FEED THE FUTURE

The U.S. Government's Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative

Feed the Future Indicator Handbook:

Definition Sheets

U.S. Government Working Document

The Feed the Future (FTF) Indicator Handbook is a working document describing the indicators selected for monitoring and evaluation of the President's global hunger and food security initiative, Feed the Future.

Updated October 18, 2013

Table of Contents by F Standard Program Structure indicator numbering
(R) = Required indicator, (RiA) =Required if Applicable indicator, (S) = Standard indicator (WOG) = Whole of Government Indicator

	Pg #
Introduction	1
Table 1. Feed the Future Indicators organized by the Feed the Future Results Framework	2
Table 2. Feed the Future Zone of Influence Population-based Survey, National/Regional and Implementing Mechanism indicators	5
Performance Indicator Reference Sheets	
3.1.9-1 Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs (S)	10
3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)	11
3.1.9-11 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)	12
3.1.9-12 Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)	13
3.1.9-13 Prevalence of underweight women (R)	14
3.1.9-14 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)	15
3.1.9-15 Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)	16
3.1.9-16 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)	17
3.1.9.1-1 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)	18
3.1.9.1-2 Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)	20
3.1.9.1-3 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	21
3.1.9.1-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	23
3.1.9.2-2 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)	24
3.1.9.2-3 Number of children under five who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)	25
3.1.9.3-1 Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition (RiA)	26
3.3.3-15 Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)	27
4-16 Ease of Doing Business rank (S)	28
4-17 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day (R)	29
4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	31
4.5-3 Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)	32
4.5-9 Daily per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) in USG-assisted areas (R)*	33
4.5-10 Total increase in installed storage capacity (m^3) (S)	34
4.5-11 Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities (S)	35
4.5-12 Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture (RiA)	36
4.5-16,17,18 Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product (RiA)*	37
4.5-19 Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	39
4.5.1-17 Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)	41
4.5.1-21 Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance (S)	42
4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)	43
4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)	44
4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)	46
4.5.1-26 Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time) (S)	47
4.5.1-28 Hectares under new or improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)*	48
4.5.2-2 Number of hectares of land under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	49
4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)*	51
4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)	53
4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)	54
4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	55
4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)	56

4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	57
4.5.2-14 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance (S)	58
4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	59
4.5.2-25 Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance (S)	31
4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)	62
4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)	63
4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)	64
4.5.2-32 Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance (S)	65
4.5.2-34 Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (S)	66
4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)	67
4.5.2-36 Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance (S)	68
4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (S)	69
4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)	71
4.5.2-39 Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance; Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance; Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)	72
4.5.2-41 Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (S)	74
4.5.2-42 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)*	75
4.5.2-43 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance (RiA)	76
4.7-4 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	21
CBLD-5 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	77
Appendix 1. List of changes to April 2012 version of the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook	79

Introduction

The Feed the Future Indicator Handbook presents the set of performance management indicators for the U.S. Government's Feed the Future Initiative. The Feed the Future Results Framework (RF) (Figure 1) provides the logic for the set of indicators described in the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook. The U.S. Government (USG) uses indicator results and performance narratives to monitor and attribute[1] progress along the impact pathway reflected in the Feed the Future RF, from activities to Feed the Future's ultimate goal of reducing poverty, hunger and under-nutrition. Operating Units (OUs) and their implementing partners (IPs) use the Feed the Future indicators, along with custom, activity-specific indicators as appropriate, and performance narratives to manage and report on performance of individual implementing mechanisms (IMs) and to track progress along the country-specific impact pathway towards the objectives of the country-specific Feed the Future strategy. Table 1 shows how the Feed the Future indicators are organized under the Feed the Future RF.

Figure 1. Feed the Future Results Framework

Feed the Future Indicators

Feed the Future's indicators can be categorized in three groups:

1. those representing conditions of the population of the Zone of Influence (ZOI), collected through a population-based survey (PBS) and reported at baseline, mid-term and final (**ZOI PBS indicators - 13**)
2. those representing national- or regional-level conditions, collected through secondary data sources and reported annually (**NTL indicators - 6**)
3. those representing results among USG direct beneficiaries, collected by the IPs and reported annually (**IM indicators - 38**)

Table 2 presents the Feed the Future indicators in each of these three groups, and additional explanation on Groups 1 and 3 is provided below.

[1] The Handbook uses USAID's Automated Directive System (ADS) 200 definition of attribution: "*Ascribing a causal link between observed changes (results) and a specific intervention. A result is attributable to the USAID, or USAID can claim credit for a result, even when other partners are involved in achieving the result, if USAID can claim that without USAID intervention the outcome would not have taken place.*" [http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/200.pdf. Page 60. Accessed 9/3/13]

Table 1. Feed the Future Indicators organized by the Feed the Future Results Framework

(R) = Required indicator, (RiA) =Required if Applicable indicator, (S) = Standard indicator (WOG) = Whole of Government Indicator *Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.		
SPS #	Indicator title	Handbook Page #
Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger		
3.1.6-16	Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)	17
4-17	Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day (R)	29
First Level Objective 1: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth		
4.5-3	Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)	32
4.5-9	Daily per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) in USG-assisted areas (R)*	33
4.5-19	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	39
First Level Objective 2: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children		
3.1.9-11	Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)	12
3.1.9-12	Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)	13
3.1.9-13	Prevalence of underweight women (R)	14
IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity		
4.5-16,17,18	Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country) (RiA)*	37
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.1: Enhanced Human and Institutional Capacity Development for Increased Sustainable Agriculture Sector Productivity		
CBLD-5	Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	77
4.5.2-5	Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)*	51
4.5.2-6	Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)	53
4.5.2-7	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)	54
4.5.2-11	Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	55
4.5.2-27	Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)	62
4.5.2-32	Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance (S)	65
4.5.2-34	Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (S)	66
4.5.2-42	Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)*	75

Table 1. Feed the Future Indicators organized by the Feed the Future Results Framework cont.

SPS #	Indicator title	Handbook Page #
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management, and Innovation		
4.5.1-21	Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance (S)	42
4.5.1-28	Hectares under new or improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)*	48
4.5.2-2	Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	49
4.5.2-13	Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	57
4.5.2-39	Number of new technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: …in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance …in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance …in Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)	72
4.5.2-41	Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (S)	74
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.3: Improved Agriculture Policy Environment		
4-16	Ease of Doing Business rank (S)	28
4.5.1-24	Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree Stage 4: Passed/approved Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)	44
Intermediate Result 2: Expanding Markets and Trade		
4.5.2-23	Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	59
4.5.2-35	Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)	67
4.5.2-36	Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance (S)	68
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.1: Enhanced Agricultural Trade		
4.5.1-26	Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (S)	47
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened		
4.5.1-22	Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)	43
4.5.1-25	Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)	46
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.3: Improved Market Efficiency		
4.5-10	Total increase in installed storage capacity (S)	34
4.5-11	Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities (S)	35
4.5.1-17	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)	41
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.4: Improved Access to Business Development and Sound and Affordable Financial and Risk Management Services		
4.5.2-29	Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)	63
4.5.2-30	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)	64
4.5.2-37	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG-assisted sources (S)	69

Table 1. Feed the Future Indicators organized by the Feed the Future Results Framework cont.

