

The gross domestic product (GDP) or value of all final goods produced by the agricultural sector within a nation in a given year. The definition of agricultural GDP follows the approach used by the UN statistical office in assisting countries to improve their national accounts. Crop output "is the product of output and the unit price at basic prices"... "less losses and wastes"... plus the net change in inventories. In general "most countries assign output and its associated costs to the time when the crop is harvested." Report year on year change in percent (i.e. annual growth rate).

RATIONALE:

Agricultural GDP is a key measure of overall agricultural performance.

UNIT:
 Percent

System Note: First enter baseline Ag GDP (GDP in year before FTF efforts) and then enter Ag GDP each subsequent year in USD. The FTF M&E system will automatically calculate the Percent change between the previous year and the current year.

DISAGGREGATE BY:

TYPE:
 Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
 Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

The centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor should obtain this data from national accounts collected by the government

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

This is a contextual indicator, that although not 100% USG-attributable at the national level, should still be measured to assess overall food security situation in a country.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: National level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Usually this is collected/determined by an entity in the host government (Ministry of Finance, National Stat Office, etc.), and the centrally-funded M&E contractor should get this information from them.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: host governments should follow UN statistical office approach in determining their Ag GDP. Once the data is entered by the centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor into FTF M&E system, the system will automatically calculate the "percent change".

5

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children

INDICATOR TITLE: 3—2 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age

DEFINITION:

Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that is a reflection of chronic nutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months (i.e. under 5 years) who are stunted, as defined by a height for age Z score < -2. Children with a height for age Z score < -2 and >= -3 are classified as moderately stunted. Children with a height for age Z score < -3 are classified as severely stunted. This indicator will be a measurement of any stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined. While stunting is difficult to measure in children 0-6 months, this indicator data will still be reported for all children under 5 to align with DHS strata.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months with a height for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with height for age Z score data.

RATIONALE:

Stunted, wasted, and underweight children under five years of age are the three major nutritional indicators. Stunting is an indicator of linear growth retardation, most often due to prolonged exposure to an inadequate diet and poor health. Reducing the prevalence of stunting among children particularly 0-23 months is important because linear growth deficits accrued early in life are associated with cognitive impairments, poor educational performance and decreased work productivity among adults. Better nutrition leads to increased cognitive and physical abilities, thus improving individual productivity in general, including improved agricultural productivity.

UNIT:
Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Sex

Note: data has shown there is not a significant difference between sexes

TYPE:
Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS survey and/or supplementary survey by central M&E contractor in targeted area (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual “pulse” on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS,

calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at:

http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

6

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children

INDICATOR TITLE: 3—3 Prevalence of underweight women

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percent of non-pregnant women of reproductive age (15-49 years) who are underweight, as defined by a body mass index (BMI) < 18.5. Women with a BMI of 16.5-18.4 are moderately underweight while those with a BMI less than 16.5 are severely underweight. To calculate an individual's BMI, weight and height data are needed: $BMI = \text{weight (in kg)} \div \text{height}^2 \text{ (in meters)}$

The numerator for this indicator is the number of non pregnant women 15-49 years with a BMI < 18.5. The denominator for this indicator is the number of non pregnant women 15-49 years in the sample with BMI data.

RATIONALE:

This indicator provides information about the extent to which women's diets meet their caloric requirements. Adequate energy in the diet is necessary to support the continuing growth of adolescent girls and women's ability to provide optimal care for their children and participate fully in income generation activities. Undernutrition among women of reproductive age is associated with increased morbidity, poor food security, and can result in adverse birth outcomes in future pregnancies. Improvements in women's nutritional status are expected to improve women's work productivity, which may also have benefits for agricultural production; thus linking the two sides of FtF

UNIT:
Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:

TYPE:
Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS survey and/or supplementary survey by central M&E contractor in targeted area (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual "pulse" on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Z

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status especially of Women and Children

INDICATOR TITLE: 3—4 Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percent of children 6-59 months who are acutely malnourished, as defined by a weight for height Z score < -2. Although the severity of wasting can be measured, include a prevalence of all wasting, i.e. both moderate and severe wasting combined.

The numerator for the indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months with a weight for height Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for height Z score data.

RATIONALE:

Stunted, wasted, and underweight children under five years of age are the three major nutritional indicators. Wasting is an indicator of acute malnutrition. Children who are wasted are too thin for their height, and have a much greater risk of dying from infectious disease than children who are not wasted.