SPS #	Indicator title	Handbook Page #
Intermediate Result 3: Increased Investments in Agriculture and Nutrition-Related Activities		
4.5.2-12	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)	56
4.5.2-38	Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)	71
4.5.2-43	Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance (RiA)	76
Sub-Intermediate Result 3.1: Increased Public Sector Investment		
3.1.9.3-1	Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition (RiA)	26
4.5-12	Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture (RiA)	36
Intermediate Result 4: Increased Employment Opportunities in Project-level, targeted Value Chains		
4.5-2	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	31
Intermediate Result 5: Increased Resilience of Vulnerable Communities and Households		
3.1.9.1-3 4.7-4	Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	21
3.3.3-15	Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)	27
4.5.2-14	Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	58
4.5.2-25	Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance (S)	61
Intermediate Result 6: Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods		
3.1.9.1-1	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)	18
3.1.9.1-2	Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)	20
Intermediate Result 7: Improved Nutrition-Related Behaviors		
3.1.9.1-4	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	23
Intermediate Result 8: Improved Use of Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition Services		
3.1.9-1	Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (S)	10
3.1.9-6	Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)	11
3.1.9-14	Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)	15
3.1.9-15	Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)	16
3.1.9.2-2	Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition (S)	24
3.1.9.2-3	Number of children under five years of age who received vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)	25

Table 2. Feed the Future Zone of Influence Population-based Survey, National/Regional and Implementing Mechanism indicators

Zone of Influence Population-based Survey Indicators		National/Regional indicators
3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women (RiA) 3.1.9-11 Prevalence of stunted children (R) 3.1.9-12 Prevalence of wasted children (R) 3.1.9-13 Prevalence of underweight women (R) 3.1.9-14 Prevalence of anemia among children (S) 3.1.9-16 Prevalence of underweight children (R)	3.1.9.1-1 Prevalence of children receiving MAD (RiA) 3.1.9.1-2 Women's Dietary Diversity (S) 3.1.9.1-3/4.7-4 Prevalence of households with hunger (RiA) 3.1.9.1-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding (RiA) 4-17 Prevalence of Poverty (R) 4.5-9 Daily per capita expenditures (R) 4.5-19 Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	3.1.9.3-1 Percentage of national budget to nutrition (RiA) 4-16 Ease of Doing Business rank (S) 4.5-12 Percentage of national budget to agriculture (RiA) 4.5.1-26 Average number of days to trade (S) 4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade (RiA) 4.5-3 Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)

Implementing Mechanism indicators

3.1.9-1 Number of people trained in child health and nutrition (S)
3.1.9-15 Number of children reached by nutrition programs (S)
3.1.9.2-2 Number of health facilities with capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)
3.1.9.2-3 Number of children who received Vitamin A (S)
3.3.3-15 Number of beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)
4.5-2 Number of jobs (RiA)
4.5-10 Total increase in installed storage capacity (m^3) (S)
4.5-11 Market discount (S)
4.5-16,17,18 Gross margin (RiA)
4.5.1-17 Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.1-21 Number of climate vulnerability assessments (S)
4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)
4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies… in stages of development (S)
4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.1-28 Hectares under irrigation and drainage services (WOG)
4.5.2-2 Number of hectares of land under improved technologies (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural training (S)
4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural training (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises…and CBOs receiving assistance (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships (S)
4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting (S)
4.5.2-14 Number of vulnerable households benefiting (S)
4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (RiA)
4.5.2-25 Number of people with a savings/ insurance (S)
4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and CBOs (S)
4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs receiving assistance to access loans (S)
4.5.2-32 Number of stakeholders using climate information (S)
4.5.2-34 Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions (S)
4.5.2-36 Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities (S)
4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs receiving business development services (S)
4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment (RiA)
4.5.2-39 Number of technologies in phases of development (S)
4.5.2-41 Number of water resources sustainability assessments (S)
4.5.2-42 Number of food security private enterprises…and CBOs that applied improved technologies (RiA) (WOG)
4.5.2-43 Number of firms/CSOs operating more profitably (RiA)
CBLD-5 Score of combined areas of organization capacity of local implementing partners (S)

ZOI PBS indicators (13)

Data sources for ZOI PBS indicators

Data for the ZOI PBS indicators are drawn from two sources: 1) secondary population-based survey sources, such as the country's Living Standard Measurement Study (LSMS) or equivalent and the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; and 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) contractor.

Entering ZOI PBS indicator data in the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS)

Values for the ZOI PBS indicators are entered into the FTFMS by the Mission, its M&E contractor, or BFS's M&E contractor FTF FEEDBACK under the "High-Level Indicators" mechanism. In addition to entering the ZOI PBS values, the Mission or the M&E contractor must also enter the estimated total population in the ZOI under each indicator disaggregate category. FTFMS then sums across the disaggregate categories and calculates total population at the indicator level. For example, the prevalence of poverty indicator measures the percent of people in the ZOI with average per capita expenditure under $1.25/day. The relevant population numbers to enter are the estimated total population of individuals in each gendered household type. The FTFMS will automatically calculate the total population of individuals in the ZOI. In contrast, the prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger measures percent of households, not individuals, so the relevant population numbers to enter are the estimated number of households of each gendered household type in the ZOI. Stunting, underweight and wasting are all measured for children under five. The relevant population numbers to enter are the estimated number of male and the estimated number of female children under five years of age in the ZOI.

Assigning ZOI PBS indicators to IMs

Operating Units (OUs) can also assign PBS indicators to IMs. In rare cases, an IM is held accountable for achieving PBS targets at the ZOI level. However, in most cases where PBS indicators are assigned at the IM level, the IM is held accountable for achieving targets for the PBS indicators in some sub-area or sub-population within the ZOI (e.g. IM program area or IM direct beneficiaries.) If an OU assigns a ZOI PBS indicator at an IM-level, it is essential that the population covered by the indicator be clearly described in the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) included in the mission Performance Management Plan (PMP) and the IM's Activity M&E Plan, and in an Indicator Note in FTFMS.

IM indicators (38)

IM indicator universe is direct beneficiaries

The majority of indicators are IM-level indicators. These indicators are reported annually and most reflect results from IM direct beneficiaries only [2]. An individual is a direct beneficiary if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the activity. Individuals who receive training or benefit from activity-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as beneficiary. An intervention is significant if one can reasonably expect, and hold OUs and IMs responsible for achieving progress toward, changes in behaviors or other outcomes for these individuals based on the level of services and/or goods provided.

[2] Some IM output indicators count results directly achieved by the activity, e.g. *4.5.1-17 kilometers of road improved or constructed and 4.5.1-28 hectares under new/rehabilitated irrigation or drainage services*, rather than results achieved with individual direct beneficiaries.

Beneficiaries who train other beneficiaries

Individuals and organizations that are trained by an IM as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy (e.g. cascade training) that then go on to deliver services directly to individuals or to train others to deliver services should be counted as direct beneficiaries of the activity – the capacity strengthening is key for sustainability and an important outcome in its own right. The individuals who then benefit from services or training delivered by the individuals or organizations trained by the IM as part of the service delivery strategy are also direct beneficiaries. However, spontaneous spillover of improved practices to neighbors does not count as a deliberate service delivery strategy; neighbors who apply new practices based on observation and/or interactions with direct beneficiaries who have not been trained to spread knowledge to others as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy are considered indirect beneficiaries and should not be counted under IM indicators.

Indirect beneficiaries

An indirect beneficiary does not necessarily have direct contact with the activity but still benefits, such as the population that uses a new road constructed by the activity, neighbors who see the results of the improved technologies applied by direct beneficiaries and decide to apply the technology themselves (spill-over), or the individuals who hear a radio message but don't receive any other training or counseling from the activity. Indirect beneficiaries are **not** counted in the Feed the Future IM indicators. Activity spill-over and other multiplier effects can be assessed as a part of performance and impact evaluations.

Identifying direct beneficiaries when using a value chain facilitative approach

Identifying and tracking individuals reached through the activity's service delivery mechanisms can be challenging when partners use the value chain facilitative approach, where services are delivered by private sector firms that may not have comprehensive customer lists or may not want to share the information. Clearly, part of building a loyal customer base, which is a profitability strategy promoted by many value chain activities, is greatly facilitated by maintenance of an updated customer list. So helping assisted firms to set up and maintain customer lists has both programmatic and M&E benefits, and is encouraged. Data provision by assisted firms can be facilitated by entering into written agreements that include reporting and non-disclosure requirements[3], and showing assisted firms how the information provided is useful and used.

Tracking direct beneficiaries should be more straight-forward if the value chain activity is also facilitating extension strategies, e.g. agro-dealer agents, that require knowing where the customers live and farm. Extension and other customer outreach approaches are important to re-enforce advice provided by the agro-dealer when an input is purchased, and provide the multiple contacts usually needed for small-holder farmers and other primary producers to successfully apply the improved technologies and management practices being promoted by the activity.

Counting beneficiaries who benefit from more than one Feed the Future activity

Individuals can benefit from more than one Feed the Future activity. While we expect individual IMs to track individual direct beneficiaries across different interventions within their activity, Feed the Future does not have the capacity to track individuals across multiple USG-funded activities. So the Operating Unit-level totals for indicators such as number of people trained in agricultural productivity or food security may count individuals more than once that benefit from more than one Feed the Future activity. Where multiple-counting is probable, OU's should state this in the narrative and FTFMS indicator note, and, to the extent feasible, provide an estimate of the extent of multiple-counting or the number of unique individuals served by the Feed the Future activities in the country.

Reporting the number of direct small-holder beneficiaries

Feed the Future has emphasized programming directed at small-holders, with a strong focus on gender equality, as a particularly effective way to increase agricultural productivity and sales, increase income, and reduce poverty, hunger and under-nutrition. Feed the Future does not currently track the number of small-holders directly assisted; doing so will be useful internally and will help us justify Feed the Future activities to key stakeholders.

[3] Non-disclosure agreements must allow access to the data for USG-funded performance and impact evaluations.

Starting in the FY13 reporting cycle, Feed the Future is requiring that a **new data point** - **number of direct beneficiaries** covered by the indicator - be reported under ***4.5.2-23 value of incremental sales***. We added the requirement to report on number of direct beneficiaries covered to this indicator for two reasons: 1) to better interpret reporting year versus baseline sales values when IM direct beneficiary numbers change (usually increase) over time; and, because the population reported on by *4.5.2-23 value of incremental sales* is defined as direct beneficiary small-holders, 2) to track the number of small-holders that Feed the Future is assisting.

In addition to reporting the number of small-holder direct beneficiaries under *4.5.2-23 value of incremental sales*, all IPs/OUs will be asked to **estimate the percentage of direct beneficiaries that are small-holder producers** for each relevant IM. FTFMS users will be able to select from the five options below:

1. Small-holders -- 0 to 20%
2. Small-holders -- 21 to 40%
3. Small-holders -- 41 to 60%
4. Small-holders -- 61 to 80%
5. Small-holders -- 81% (or more)

IPs will have permission in FTFMS to select for their mechanism (except for those OUs where all FTFMS data are entered by the OU.) OUs will approve the small-holder estimates when approving FY13 results. A smallholder estimate is not required for mechanisms that do not reach farmers directly (policy, research, etc.).

Detailed instructions for locating and selecting the smallholder estimate will be provided in the annual FTFMS guidance. OUs should work with their IPs to estimate small-holder participation as accurately as possible.

Feed the Future Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)

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 (S)	
DEFINITION: Number of participants (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, mothers/caregivers, policy-makers, researchers, and other non-health personnel) in child health care and child nutrition training provided through USG-supported programs during the reporting year. ** For this indicator, count the training attendance numbers without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple trainings. Counting individuals multiple times is acceptable for this indicator. Counting training attendance numbers rather than individuals is <u>not</u> acceptable for *4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training* **	
RATIONALE: Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USG-supported health and nutrition programs in this element.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners; service statistics from USG activities	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries; only those trained through USG activities ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Through activity records/program data ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual	

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: 3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)

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. Although different levels of severity of anemia can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all anemia, i.e. mild, moderate and severe anemia combined

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

UNIT: Percent Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter: 1. percent of women 15-49 years in the sample with anemia 2. percent of pregnant women 15-49 years in the sample with anemia 3. total population of pregnant women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in the ZOI 4. percent of non-pregnant women 15-49 years in the sample with anemia 5. total population of non-pregnant women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in the ZOI	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Physiological status: Pregnant, Non-pregnant
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

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

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-11 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)

DEFINITION:

Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that is a reflection of chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are stunted, as defined by a height for age Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of stunting can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined. While stunting is difficult to measure in children 0-6 months and most stunting occurs in the -9-23 month range (1,000 days), this indicator reports on all children under 59 months to capture the impact of interventions over time and to align with DHS data.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample 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 Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator <u>and</u> for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter: 1. percent of children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is stunted 2. percent of male children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is stunted 3. total population of male children 0-59 month of age in the ZOI 4. percent of female children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is stunted 5. total population of female children 0-59 month of age in the ZOI	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

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

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-12 Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are acutely malnourished, as defined by a weight for height Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of wasting can be measured, this indicator measures the 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 in the sample 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 than children who are not wasted.

UNIT: Percent
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter:

1. percent of children 0-59 months of age in the sample that is wasted
2. percent of male children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is wasted
3. total population of male children 0-59 month of age in the ZOI
4. percent of female children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is wasted
5. total population of female children 0-59 month of age in the ZOI

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Sex: Male, Female

TYPE:
Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

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

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-13 Prevalence of underweight women (R)

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. To calculate an individual's BMI, weight and height data are needed: BMI = weight (in kg) ÷ height (in meters) squared.

The numerator for this indicator is the number of non-pregnant women 15-49 years in the sample 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, linking the two strategic objectives of Feed the Future.

UNIT: Percent Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of non-pregnant women of reproductive age in the sample that is underweight 2. total population of women of reproductive age in the ZOI	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION**:** Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

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: 3.1.9-14 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)

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. Although different levels of severity of anemia can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all anemia, i.e. mild, moderate and severe anemia combined

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 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:*
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator <u>and</u> for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter: 1. percent of children 6-59 months in the sample with anemia 2. percent of male children 6-59 month of age in the sample with anemia 3. total population of male children 6-59 month of age in the ZOI 4. percent of female children 6-59 month of age in the sample with anemia 5. total population of female children 6-59 month of age in the ZOI	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

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: 3.1.9-15 Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)	
DEFINITION: Number of children under five years of age reached during the reporting year by USG-supported activities with nutrition objectives, which can include behavior change communication interventions, home or community gardens, micronutrient fortification or supplementation, anemia reduction packages, growth monitoring and promotion and management of acute malnutrition.	
RATIONALE: Good coverage of nutrition programs is essential to prevent and treat malnutrition and improve child survival.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries; only those children reached by USG intervention ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records/program data, service statistics ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual	

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-16 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)

DEFINITION:
Underweight 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. Although different levels of severity of underweight can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all underweight, i.e. both moderate and severe underweight combined.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample 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 five is the goal of the Feed the Future Initiative. The prevalence of underweight children is also an indicator to monitor the Millennium Development Goal 1.8 "Halving the number of people who are hungry." Monitoring the prevalence of underweight children 0-59 months therefore allows USAID and its partners to show the contribution of Feed the Future programs to the Millennium Development Goal.

UNIT: Percent
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter:

1. percent of children 0-59 months of age in the sample that is underweight
2. percent of male children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is underweight
3. total population of male children 0-59 month of age in the ZOI
4. percent of female children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is underweight
5. total population of female children 0-59 month of age in the ZOI

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Sex: Male, Female

TYPE:
Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION**:** Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 6: Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-1 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD), apart from breast milk. The "minimum acceptable diet" indicator measures 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 and breastfeeding status, 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 in the sample who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

---

Breastfed children 6-23 months of age in the sample with MAD component data

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 in the sample with MAD component data

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 below):

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.

For the MAD indicator, minimum dietary diversity for non breastfed children is defined as four or more food groups out of the following six 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. For non-breastfed children to receive a minimum adequate diet, at least two of these feedings must be milk feeds.