UNIT:
Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Sex

Note: data has shown there is not a significant difference between sexes

TYPE:
Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS survey and/or supplementary survey by central M&E contractor in targeted area (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual “pulse” on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at:

http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

8

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1 AGRICULTURE ENABLING ENVIRONMENT
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.4: Enhanced institutional capacity development for increased ag. sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-8 NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS/ORGANIZATIONS UNDERTAKING CAPACITY/COMPETENCY STRENGTHENING AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE

DEFINITION:

Number of institutions/organizations undertaking capacity / competency strengthening in one or more of the six areas of institutional/organizational competency: governance (e.g., board, mission/goal/ constituency, leadership, legal status); management practices (e.g., organizational structure, information management, administration procedures, personnel, planning, program development, program reporting); human resources (e.g., human resources development, staff roles, work organization, diversity issues, supervisory practices, salary and benefits); financial resources (e.g., accounting, budgeting, financial/inventory controls, financial reporting); service delivery (e.g., sectoral expertise, constituency, impact assessment); external relations (e.g., constituency relations, collaboration, public relations, local resources, media). Include any institution receiving USG assistance.

RATIONALE:

There are 5 stages of institutional/organizational capacity strengthening: 1) undergoing capacity/competency assessments, 2) institution/organization assessments presented for consultation, 3) undertaking capacity/competency strengthening, 4) making significant improvements, 5) mature/viable. This indicator measures the third of five stages of institutional/organizational capacity strengthening in agriculture. This indicator is easily aggregated upward from all operating units.

UNIT:
Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:
None

TYPE:
Outcome, if institution heavily involved

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
More = better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

System Note: In the FTF M&E system, the institution name will be entered and then associated with one of the five stages of capacity building listed above. The system **will automatically aggregate** the total number of institutions at each level.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing Partner
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Implementing Partner records/Survey of institutions if needed

9

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1 AGRICULTURE ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.3: Improved Agricultural Policy Environment (increase productivity)

INDICATOR TITLE: NUMBER OF POLICIES / REGULATIONS / ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case:

- Stage 1: (Indicator #4.5.1-9) Analyzed
- Stage 2: (Indicator #4.5.1-10) Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation
- Stage 3: (Indicator #4.5.1-13) Presented for legislation/decree
- Stage 4: (Indicator #4.5.1-12) Prepared with USG assistance passed/approved
- Stage 5: (Indicator #4.5.1-11) Passed for which implementation has begun

These are 5 different indicators, each measuring a successive stage in the progression from analysis to implementation

DEFINITION:

Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, and public investment that...

Stage 1: ...underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures).

Stage 2: ...underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.

Stage 3: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)

Stage 4: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).

Stage 5: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).

RATIONALE:

The indicator measures the number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. This indicator is easily aggregated upward from all operating units.

UNIT:
number

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Sector:

- Inputs (e.g. seed, fertilizer)
- Outputs (e.g. rice, maize)
- Macroeconomic (e.g. exchange rate)
- Agricultural sector-wide (e.g. wage rate for ag labor)
- Research, extension, information, and other public service
- Food security/vulnerable (e.g. safety net)

System note: These disaggregates will be in the FTF M&E system in a drop-down menu, although not necessarily in FACTS Info

TYPE:
Stages 1 & 2 = Output
Stages 3, 4, & 5 = Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Although this set of 5 indicators tracks individual policies through the stages, one should see the aggregates of these indicators, over time, change in certain ways. One should expect the value of this indicators measuring the earlier stages to decline and the indicators measuring the later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e., move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

*System Note: In the FTF M&E system, the policy title/name should be entered and then associated with one of the five stages listed above, as well as labeled for the sector it addresses. The system **will automatically aggregate** the total number of policies at each stage of development and in each sector.*

Implementing Partners should clearly describe each policy/regulation in the title/description in the system as to avoid double counting by multiple partners operating in a given country. Missions should consider assigning this indicator to the particular partner best positioned to track this indicator.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; policies specifically addressed with USG assistance
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing Partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Observation and analysis of host government legal status of the various policies being addressed

10

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the area (in hectares) first brought under new technology during the current reporting year. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous year should not be included. Relevant technologies include:

- Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including packaging;
 - Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;
 - Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides;
 - Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved agricultural production and marketing practices, and better natural resource management practices.
- Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted.

RATIONALE:

Tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity.

UNIT:
Hectares

DISAGGREGATE BY:

- Sex of the adopter/implementer of these new technologies on the hectares being counted: male, female, or association-applied
- Technology type: crop genetics (including nutritional enhancement), animal genetics, pest management, disease management, soil-related (fertility and conservation, including tillage), water management, post-harvest handling and storage, processing, and other

System note: these disaggregations will be available in the FTF M&E system and not necessarily in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level – only those hectares affected by USG assistance, and only those brought under new technologies/management this year
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: via survey or other applicable method

There should be a clear link between indicator 4.5.2-2 the reported number of hectares under improved management and indicator 4.5.2-5 the number of individuals (farmers, processors, etc.) applying new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (measured under indicator #4.5.2-5) as well as associations/cooperatives/WUAs/CBOs, and MSME's applying new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (as measured under indicator #4.5.2-28), e.g. if a farmer applied new technologies to his/her land, then the farmer would be counted under indicator #4.5.2-5 and the # of hectares s/he applied the new technologies on would be counted in indicator #4.5.2-2, whereas if a producers association/group applied a new technology, it would be counted under indicator #4.5.2-28 and the hectares on which it was applied counted under #4.5.2-2)

11

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased agricultural sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training

DEFINITION:

The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through formal or informal means. This includes farmers, ranchers 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. Training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources management. In-country and off-shore training are included. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities. An example is a USDA Cochran Fellow.

This is not to include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead.

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 policy formulation and implementation which is key to transformational development.

UNIT:

Number of individuals

DISAGGREGATE BY:

--Sex

--Type of individual:

- Primary sector producers
- Processors, managers, traders
- Researchers
- Policymakers

--# of unique individuals, i.e. the number of individuals, out of the total training attendance, who were trained for the first time by the Implementing Partner with FTF funds. Doing this disaggregation will enable us to track both the total participation at trainings, as well as the number of unique individuals we are reaching with our trainings.

TYPE:

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level, individuals targeted by USG program
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing Mechanism
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Program training records

Since this has historically been reported by simply counting the attendance at each training held, without taking into account individuals receiving multiple trainings, we will continue to account attendance, and then disaggregate for # of unique individuals in order to better understand how many new people we are reaching

12

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-8 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance

DEFINITION:

Number of technologies, management practices, or products made available. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. New varieties/breeds of food and non-food crops, livestock products, fisheries, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included. Technologies may include improved management practices such as sustainable land management. Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted; an improvement would be significant if, among other reasons, it served a new purpose or allowed a new class of users to employ it. Examples include a scaled-down milk container that allows individuals to carry it easily, a new blend of fertilizer for a particular soil, and tools modified to suit a particular management practice.

Note that completing a research activity does not in itself constitute having made a technology available. In the case of crop research that developed a new variety, e.g., the variety must have passed through any required approval process, and seed of the new variety should be available for multiplication. The technology should have proven benefits and be as ready for use as it can be as it emerges from the research and testing process. In some cases more than one operating unit may count the same technology. This would occur if the technology were developed, for instance, in collaboration with a U.S. university and passed through regional collaboration to other countries. Technologies made available for transfer should be only those made available in the current reporting year. Any technology made available in a previous year should not be included. Note that there are several phases for tracking technologies represented through different indicators:

Number of new technologies or management practices...

...in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance (4.5.2-10)

...in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance (4.5.2-9)

...in Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (4.5.2-8)

RATIONALE:

This indicator tracks the 3rd of 3 stages in agricultural research and technology investments and progress toward dissemination. Technological progress is foundational for ag. growth.

UNIT:
Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Commodity, if applicable

Technology type:

crop genetics (including nutritional enhancement), animal genetics, pest management, disease management, soil-related (fertility and conservation, including tillage), water management, post-harvest handling and storage, processing, and other

System note: In the FTF M&E system, you will enter the number of each type of technology made available for transfer, and the system will aggregate the total number entered from all projects to address this indicator. Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:
Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; only those technologies made available for transfer from the USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: from project records or survey

13

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.5: Agricultural producer organizations strengthened

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-11 NUMBER OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISES, PRODUCERS ORGANIZATIONS, WATER USERS ASSOCIATIONS, TRADE AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS) RECEIVING USG ASSISTANCE

DEFINITION:

Total number of private enterprises, farmers' associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations and community-based organizations receiving USG assistance. This assistance includes support that aim at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. "Organizations assisted" does not include those merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering by one or more employees.

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

This indicator counts the number of groups trained, e.g. a company training or association training. If training is directed at individuals and not at the firm/organization as a whole, use indicators #4.5.2-6 or 7 (short and long term training) to report results.

The outcome of this group training, i.e. groups applying new practices, should be reported under #4.5.2-28, which measures groups applying new practices, while the outcome of individuals receiving training, i.e. individuals applying new practices, should be reported under #4.5.2-5.

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)

System note: In the FTF M&E system, you will enter the number of each type of organization receiving assistance for your projects, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator across all projects. Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:
Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing Partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: participant records of training and various USG assistance for these specific types of organizations/associations

14

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: Sub IR 1.5: Agricultural producer organizations strengthened

INDICATOR TITLE:: NUMBER OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS/ASSOCIATIONS ASSISTED AS A RESULT OF USG SUPPORTED INTERVENTIONS

DEFINITION:

Organizations assisted are those that are engaged with a project activity and either already have shown benefit from the activity (as measured by any of the types) or have a high likelihood of gaining one of those benefits due to their significant level of engagement with the project.