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

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 Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter: 1. percent of children 6-23 months in the sample receiving a minimum acceptable diet 2. percent of male children 6-23 months in the sample receiving a minimum acceptable diet 3. total population of male children 6-23 months in the ZOI 4. percent of female children 6-23 months in the sample receiving a minimum acceptable diet 5. total population of female children 6-23 months in the ZOI	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)	

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 6: Improved access to diverse and quality foods

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-2 Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)

DEFINITION:
This validated indicator aims to measure the micronutrient adequacy of the diet and reports the mean number of food groups consumed in the previous day by women of reproductive age (15-49 years). To calculate this indicator, nine food groups are used:

1. Grains, roots and tubers; 2. Legumes and nuts; 3. Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese); 4. Organ meat; 5. Eggs;
6. Flesh foods and other misc. small animal protein; 7. Vitamin A dark green leafy vegetables;
8. Other Vitamin A rich vegetables and fruits; 9. Other fruits and vegetables

The *Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age* indicator is tabulated by averaging the number of food groups consumed (out of the nine food groups above) across all women of reproductive age in the sample with data on dietary diversity.

To collect data for this indicator, a more disaggregated set of food groups than the nine food groups above should be used in the questionnaire (See Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators.) For collection and tabulation of this indicator, foods used in condiment amounts should not be counted as having been consumed.

RATIONALE:
Women of reproductive age are at risk for multiple micronutrient deficiencies, which can jeopardize their health and ability to care for their children and participate in income generating activities. Maternal micronutrient deficiencies during lactation can directly impact child growth and development but the potential consequences of maternal micronutrient deficiencies are especially severe during pregnancy, when there is the greatest opportunity for nutrient deficiencies to cause long term, irreversible development consequences for the child in-utero. Dietary diversity (assessed here as the number of food groups consumed) is a key dimension of a high quality diet with adequate micronutrient content; and thus, important to ensuring the health and nutrition of both women and their children.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number Please enter these two data points: 1. Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in the sample 2. Total population of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in the ZOI	None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Although this indicator will be collected in the ZOI by an M&E contractor, USAID/W is also working with HQ and Missions to have WDDS added as a module to the DHS. Missions direct which modules the DHS should add to the default set of survey questions. Focus Countries should request that the WDDS module be added to upcoming DHS for collection of the national-level data.

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. If the appropriate module is included in a country's DHS, missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), if the appropriate optional module is included.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the appropriate data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF - IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-3 and 4.7-4 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)

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, four responses are possible (never, rarely, sometimes or often), which are collapsed into the follow three responses: 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.

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

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

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 to be meaningful for cross-cultural use using data sets from seven diverse sites.

UNIT: Percent
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI number of households covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total number of households in the ZOI. Enter:

1. percent of households in the sample with moderate to severe hunger
2. percent of FNM households in the sample with moderate to severe hunger
3. total population of FNM households in the ZOI
4. percent of MNF households in the sample with moderate to severe hunger
5. total population of MNF households in the ZOI
6. percent of M&F households in the sample with moderate to severe hunger
7. total population of M&F households in the ZOI
8. percent of CNA households in the sample with moderate to severe hunger
9. total population of CNA households in the ZOI

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

TYPE:
Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).USAID/W will work to get these HHS questions incorporated into the DHS in applicable countries. Then, the DHS will also be able to show this data at the national level.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This indicator should always be measured at the same time each year, ideally at the most vulnerable part of the year (e.g. right before harvest, during the dry season, etc.) Although this indicator will be collected in the ZOI by an M&E contractor, USAID/W is also working with HQ and Missions to have the HHS added as a module to the DHS. Missions direct which modules the DHS should add to the default set of survey questions, and Focus Countries should request that the HHS module be added to any upcoming DHS for collection of the national-level data.

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. If the appropriate module is included in a country's DHS, missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), if the appropriate optional module is included.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the appropriate data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the

Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)

- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 7: Improved nutrition-related behaviors

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)

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, including water.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-5 months in the sample exclusively breastfed on the day and night preceding the survey. The denominator is the total number of children 0-5 months in the sample with exclusive breastfeeding data.

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

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
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter:

1. percent of children 0-5 months of age in the sample who are exclusively breast fed
2. percent of male children 0-5 months of age in the sample who are exclusively breast fed
3. total population of male children 0-5 months of age in the ZOI
4. percent of female male children 0-5 months of age in the sample who are exclusively breast fed
5. total population of female children 0-5 months of age in the ZOI

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Sex: Male, Female

TYPE: OUTPUT/OUTCOME
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Feed the Future monitors this indicator in the ZOI (i.e. our targeted sub-national regions/districts targeted by USG interventions) to measure results attributable to Feed the Future assistance. Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators" mechanism in the FTFMS. Missions should also monitor this indicator at the national level. Missions should only enter national-level values into the PPR the year the data become available. Do not enter ZOI values in the PPR.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. MEASURE-DHS collects national-level through Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: ZOI data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the DHS, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future M&E contractor, using the official DHS method of collection and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators (http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/ftf_vol8_populationbasedsurveyinstrument_oct2012.pdf.)
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting. DHS data are collected every five 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

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: 3.1.9.2-2 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)	
DEFINITION: A health facility may include government health clinics, private clinics as well as clinics run by community-based organizations or local NGOs. Many health facilities are set up by International NGOs (INGOs), who may also provide staff training. As long as a local entity is actually running the facility, it can be counted here, even if a non-local entity was influential in setting up, funding, or training the staff. An "established capacity to manage acute under nutrition" indicates the organization has a program with established procedures, methods and appropriate materials (resources, trained staff, etc.) 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. NOTE: This indicator should include all currently capable health facilities with capacity to manage acute malnutrition, and not only those who achieved the capability during this fiscal year as a result of USG assistance. The intention is to reflect the current coverage of capable health facilities during each given fiscal year	
RATIONALE: A key objective of Feed the Future 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	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level; only those health facilities supported by USG intervention ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program data, service statistics, assessment of health facilities involved in the activity ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual	

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: 3.1.9.2-3 Number of children under five who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)	
DEFINITION: Number of children under five years of age who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs in the last 6 months from the time this data is collected. In order to reduce Vitamin-A deficiency most effectively, children need two rounds of coverage in one year. *In order to not double count children, please only report the number done in the last 6 months.*	
RATIONALE: Vitamin A supplementation reduces risk of under-five mortality by about one-fourth among the millions of children deficient in this micronutrient	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* 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, service statistics ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual	

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition-related activities** **Sub IR 3.1: Increased public sector investment**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.3-1 Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition (RiA)	
DEFINITION: This indicator provides the amount of funding from the country's national budget directed towards nutrition. This figure will most likely be reflected in line items under the Ministry of Health and/or the Ministry of Agriculture.	
RATIONALE: To measure sustainable public sector investment in nutrition activities, we will monitor trends in the amount and percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition. Public investment in nutrition demonstrates the host government's commitment to improving the nutritional status of its citizens and is a core component of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement.	
UNIT: Please enter these two data points: 1. numerator: amount of national budget in USD allocated to nutrition 2. denominator: total national budget amount in USD *FTFMS note: FTFMS will automatically calculate the percent of the national budget allocated to nutrition from these two data points.*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Increase is better
DATA SOURCE: Host government budget sheets.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: National, contextual ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Host government budget publications or treasury records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.3.3: Social Assistance
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.3.3-15 Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)

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

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

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

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

RATIONALE:
Provides information on USG assistance aimed at increasing self-sufficiency in vulnerable populations.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of Asset strengthened: community assets, human assets/capital, and household assets, New vs. Continuing: --New = this is the first year the beneficiary participated in a productive safety net --Continuing = this beneficiary participated in the previous reporting year and continues to participate in the current reporting year Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records, program data
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Objective 4: Economic Growth
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.3: Improved Agricultural Policy Environment

INDICATOR TITLE: 4-16 Ease of Doing Business rank (S)

DEFINITION:

Every year the World Bank publishes "Doing Business" with data gathered from almost all countries. There are nine topics that make up the index and have been included consistently since 2010: 1) starting a business, 2) construction permits, 3) registering property, 4) getting credit, 5) protecting investors, 6) paying taxes, 7) trading across borders, 8) enforcing contracts and 9) closing a business/resolving insolvency. Two topics: 1) getting electricity and 2) employing workers, have been included in the aggregate score some but not all years since 2010. Most of the indicators that are used are easily understood like the number of procedures to start a business, the number of days to register property or total taxes as a percent of profit. In addition the Bank periodically publishes more detailed indices for individual countries which provide detail on variability in the indicators within the country. For the purpose of this indicator the overall score is used. The reporting country ought to look at the more detailed *Doing Business* (DB) report to determine which items contributed to the improvement or lack of improvement of the overall score. This can provide a guide to actions that are most likely to improve the business environment