"Organizations assisted" does not include those merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering by one or more employees.

Only those organizations whose primary purpose is to serve women should be counted. In some cases men will be members of these organizations; this would not prevent counting the organization, as long as the primary intended beneficiaries of the organization are women.

Operating units should require of each implementing partner a written explanation for why those included in the partner's estimates of beneficiaries belong there.

Organizations whose primary purpose is to serve women are not included, because they are counted in a separate indicator. In some cases, producer associations or other organizations operate firms. In these cases both entities could be counted (under organizations assisted and under firms assisted) if both the organization and the firm receive appropriate (presumably different) types of assistance.

RATIONALE:

Tracks USG investments to increase capacity of women in agriculture.

UNIT:

Number of Women's Organizations/ Associations

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE: OUTPUT/OUTCOME

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

15

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions

DEFINITION:

A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a beneficiary if s/he is engaged with a project activity and either already has shown benefit from the activity or has a high likelihood of gaining one of those benefits due to his/her significant level of engagement with the project.

- Beneficiaries do not include those merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering. Beneficiaries include people who receive training. Household data will be disaggregated by the sex of the claimed or presumed head.
- The definition of "rural" should be the definition used by the respective national statistical service.

If a project's tactic is to work through a group or association to create benefits for the membership of that group or association, the members of the group can be counted as direct beneficiaries, even if the technical assistance is not provided directly to those individuals. Therefore it's important to note that individuals counted under indicator # 4.5.2-27 (Number of members of producer organizations/CBOs receiving USG assistance) could be part of the total reported under this indicator, #4.5.2-13, as applicable. In addition, note that households counted under indicator # 4.5.2-14 (Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance) could be part of the total here in #4.5.2-13, so that one would have "Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG assistance, of which x number are vulnerable."

The implementing partner needs to be able to demonstrate from the records of the group or otherwise that the assistance was transmitted to its membership. This would be particularly clear and feasible for small producer groups and trade associations; it would not be credible for an apex cooperative association that might have hundreds of thousands of members.

RATIONALE:

Tracks access and equitable access to services in targeted area.

UNIT:
Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

--by gendered household head type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

--by Continuing vs. New households: Rural households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Taking the example of a benefit derived from technology adoption, if a household adopted last year an agricultural technology provided under a USG program and continued to use that technology in the current (reporting) year, then that household should be counted. If the household adopted the technology last year but was not using it during the current (reporting) year, then the household 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."

Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:
Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; attributable to USG investment
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: from Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.

16

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5 Agriculture

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-4 Gross margin per unit of land or animal of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country)

DEFINITION:

The gross margin is the difference between the total value of sales of the agricultural item or livestock and the cost of producing that item, divided by the total number of units (hectares for crops, animals for livestock) in production. Gross margin per hectare or per animal for targeted commodities is a measure of net income for that farm activity. Input costs included should be those significant input costs that can be easily ascertained. These are likely to be the cash costs. To conserve data collection resources, only those input costs estimated to be at least 5% of the total input cost should be included. Most likely items are: purchased seed, feed, fertilizer, pesticides, hired labor, and hired machine/veterinary services. Reporting of current-year results for individuals and firms who have benefited in previous years from this same USG assistance should be included along with current-year results of current beneficiaries. Reporting all data elements (Area, Production, Quantity of Sales, Value of Sales, and Purchased Input Cost) requested is critical to the ability to aggregate results across missions.

RATIONALE:

Improving the gross margin for farming commodities/animals contributes to increasing ag. GDP, will increase income, and thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the Goal indicator of reducing poverty.

UNIT:

dollars/hectare or dollars/animal

Note: convert local currency to USD by using an average of the market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period

DISAGGREGATE BY:

--Targeted commodity
-- by gendered household head type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

System note: These disaggregations will not necessarily be available in FACTSInfo, but will be available in the FTF M&E system in a drop down menu.

TYPE:

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

Gross margin is calculated by applying a formula against these 5 data points: 1) Area (hectares) or Number of animals (for livestock), 2) Production 3) Value of Sales (USD), 4) Quantity of Sales and 5) purchased input costs (report only those costs that are at least 5% of total cost, i.e. do not report miniscule costs)

Price = value of sales divided by quantity of sales; **gross revenue** = price x production; **net revenue** = gross revenue minus purchase input cost; **gross margin (per ha or per animal)** = net revenue divided by area (for crops) or by animals (for livestock)

FTF System Note: Simply enter the 5 data points into the FTF M&E system, and it will do the calculation of gross margin automatically. This calculation cannot be done without all 5 data points.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level, in targeted commodities/livestock
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing Partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Through farmer survey

Note: If the item is home consumed then the market price received by farmers selling the product is used to value it. Cost includes all purchased inputs, purchased transportation (including fuel), or hired labor, but does not include any imputed value of family or community labor.