From the WB website: *"The ease of doing business index ranks economies from 1 to 183. For each economy the index is calculated as the ranking on the simple average of its percentile rankings on each of the topics included in the index…The ranking on each topic is the simple average of the percentile rankings on its component indicators. If an economy has no laws or regulations covering a specific area—for example, bankruptcy—it receives a "no practice" mark. Similarly, an economy receives a "no practice" or "not possible" mark if regulation exists but is never used in practice or if a competing regulation prohibits such practice. Either way, a "no practice" mark puts the economy at the bottom of the ranking on the relevant indicator."*

RATIONALE:
Improving the business environment is likely to contribute to improving investment. The World Bank emphasizes that most of the data collected for the DB comes from small and medium businesses which makes it more useful for Feed the Future. The Bank also provides detailed information on how the data is collected as well as where there are weaknesses.
The development hypothesis is that making it easier to do business is likely to lead to more investment and thus jobs. The increase in investment will improve agricultural productivity (the IR) which in turn will contribute to agricultural sector growth (the Key Objective). As most of the poor are involved directly or indirectly in agriculture this improvement will reduce poverty.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percentile Rank *FTFMS note: In order to analyze change, the rank will be entered each year into FTFMS, which will automatically calculate the change in rank from the previous year. The change in rank is also available in the DB report.*	None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* A higher ranking (lower number) is better

DATA SOURCE:
World Bank *Doing Business*, an annual report available on line: http://www.doingbusiness.org/
Please see the data collection methodology here http://www.doingbusiness.org/methodology/methodology-note#Ease of DB
**Note that Gates Foundation and World Bank are working to develop an "Ease of Doing Agri-business" indicator, but it is not yet available.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This is a contextual indicator that, although not USG-attributable at the national level, should still be measured to assess this aspect of enabling environment in a country. Because this is a contextual indicator, no targets need to be set.

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: National level, for monitoring context.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: The data are obtained from the World Bank's annual DB report. Missions or their M&E contractor should pull the score from the DB report and enter into the FTFMS.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: The Mission or their M&E contractor will research this data on http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings and enter it into the FTFMS.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Objective 4: Economic Growth
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

INDICATOR TITLE: 4-17 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day* (R)

**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 is $1.25 dollars per person per day, converted into local currency at 2005 "Purchasing Power Parity" (PPP) exchange rates then adjusted for cumulative inflation from 2005 to the month and year the population-based survey data were collected using the relevant consumer price index. 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 valued 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 the household's 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.

Data for this indicator must be collected using the Consumption Expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Missions are encouraged to use the LSMS Integrated Survey in Agriculture Consumption Expenditure module, which has been incorporated in the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators. Feed the Future will collect consumption-expenditure data in order to calculate prevalence of poverty for this indicator, as well as per capita expenditures to be used as a proxy for income. Expenditures are used instead of income because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income and because expenditure data are less prone to error, easier to recall and are more stable over time than income data.
The most convenient single source is the World Bank's online DataBank (http://databank.worldbank.org/ddp/home.do?Step=12&id=4&CNO=2). Using data from the DataBank, Table 2 shows, for each FtF country, the 2005 PPP exchange rate (in **bold**),[4] annual average values of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for years 2006-2011, and finally the local currency equivalent of $1.25 at 2005 PPP, adjusted by cumulative inflation since 2005 as outlined above. Values for additional countries can be downloaded from the DataBank.
To calculate the local currency equivalent to the $1.25 line at the prices prevailing in a given *month*—for example, the household survey data cited in the example above—requires monthly CPI data. These are compiled by the International Monetary Fund in its publication *International Financial Statistics*. USAID employees can gain access to those data through the Economic Analysis and Data Services (EADS). Alternatively, E3 staff can download data from this source. Currently, all IMF CPI data are normalized so that 2005=100, which makes the calculation described above particularly simple.

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 Feed the Future Initiative. All objectives, program elements, and projects are designed to reduce poverty.

UNIT: Percent	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator <u>and</u> for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter: 1. Percentage of people from sample living on <$1.25/day 2. Percentage of people in FNM households from sample living on <$1.25/day 3. Total population of people in FNM households in the ZOI 4. Percentage of people in MNF households from sample living on <$1.25/day 5. Total population of people in MNF households in the ZOI 6. Percentage of people in M&F households from sample living on <$1.25/day 7. Total population of people in M&F households in the ZOI 8. Percentage of people in CNA households from sample living on <$1.25/day 9. Total population of people in CNA households in the ZOI	Gendered Household Type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female Adult (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child no Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

[4] The PPPs used for this purpose apply to "individual consumption expenditure by households," or "private consumption." They differ from PPPs measured over GDP, used to compare the size of national economies. The original source is *Global Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures, 2005 International Comparison Program*, Table 1: Purchasing power parities, local currency units per US$ (pages 28 and following), in the column labeled "Individual Consumption Expenditures by Households."

DATA SOURCE: Secondary data *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI, or population-based surveys conducted by M&E contractor in the Feed the Future ZOI.
MEASUREMENT NOTES ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: This indicator should be collected in the Feed the Future ZOIs (i.e. the targeted population/sub-national level) through population-based surveys. ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data for the Feed the Future ZOI. ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the Living Standards Measurement Survey or similar national-level survey, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) contractor, using the country-specific LSMS methodology and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators. ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR4: Increased employment opportunities in targeted value chains**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	
DEFINITION: Jobs are all types of employment opportunities **created** during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/fishery employment). **Jobs lasting less than one month are not counted** in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through length. Jobs should be converted to *full-time equivalents* (FTE). One FTE equal 260 days or 12 months. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE and a job that last for 130 days should be counted as 1/2 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as work hours may vary greatly. "Attributed to FTF implementation" includes farming and non-farm jobs where Feed the Future investments were intentional in assisting in any way to expand (or contract) jobs and where a program objective of the Feed the Future investment was job creation.	
RATIONALE: This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, Feed the Future 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:* Location: Urban, rural Duration: New, Continuing: --New= this is the first time the person holds a job created by Feed the Future --Continuing = the person continues to hold a job from a previous fiscal year created by Feed the Future Sex of job-holder: Male, Female (*if one FTE is evenly split by a male and a female, then it would be 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males)*
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partner records	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries, 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; firm/farm records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual	

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 (R)	
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." The indicator reports year on year change in percent (i.e. annual growth rate).	
RATIONALE: Agricultural GDP is a key measure of overall agricultural performance.	
UNIT: Percent *FTFMS Note: First enter baseline Ag GDP in 2010 local currency, and then enter Ag GDP each subsequent year in local currency converted to constant 2010 local currency equivalent.* *FTFMS **will automatically calculate the Percent Change** between the previous year and the current year.*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: National accounts collected by the government	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: This is a contextual indicator that, although not USG-attributable at the national level, should still be measured to assess overall food security situation in a country. However, given the important of this indicator for overall achievement of Feed the Future goals, and the fact that many country governments, especially under CAADP, have set targets for this indicator, focus country mission should set targets and track progress against those targets. ➢ 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 Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner will get this information from them. ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data should be obtained from host governments publications/records. Once the data are entered into the FTFMS, the system will automatically calculate the "percent change." FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported. However, GDP data is usually only available for calendar years and thus is somewhat lagged. For example, GDP data for calendar year 2012 are the latest available for FY 2013 reporting. Users should enter the most recently available GDP data, and note the period that the GDP data cover in the FTFMS Indicator Note.	

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

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-9 Daily per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) in USG-assisted areas (R)*
*Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.

DEFINITION:
This indicator will measure the daily per capita expenditures of rural households as a proxy for income, based on the assumption that increased expenditures is strongly correlated to increased income. Data for this indicator must be collected using the Consumption Expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Missions are encouraged to use the LSMS Integrated Survey in Agriculture Consumption Expenditure module, which has been incorporated in the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators. Feed the Future will collect consumption-expenditure data to calculate prevalence of poverty and daily per capita expenditures to be used as a proxy for income.

Expenditures are used instead of income because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income and because expenditure data are less prone to error, easier to recall and are more stable over time than income data.

The daily per capita expenditure figure must be converted to constant 2010 USD. The steps to covert daily per capita expenditure data collected in the country' local currency units (LCU), e.g. Honduran lempira, Ghana cedis, Tanzania shillings; to constant 2010 USD (2005 PPP adjusted to 2010 US prices) are:

1) Convert LCU at the time of the survey to LCU at 2005 prices, by dividing by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the survey month and year (you will need to divide the CPI for the survey month/year by the CPI for 2005 if 2005 is not the base year for the country's CPI.)
2) Convert 2005 LCU to 2005 US$ by dividing by the 2005 PPP conversion rate.
3) Convert US$ in 2005 prices to US$ in 2010 prices by multiplying by 111.65, which is the US CPI for 2010.

RATIONALE:
There is a relationship between increased incomes and improved food security, reduced poverty, and improved nutrition. The usefulness of an income proxy methodology derives from the importance of a change in household income and its impact on the overarching Feed the Future goal of reducing poverty and hunger. Thus, measurement of household income (through this proxy) is one logical choice for monitoring the effects of policies and programs oriented towards accomplishing this goal.

UNIT: 2010 US dollar
Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter:

1. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) of sample
2. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) of FNM households from sample
3. Total population of people in FNM households in the ZOI
4. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) MNF households from sample
5. Total population of people in MNF households in the ZOI
6. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) in M&F households from sample
7. Total population of people in M&F households in the ZOI
8. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) in CNA households from sample
9. Total population of people in CNA households in the ZOI

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

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Secondary data *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI, or population-based surveys conducted by M&E contractor in the Feed the Future ZOI.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: This indicator should be collected in the Feed the Future ZOIs (i.e. the targeted population/sub-national level) through population-based surveys.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect this data in the Feed the Future ZOI.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the Living Standards Measurement Survey or similar national-level survey, *if* the data were collected within the previous two years *and* a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) contractor, using the country-specific LSMS methodology and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade / Sub IR 2.3: Improved market efficiency**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-10 Total increase in installed storage capacity (m^3) (S)	
DEFINITION: This indicator measures total increase during the reporting year in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through USG programming and leverage. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.	
RATIONALE: The overall goal of the Feed the Future Initiative is to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger." Post harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products are typically a significant proportion of overall initial production in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could therefore substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas as well.	
UNIT: Cubic meters	*DISAGGREGATE BY*: Storage type: Dry, cold
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Increase
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: On-farm and off-farm – only direct beneficiaries ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Copies of sales receipts for construction, equipment and installation services; IP records ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Annual	

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade / Sub IR 2.3: Improved market efficiency

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-11 Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities (S)

DEFINITION:
The market discount rate helps monitors whether the targeted beneficiaries of a value chain investment are receiving the highest value for their product as compared to a seller in a competitor market receiving an industry or value chain highest price point for the same product. The market discount rate (percent) is calculated as {[one (1) minus (average price of a selected commodity/product in country divided by the average price of that commodity/product in the relevant competing market)] multiplied by 100}

To ensure comparable prices from each market are used, enter prices consistent with 1) where the two products are in the value chain (e.g. farm-level, aggregation, processing), 2) the state of the products (i.e. the price of the product in each market represents the same state of value addition, e.g. level of processing, type of packaging.), and 3) the costs included in the price (e.g. Free-on-Board, Cargo, Insurance and Freight - - select a price that combines the same costs at both points of sale.)

RATIONALE:
The overall goal of the Feed the Future Initiative is to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger." The market discount is a qualitative indicator that captures the value of products produced within a value chain and compares that value to an independent reference price. As value chains receive assistance (e.g., better maize drying practices used by farmers) the value of products should improve relative to the value of similar products benchmarked against a reference location(s).

UNIT:
Percent

Please enter these two data points:
1. Average Price (US$/mt) received by USG beneficiaries
2. Average Price (US$/mt) received in competitor market at a consistent, parallel point in targeted value chain.

FTFMS note: Enter the price received by the USG-beneficiary producers and in the competitor market, and the system will calculate the market discount percent.

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Commodities/products (rice, maize, coffee, mangos, fish, dairy, etc)

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Decrease of the market discount rate is better, i.e. the farmers are getting the highest price they can

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners will enter price for targeted commodity/product and appropriate reference market price. System will calculate market discount percentage.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Free on Board (FOB); Cost, Insurance, Freight (CIF); or some similar price point in the value chain – direct beneficiaries only
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners collects price on commodity/product of targeted value chains. The benchmark / reference prices will be determined and collected by Implementing Partner or the Mission's M&E contractor.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Price information from sales receipts or accounting books, etc.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities
Sub IR 3.1: Increased public sector investment

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-12 Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture (RiA)

DEFINITION:
The percentage of a country's national budget allocated to agriculture is measured by the amount of money budgeted for the Ministry of Agriculture (and Fisheries, Forestry and similar ministries, if applicable in the country circumstances) divided by the total national budget amount. The indicator measures the amount budgeted (i.e. allocated), not the amount actually expended. While funding to support agriculture may be budgeted in line items other than the line item for the Ministry of Agriculture/Fisheries/Forestry, the amount budgeted for the Ministry of Agriculture/Fisheries/Forestry is used as a proxy for the total budget allocation for agriculture for ease of measurement and comparability across countries.

Note, under CAADP, *"African governments have agreed to increase public investment in agriculture by a minimum of 10 per cent of their national budgets and to raise agricultural productivity by at least 6 per cent."* The indicator CAADP uses to monitor the 10 percent budgetary commitment measures expenditures, not budget allocation. And, the indicator attempts to capture all agriculture-related government expenditures, not just those by the Ministry of Agriculture/Fisheries/Forestry budgets. However, measuring these expenditures is complicated, and Missions would require specialized expertise and expend considerable effort to collect the data. Data for the agriculture-related expenditures indicator are available from a secondary source only for a subset of Feed the Future focus countries, and the considerable lag time before data are available limits the data's usefulness as a measure of government commitment as a result of Feed the Future activities for many of these countries. For these reasons, Feed the Future monitors the amount allocated (budgeted) for the Ministry of Agriculture rather than amount expended.

RATIONALE:
To measure sustainable public sector investment in agriculture and food security-related activities, we will monitor trends in the percentage of national budget allocated to this type of service delivery. Public investment in agriculture demonstrates the host government's commitment to encouraging economic growth in the sector, and is indicative of the success of FTF's policy engagement.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent Please enter these two data points: 1. numerator: amount of national budget in USD allocated to the Ministry of Agriculture 2. denominator: total national budget amount in USD *FTFMS Note: FTFMS will automatically calculate percent of budget allocated to agriculture from these two data points.*	None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Increase is better

DATA SOURCE:
Host government budget sheets

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: National, contextual
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: The Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner retrieves from national records and enters in the FTFMS.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Host government budget publications or treasury records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-16,17,18 Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product (RiA)*
*Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.

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

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

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

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

Gross margin per ha, per animal, per cage = [(TP x VS/QS) – IC] / UP

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

If a direct beneficiary sample survey is used to collect gross margin data points, the sample survey estimates must be extrapolated to total beneficiary estimated values before entry into FTFMS to ensure accurate calculation of weighted average gross margin per commodity across implementing mechanisms at the Operating Unit level and across countries for Feed the Future overall reporting.