17

SPS LOCATION: Element 4.5.2 Agricultural Sector Capacity
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR2: Expanding Markets and Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm- level) attributed to FTF implementation

DEFINITION:

This indicator will collect both volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities for its calculation. The value of incremental sales indicates the value (in USD) of the total amount agricultural products sold by farm households relative to a base year and can be calculated based on the total quantity/volume (in metric tons) sold of a crop times the crop price in the previous year minus the total quantity/volume (in metric tons) sold of a crop times the crop price in the base year. Pre-existing sales should not be counted; only incremental sales facilitated by the project should be counted. Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator #4.5—4, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value here.

RATIONALE:

Volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those smallholders. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by subsistence and semi-subsistence smallholders. 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.

UNIT:

USD

[Volume (in metric tons) sold x Crop price in previous year]

–

[Volume (in metric tons) sold x Crop Price in base year]

=

Value of incremental sales in current year

Note: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Targeted agricultural products, sex of smallholder

Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project level; those affected by USG project reach
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partner
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: The value of incremental sales can be collected directly from farmers and, in some cases, cross-checked with recorded sales data by farmer's associations.

Only count the increase in sales attributable to the FTF investment, i.e. where FtF assisted the individual farm directly. Examples of FTF investment could include: improved seeds, better input availability or farming techniques, marketing assistance or other activities that benefited farmers. This will be done on an annual basis.

18

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-36 Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance

DEFINITION:

This indicator will measure the value of regional and non-regional exports in USD attributable to USG assistance. Exports to be counted here are those from countries for which an Operating Unit has an active program. Exports can include those within and outside of neighboring regions, so as to avoid loss of counter-seasonal exports, which often leave the proximate region. The commodities to be counted are those that are targeted in the work plans and/or contracts of the implementing partners. Note that these within-region exports could also be counted in indicator #4.5.2-35, which is intended to measure overall regional trade in certain commodities, even beyond USG attribution.

RATIONALE:

Increased agricultural trade is one of the end results of efficient markets.

UNIT:
 USD

DISAGGREGATE BY:

- Commodity
- Regional trade (value of exports sent within the region)
- Non-regional trade (value of exports going outside of region)

FTF system note: a drop –down list of commodities will be available to simplify aggregation. Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:
 Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
 Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project level; only those exports attributable to the USG project, as defined by the exports of a country where USG has a program
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Producer records, available trade data, etc.

19

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 3: Increased private sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FtF assistance

DEFINITION:

Number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed due to FtF intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Although a GDA (Global Development Alliance) is defined by a 1:1 ratio ofCHECK WITH GDA A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. USAID must be one of the public partners. USAID is almost always represented in the partnership by its implementing partner. For-profit enterprises and NGOs are considered private. A public entity can be national or sub-national government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner. It could include state enterprises which are non-profit. A private entity can be a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully).

A mission or a project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included, unless those partnerships

- An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation.
- A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers.

RATIONALE:

The assumption of this sub-IR is that if more partnerships are formed that there is a likelihood that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will help achieve IR3 which then contributes to the Key Objective of agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will be a reduction in poverty.

UNIT:

Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Type of partnership (refer to the *primary focus* of the partnership):

- agricultural production
- agricultural post harvest transformation
- nutrition
- other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships)
- multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)

System note: In the FTF M&E system, you will enter the name of the partnership, label it for its type, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator. Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project level; attributable to USG investment
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Observation and records of partnerships created

20

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 Agricultural Sector Capacity

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 3: Increased private sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation

DEFINITION:

Investment is defined as any use of resources intended to increase future production output or income. The “food chain” includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as animals for traction, storage bins, and machinery. Downstream investments could include capital investments in equipment, etc. to do post-harvest transformation/processing of agricultural products as well as the transport of agricultural products to markets. “Private sector” includes any privately-led agricultural activity whether it is managed by an individual/household or a formal company. A CBO or NGO may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural activity. “Leveraged by FTF implementation” indicates that the new investment was directly or indirectly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the FTF initiative. Investments reported should not include funds received by the investor from USG as part of any grant or other award.

RATIONALE:

Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production. Agricultural growth is critical to achieving the FTF goal to “Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger”.

UNIT:
US Dollars

DISAGGREGATE BY:
None

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Increase = better

DATA SOURCE:
implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; new investment (within reporting year) leveraged within scope of USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: private sector financial records, Program data

21

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5 Agriculture
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR4: Increased agriculture value-chain productivity leading to greater on- and off-farm jobs

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation

DEFINITION:

Jobs are all types of employment opportunities **created** in agriculture-related enterprises (including paid on-farm employment). Jobs lasting less than one month are not counted. Jobs should be converted to full-time equivalents. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not established as work hours may vary greatly.

"Attributed to FTF implementation" is subjective and includes farming and non-farm jobs where FtF assisted in any way to expand (or contract) jobs including helping to provide loans, policy change that led directly to job creation, etc.

RATIONALE:

This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, FTF is concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not temporary employment (of short duration such as a period of less than one month).

UNIT:
FTEs

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex of jobholder
 (if one FTE is split by a male and a female, then it would be 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males)
 Urban/rural (location of job)

System note: These disaggregations will not necessarily be available in FACTSInfo, but will be available in the FTF M&E system in a drop down menu.

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners should obtain the information from either a census or a sample of firms or farmers assisted by/participating in the project. Use a census if the number of assisted firms or farmers is small enough to do so; use a sample if the number is too large.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Only at the project-level, attributed to USG programs
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Through census or sampling of participating firms/farms, depending on size.

22

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF - IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 3--5 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percent of households experiencing moderate or severe hunger, as indicated by a score of 2 or more on the household hunger scale (HHS). To collect data for this indicator, respondents are asked about the frequency with which three events were experienced by household members in the last four weeks: 1. no food at all in the house; 2. went to bed hungry, 3. went all day and night without eating. For each question, the following responses are possible: never (value=0), rarely or sometimes (value=1), often (value=2). Values for the three questions are summed for each household, producing a HHS score ranging from 0 to 6 for each household.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of households with a score of 2 or more on the HHS. The denominator is the total number of households in the sample with HHS data.

RATIONALE:

Measurement of household hunger provides a tool to monitor global progress of USG supported food security initiatives. A decrease in household hunger is also a reflection of improved household resilience. The indicator has been validated using data sets from seven diverse sites to be meaningful for cross-cultural use.

UNIT:

Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:

--by gendered household head type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

TYPE:

Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

USAID/W will work to get these HHS questions incorporated into the DHS in applicable countries. Therefore, data source will be DHS and/or supplementary survey conducted by centrally-funded M&E contractor (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

USAID/W is working with HQ and the Missions to have the Household Hunger Scale (HHS) added as a module to the DHS. Missions direct which modules the DHS should add to the default set of survey questions, and all Focus Countries should request that the HHS module be added to any upcoming DHS as possible for collection of the national-level data.

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual "pulse" on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.

- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

For more information on the HHS, including guidance for collection and tabulation of the proportion of households with moderate or severe, refer to the FANTA-2 website: www.fanta-2.org

24

23

SPS LOCATION: 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-14 NUMBER OF VULNERABLE HOUSEHOLDS BENEFITING DIRECTLY FROM USG ASSISTANCE

DEFINITION:

A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a beneficiary if s/he is engaged with a project activity and either already has shown benefit from the activity) or has a high likelihood of gaining one of those benefits due to his/her significant level of engagement with the project.

Beneficiaries do not include those merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering.

Beneficiaries include people who receive training. Household data will be disaggregated by the sex of the claimed or presumed head.

The definition of “vulnerable” will be the definition used by the operating unit in formulating its Results Framework and activities. Possible groups include but are not limited to: HIV/AIDS sufferers and their families and those affected by drought, conflict and low assets (poverty traps), single family head of household, marginalized ethnic groups, etc.

Note that households counted under this indicator # 4.5.2-14 could be part of the total in #4.5.2-13, so that one would have “Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG assistance, of which x number are vulnerable.”

RATIONALE:

Inclusive ag sector growth is dependent on equitable access, and it is a key tenet of FTF to bring in typically marginalized groups.

UNIT:

Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

--by **gendered household head type**: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

--by **Continuing vs. New households**: Vulnerable households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any vulnerable households that benefited in a previous year but not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Taking the example of a benefit derived from technology adoption, if a vulnerable household adopted last year an agricultural technology provided under a USG program and continued to use that technology in the current (reporting) year, then that household should be counted. If the vulnerable household adopted the technology last year but was not using it during the current (reporting) year, then the household should not be included. Any vulnerable household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under “**Continuing**.” Any vulnerable household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under “**New**.” No vulnerable household should be counted under both “Continuing” and “New.”

Disaggregates not necessarily available in FACTSInfo.

TYPE:

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher = better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; only those affected by USG project reach, strong attribution
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: from definition of “vulnerable” in OU’s RF, with info from Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.

24

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6 Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-2 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD), apart from breast milk. A "minimum acceptable diet" consists of measuring both the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity, as appropriate for various age groups. If a child meets the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity for their age group, then they are considered to receive a minimum acceptable diet.