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

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

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

Also, if the form of the commodity varies between how it was harvested/produced and how it was sold, e.g. shelled peanuts are harvested but unshelled peanuts are sold, the sales form must be converted to its equivalent in the harvested/produced form prior to entry in FTFMS. For example, in Malawi, the extraction rate for shelled from unshelled peanuts is 65%. So if 1,500 kg of shelled peanuts were sold, this is equivalent to 2,304 kg of unshelled peanuts, and 2,304 should be entered as sales quantity, not 1,500, assuming that total production was

measured in kg of unshelled peanuts. Country-specific extraction rates for a range of value-added commodities may be found at http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/ess/documents/methodology/tcf.pdf.

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

The FTFMS will also automatically calculate the three PPR gross margin indictors listed under UNIT below by calculating operating-unit-level weighted average gross margin per hectare (includes crops and pond-based aquaculture), per animal and per cage across all relevant commodities reported by operating unit's IMs for entry into FactsInfo. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the PPR indicators, however, because non-commodity-specific average gross margin across substantially different commodities (e.g. gross margin for live cows and gross margin for eggs, for maize and for basil, for irrigated and for rain-fed rice, for maize and for pond aquaculture fish) could be meaningless or misleading. Missions are encouraged to use the FTFMS commodity-sex-specific data to understand and report on gross margins.

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

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

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

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

FTFMS notes:
Enter the five data points into FTFMS for baseline and actual reporting. Data should be entered disaggregated to the lowest level – i.e. by commodity then by sex under each commodity. FTFMS will calculate gross margin per ha, animal or cage automatically. This calculation cannot be done without all five data points.

FTFMS will produce a PPR report that aggregates commodity-specific gross margins data into the three FACTSInfo gross margin indicators:
4.5-16 Farmer's gross margin per unit of land
4.5-17 Farmer's gross margin per unit of animal
4.5-18 Farmer's gross margin per crate

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Targeted commodity (type of crop, type of animal or animal product, or type of fish – freshwater or marine). *Gross margin should be reported separately for horticultural products; the general "Horticulture" category should not be used. If a large number of horticultural crops are being produced and tracking gross margin for each is too difficult, gross margins may be reported for the five (5) most commonly produced horticultural products.*
Sex of farmer: Male, Female, Joint, Association-applied. *Note, before using the "Joint" sex disaggregate category, partners must determine that decision-making about what to plant on the plot of land and how to manage it for that particular beneficiary and targeted commodity is truly done in a joint manner by male(s) and female(s) within the household. Given what we know about gender dynamics in agriculture, "joint" should not be the default assumption about how decisions about the management of the plot are made.*

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Additional data elements can be collected so Missions and partners can calculate productivity of other factors of production. For example, water consumption in cubic meters can be collected and used in the denominator to calculate water productivity, which is important in irrigated areas, and total labor used can be collected and used to calculate labor productivity in labor-scarce settings.

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries, targeted commodity/fisheries/livestock product
- DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Direct beneficiary farmer/fisher/rancher sample surveys; data collection through producer organizations or farm records, routine activity records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually.

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5:Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – First level objective: Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-19 Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index Score (R)

DEFINITION: The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) measures the empowerment, agency, and inclusion of women in the agriculture sector in an effort to identify and address the constraints that hinder women's full engagement in the agriculture sector. The WEAI is composed of two sub-indexes; the Five Domains of Empowerment sub-index (5DE) measures the empowerment of women in five areas; and the Gender Parity sub-Index (GPI) measures the average level of equality in empowerment of men and women within the household. The WEAI is an aggregate index reported at the ZOI level and is based on individual-level data on men and women within the same households and data on women living in households with no adult male.

The 5DE sub-index assesses whether women are empowered across the five domains examined in the WEAI. Each domain is weighted equally, as are each of the indicators within a domain. The five domains, their definitions under the WEAI, the corresponding indicators, and their weights for the 5DE are:

Domain (each weighted 1/5 of 5DE sub-index)	Definition of Domain	Indicators	Weight of indicator in 5DE sub-index
Production	Sole or joint decision-making over food and cash-crop farming, livestock, fisheries as well as autonomy in agricultural production	Input in productive decisions	1/10
		Autonomy in production	1/10
Resources	Ownership, access to, and decision-making power over productive resources such as land, livestock, agricultural equipment, consumer durables, and credit	Ownership of assets	1/15
		Purchase, sale or transfer of assets	1/15
		Access to and decisions on credit	1/15
Income	Sole or joint control over income and expenditures	Control over use of income	1/5
Leadership	Membership in economic or social groups and comfort in speaking in public	Group member	1/10
		Speaking in public	1/10
Time	Allocation of time to productive and domestic tasks and satisfaction with the available time for leisure activities	Workload	1/10
		Leisure	1/10

The 5DE is a measure of empowerment rather than disempowerment. A woman is defined as empowered in the 5DE if she reaches the threshold of empowerment in 80 percent or more of the weighted indicators. For disempowered women, the 5DE also shows the percentage of indicators in which those women meet the threshold of empowerment. The 5DE contributes 90 percent of the weight to the WEAI.

The GPI reflects the percentage of women who are as empowered as the men in their households. It is a relative equality measure that demonstrates the equality in 5DE profiles between the primary adult male and female in each household. In most cases, these are husband and wife, but they can be the primary male and female decision-maker regardless of their relationship to each other. For households that have not achieved gender parity, the GPI shows the gap that needs to be closed for women to reach the same level of empowerment as men. By definition, households without a primary adult male are excluded from this measure, and thus the aggregate WEAI uses the mean GPI value of dual-adult households. The GPI contributes 10 percent of the weight to the WEAI.

The 5DE score ranges from zero to one, where higher values indicate greater empowerment. It is constructed using a robust multidimensional methodology known as the Alkire Foster Method (see http://www.ophi.org.uk/research/multidimensional-poverty/alkire-foster-method/ for information on the method). The score has two components. First, it reflects the percentage of women who are empowered (H_e). Second, it reflects the percentage of domains in which those women who are not yet empowered (H_n) still have adequate achievements (A_a).The 5DE formula is: 5DE = $\{H_e + (H_n \times A_a)\}$, where $H_e + H_n = 100\%$ and $0 < A_a < 80\%$.*

The GPI also ranges from zero to one, with higher values indicating greater gender parity, and is constructed with two factors. First, it shows the percentage of women whose empowerment scores are lower than the men's in the household (H_{GPI})**. Second, the GPI shows the percentage shortfall in empowerment scores (I_{GPI}) for those women who do not have gender parity. The overall formula is the product of these two numbers, following the Foster Greer Thorbecke "poverty gap" measure: GPI = $\{1 - (H_{GPI} \times I_{GPI})\}$.

* This corrects an error in the WEAI Brochure (http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/weai_brochure.pdf).

** This notation (H_{GPI}) is different from that used in the WEAI Brochure, but is the same as that used in the WEAI Instructional Guide (http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/weai_instructionalguide.pdf) and published articles.