Tabulation of the indicator requires that data on breastfeeding, dietary diversity, number of semi-solid/solid feeds and number of milk feeds be collected for children 6-23 months the day preceding the survey. The indicator is calculated from the following two fractions:

1. Breastfed children 6-23 months of age who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

Breastfed children 6-23 months of age

and

2. Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age who received at least 2 milk feedings and had at least the minimum dietary diversity not including milk feeds and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age

Minimum dietary diversity for breastfed children 6-23 months is defined as four or more food groups out of the following 7 food groups (refer to the WHO IYCF operational guidance document cited at bottom):

1. Grains, roots and tubers
2. Legumes and nuts
3. Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese)
4. Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats)
5. Eggs
6. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables
7. Other fruits and vegetables

Minimum meal frequency for breastfed children is defined as two or more feedings of solid, semi-solid or soft food for children 6-8 months and three or more feedings of solid, semi-solid or soft food for children 9-23 months.

Minimum dietary diversity for non breastfed children is defined as four or more food groups out of the following 6 food groups:

1. Grains, roots and tubers
2. Legumes and nuts
3. Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats)
4. Eggs
5. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables
6. Other fruits and vegetables

Minimum meal frequency for non breastfed children is defined as four or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, soft food, or milk feeds for children 6-23 months, with at least two of these feedings being milk feeds .

RATIONALE: Appropriate feeding of children 6-23 months is multidimensional. The minimum acceptable diet indicator combines standards of dietary diversity (a proxy for nutrient density) and feeding frequency (a proxy for energy density) by breastfeeding status; and thus provides a useful way to track progress at simultaneously improving the key quality and quantity dimensions of children's diets.

UNIT:
Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:
None

TYPE: Outcome	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: DHS and/or supplementary survey conducted by centrally-funded M&E contractor (see notes below)	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LEVEL of COLLECTION?: <i>For FTF:</i> This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual "pulse" on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.</i> To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.</i> ➤ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately. ➤ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH , as available. ➤ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?: bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years) <p>Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country</p> <p>For detailed guidance on how to collect and tabulate this indicator, refer to the WHO document: Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices, Part 2, Measurement, available at http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241599290_eng.pdf</p>	

25

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 7: Improved nutrition-related behaviors

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percent of children 0-5 months of age who were exclusively breastfed during the day preceding the survey. Exclusive breastfeeding means that the infant received breast milk (including milk expressed or from a wet nurse) and may have received ORS, vitamins, minerals and/or medicines, but did not receive any other food or liquid.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-5 months exclusively breastfed in the day preceding the survey. The denominator is the total number of children 0-5 months.

RATIONALE:

Exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months provides children with significant health and nutrition benefits, including protection from gastrointestinal infections and reduced risk of mortality, due to infectious disease.

UNIT:

Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE: OUTPUT/OUTCOME

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS and/or supplementary survey conducted by centrally-funded M&E contractor (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual “pulse” on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LOAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LOAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the [Nutrition Update 2010](#) booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at:

http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

For detailed guidance on how to collect and tabulate this indicator, refer to the WHO document: Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices, Part 2, Measurement, available at http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241599290_eng.pdf

<u>26</u>	
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services	
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-1 NUMBER OF PEOPLE TRAINED IN CHILD HEALTH AND NUTRITION THROUGH USG-SUPPORTED PROGRAMS	
DEFINITION: Number of people (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel) trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported programs.	
RATIONALE: Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USG-supported health area programs in this element.	
UNIT: Number	DISAGGREGATE BY: --Sex --# of unique individuals (i.e. this is their first training by this Implementing Partner in this sector)
TYPE: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners; service statistics from USAID projects	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; only those trained through USG activities ➤ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing Partners ➤ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: Through activity records/program data 	

27

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age

DEFINITION:

Anemia is measured by hemoglobin concentration in the blood and, for this indicator, is collected among women of reproductive age (15-49 years). Non pregnant women (NPW) with a hemoglobin concentration less than 12g/dl and Pregnant women (PW) with a hemoglobin concentration less than 11g/dl are classified as anemic.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic women 15-49 years. The denominator is the total number of women 15-49 years in the sample with hemoglobin data.

RATIONALE:

This indicator emphasizes the importance of women's micronutrient nutrition both pre-pregnancy and during pregnancy for the growth and development of the child in-utero and for a safe delivery and positive birth outcome. Maternal anemia during pregnancy is associated with increased risk of hemorrhage, sepsis, maternal mortality, perinatal mortality, and low birth weight. Maternal micronutrient nutrition (including adequate iron stores) is also necessary to support optimal maternal care for the child, including nutrient content of breastmilk fed to the child, during infancy and early childhood.

This IR emphasizes use of nutrition services with the assumption that if people use the health and nutrition services, anemia in women of reproductive age will drop.

Note that while there are cut-offs for severity of anemia, FTF will be reporting on women with any anemia. For NPW, the cut-offs for mild, moderate and severe anemia are 10-11.9 g/dl, 7-9.9 g/dl and <7 g/dl, respectively. For PW, the cut-offs are 10-10.9 g/dl, 7-9.9 g/dl and <7 g/dl, respectively.

UNIT:
Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:
None

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS and/or supplementary survey conducted by centrally-funded M&E contractor (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

➤ **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual "pulse" on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Information on frequency of DHS can be gotten from:

http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

28

SPS LOCATION: Program 3.1.9 NUTRITION

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition

DEFINITION:

A health facility may include government health clinics, private clinics as well as clinics run by community-based organizations or local NGOs. An “established capacity to manage acute under nutrition” indicates the organization has a program with established procedures, methods and appropriate materials to address acute under nutrition. An example of this could be a facility that meets the criteria on the National Protocol in the Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) program. This indicator is asking how many health facilities have this type of management capacity.

RATIONALE:

A key objective of FTF is the “Improved nutritional status, especially of women and children”. Assistance to poor via health facilities that treat under-nutrition is a key component to achieving this objective.

UNIT:

Number of health facilities

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Urban and rural

TYPE:

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Increase is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; only those health facilities supported by USG intervention
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: program data, assessment of health facilities involved in project

29

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-9 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months

DEFINITION:

Anemia is measured by hemoglobin concentration in the blood and, for this indicator, is collected among children 6-59 months. Children with a hemoglobin concentration less than 11g/dl are classified as anemic.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic children 6-59 months. The denominator is the total number of children 6-59 months in the sample with hemoglobin data.

Note that while there are cut-offs for severity of anemia, FTF will be reporting on children with any anemia. The cut-offs for mild, moderate and severe anemia are 10.0-10.9g/dl, 7-9.9 g/dl, and <7g/dl, respectively.

Note that a similar indicator (#3.1.3-42) exists in the List of Standard Indicators from F, but is used to measure anemia as associated with malaria. Although it may be difficult to determine whether a child's anemia is being caused by malaria or nutritional factors, report results under this indicator when measuring as part of a nutrition-related intervention and report results under #3.1.3-42 when measuring as part of a malaria-related intervention.

RATIONALE:

This indicator highlights the importance of micronutrient nutrition (iron status, in particular) for child health and development. Child anemia is associated with adverse consequences for child growth and development, including increased morbidity and impaired cognitive development.

UNIT:
Percent

DISAGGREGATE BY:
none

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

DHS and/or supplementary survey conducted by centrally-funded M&E contractor (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?:** *For FTF:* This indicator should be monitored at both the national level for keeping a contextual “pulse” on the country situation, and at the sub-national level (for the geographic region targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Note that these two sets of data will not be comparable to each other, since the DHS does not necessarily disaggregate by the exact regions/sub-regions targeted by the USG intervention.

To measure the national level: Use DHS data (every 5 years) and rolling average in interim years of survey. The AIM contract through GH has the methodology to calculate this rolling average properly.

- *Although the DHS provides comprehensive data at the national level, the Survey is only conducted every 5 years. Therefore a rolling average of the DHS data should be reported in between Survey years.*

To measure the targeted sub-national level: Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually

- *OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that were developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. See the resources in the Annex of this handbook for information on OM Surveys and LQAS.*

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?:** The central FTF M&E contractor will enter official DHS data into the FTFMS, calculate the rolling average of DHS data in the off-years and enter the data, and conduct OM Surveys to report bi-annual results on sub-national regions targeted by USG intervention. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?:** DHS, rolling average of DHS results, and/or OM Survey; Baselines should be obtained from the Nutrition Update 2010 booklet recently published by USAID/GH, as available.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?:** bi-annually in targeted sub-national regions via OM Survey; annually at national level (DHS report or rolling average in between Survey years)

Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at:

http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

30

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION
 INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-10 (formerly 3.1.6-10) NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE WHO RECEIVED VITAMIN A FROM USG-SUPPORTED PROGRAMS

DEFINITION:
 Number of children under 5 years of age who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs.

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:
 None

TYPE:
 Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
 Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
 Implementing partners, service statistics from USAID projects

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; only those children reached by USG intervention
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: activity records/program data

31

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-11 (formerly 3.1.6-9) NUMBER OF CHILDREN REACHED BY USG-SUPPORTED NUTRITION PROGRAMS

DEFINITION:

Number of children reached by programs that promote good infant and young child feeding and/or growth promotion programs

RATIONALE:

Promotion of good infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices, including breastfeeding, and participation in community based growth monitoring and promotion (GMP), are essential in preventing malnutrition and improving child survival.

UNIT:

Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE:

Output

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION?: Project-level; only those children reached by USG intervention
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?: activity records/program data