The WEAI score is computed as a weighted sum of the ZOI-level 5DE and the GPI. Thus, improvements in either the 5DE or GPI will increase the WEAI. The total WEAI score = $0.9\{ H_e + (H_n \times A_a)\} + 0.1\{1 - (H_{GPI} \times I_{GPI})\}$.	
RATIONALE: Feed the Future supports the inclusion of poorer and more economically vulnerable populations in economic growth strategies in the agriculture sector in order to have a transformational effect on regional economies and restructure local production, distribution, and consumption patterns for long-term, sustainable development. Because women play a prominent role in agriculture and due to the persistent economic constraints they face, women's empowerment is a main focus of Feed the Future. Empowering women is particularly important to achieving the Feed the Future objective of inclusive agriculture sector growth. The WEAI was developed to track the change in women's empowerment levels that occurs as a direct or indirect result of interventions under Feed the Future.	
UNIT: Number Please enter these three data points: 1. Score for 5DE sub-index 2. Score for GPI sub-index 3. Total population in the ZOI	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Population-based surveys conducted by an M&E contractor in the Feed the Future ZOI	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: This indicator should be collected in the Feed the Future ZOIs (i.e. the targeted population/sub-national level) through population-based surveys. ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: An M&E contractor will collect the data for the Feed the Future ZOI. ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: For the ZOI survey, the M&E contractor should conduct a population-based survey using the WEAI methodology and the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators. ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Data should be collected in the Zones of Influence for baseline, mid-term, and final reporting.	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.3: Improved market efficiency	
NDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-17 Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)	
DEFINITION: A road opens up transport from rural spaces where rural-based production activities such as agriculture are taking place, and connects, either directly or indirectly, with population centers and market activity. A road "improvement" indicates that the USG intervention significantly improved the ease of commercial transport along that road, while "constructed" refers to a new road. In general, a road need not necessarily be paved with cement or asphalt but should significantly facilitate the transport of goods compared to the previous situation without the road or without the road improvement. Please only count those road improved or constructed during the reporting year.	
RATIONALE: The linkage of rural communities to markets is considered a crucial means of increasing agricultural and other rural-based production as well as the access of rural communities to food at reasonable prices as well as greater off-farm employment opportunities and access to health and nutrition services.	
UNIT: *Kilometers*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Construction type: Improved, Constructed (new)
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: *Implementing Partners*	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level; only those roads constructed with USG assistance ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Direct measurement, activity records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: GCC and FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-21 Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance (S)	
DEFINITION: Where existing vulnerability assessments carried out under national or donor processes are not sufficient for developing and implementing a program, a climate vulnerability assessment should be conducted using best practices, at a relevant temporal and spatial scale for the envisioned program, and involving key stakeholders. Best practices include the participatory identification of priority climate-sensitive sectors, livelihoods or systems; identification of priority populations and regions; assessment of anticipated climate and non-climate stresses; estimates of potential impacts; and assessment of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity of the system to climate stresses. Only count those assessments conducted during the reporting year.	
RATIONALE: Vulnerability assessments that take climate and non-climate stressors into account form the basis for programming by presenting an integrated problem analysis. A vulnerability assessment should inform, and will help to justify, a program by indicating why certain strategies or activities are necessary to minimize exposure to climate stress, reduce sensitivity, or strengthen adaptive capacity. A range of methods may be used, depending on the decision context, including participatory workshops, community-based PRA-type assessments, economic assessments, risk and vulnerability mapping, etc.	
UNIT: Number of assessments	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing Partner records, survey or other applicable method ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)	
DEFINITION: This indicator should be used as an outcome indicator to measure a step in the process towards formalization of land ownership (see indicator #*4.5.1*-25), and it tracks the number of **additional** rural hectares that are mapped and adjudicated during the reporting year. "Mapped" indicates that the borders of a land area or water body are clearly indicated as to their physical/geographical location. "Adjudicated" means that property ownership rights and/or use rights have been defined for a body of land or water. Adjudicated rights can include "full" use rights, including the sale of the land to another owner, or some type of public or common property rights. This latter situation could involve deciding, for example where certain individuals, certain communities, the public, etc. may or may not engage in certain "use" activities such as to hunt and/or fish and/or engage in agriculture or grazing but does not involve individual ownership. This indicator counts how many additional hectares were mapped and adjudicated in a given year with USG assistance within the activity program area. This contrasts to the other property rights indicator *4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land*, which counts the total number of households that have been assigned formal ownership (i.e. formal government administrative recognition of their rights) within the activity program area.	
RATIONALE: Clear property rights are a prerequisite for secure investment that encourages long term economic growth in rural areas. Clear property rights also contribute to sustainable use over time by defining what activities may or may not take place on a given area of land and who can engage in those activities.	
UNIT: Hectares	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex of landholder: -- male --female --joint --communal
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners, from the relevant host government agency	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity level; only those hectares affected by USG programs ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners, with information from the host governments ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: If land is truly mapped, adjudicated, and otherwise accounted for, the host government or a local entity would keep these records. Implementing partners should obtain data on the applicable hectares from that government or local entity. ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agriculture Productivity / Sub IR 1.3: Improved Agricultural Policy Environment**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: **Stage 1: Analyzed** **Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation** **Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree** **Stage 4: Passed/approved** **Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)**	
DEFINITION: Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture 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 small-holder-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). Do not "double-count" policies that passed through several stages during the reporting year. Report only the highest stage completed during the reporting year, e.g. of a policy was analyzed then presented for stakeholder consultation, report one policy at Stage 2.	
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 *FTFMS Note: Please enter the name of the* policy / regulation / administrative procedure *and then select its sector and stage in order to track movement through the stages. FTFMS will automatically calculate the number of policies at each stage.*	*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 agricultural labor) • Research, extension, information, and other public service • Food security/vulnerable populations (e.g. safety net) • Climate change adaptation or natural resource management (NRM) (agriculture-related) Stage 1: Analyzed 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation 3: Presented for legislation/decree 4: Passed/approved 5: Passed for which implementation has begun

TYPE: Stages 1 & 2 = Output Stages 3, 4, & 5 = Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actuals for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates 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: 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: Activity-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 ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)	
DEFINITION: "Formalized" here implies that the user of the rural land, farm land, fishery, or water body has some type of formal government administrative recognition of the user's property right of the land/water that increases the tenure security of the resource for the owner. This measures households that, during the reporting year, received formal recognition by government institutions or traditional authorities at national or local levels of ownership rights and/or use rights through certificates, titles, leases, or other recorded documentation. This can include secondary rights. The formalization process varies by activity but can include the recordation or registration of a customary or informal right, as well as the regularization or adjudication of rights prior to formalization.	
RATIONALE: Although it is not the only approach, registration of farmland or fishing area increases the security of tenure over the land or fish stocks. This in turn increases the security of durable capital investments in the land that can have significant positive impact on agricultural productivity. Example capital investments include irrigation, cash crop trees, and soil and water conservation (e.g. terraces) or access to fishing grounds. Farmer/Fisher/Rancher households are more likely to invest in productivity enhancing durable capital investments when they have greater security of tenure.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex of landowner(s) with the formalized rights: --male --female --joint --communal *In many cases a registration document will list multiple users/owners, e.g. both a husband and wife, in which case one should use the disaggregation category of "joint" listed above.*
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners records, in conjunction with the National Cadastral Service, or whichever entity records land rights in the government	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Report on the hectares that became formalized within the targeted geographic scope of the activity. The baseline for this indicator would be 0, since you should count only those hectares formalized as a result of USG assistance, not how many are already formalized in the country/region. ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries; only those households with land formalized as a result of USG assistance ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing Partner records, National Cadastral Service for the records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1:Agriculturalal Enabling Environment **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.1 Enhanced Agricultural Trade**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-26 Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time) (S)	
DEFINITION: This Sub IR indicator is from the World Bank's annual *Doing Business* report (see the indicator table in the back of the publication). It is a component of the "trading across borders" section, and is comprised of the components called "time to export (days)" and "time to import (days)". Add the average days to export + the average days to import of the first year before activity implementation and divide by two, and that becomes the baseline average number of days to trade. Then in every subsequent year, report the average of the number of days required to trade across borders (i.e. (days to import + days to export) ÷ 2) recorded for that year. The detailed methodology as to how the WB collects this data is reported in their methodology paper.	
RATIONALE: One of the key elements to improving the policy environment is to make it easier to trade across borders. The Bank also includes an overall ranking for trading across borders, the number of documents needed and the cost to export or import (per container). There is usually a good correlation between these, but it is easiest to understand the number of days required for international trade. The development hypothesis is that speeding up international trade will provide an incentive to improve agricultural output. Because the poor are mainly in farming or agricultural sector activities, simplifying trade is likely to improve the incomes of the poor.	
UNIT: Number (of days)	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better
DATA SOURCE: World Bank's annual report on *Doing Business (indicator tables in back of report) – available online here: http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploretopics/trading-across-borders*	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: National level, for contextual monitoring ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Missions or their M&E contractor should pull the data from the World Bank report and enter into the FTFMS. ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: From the 2 components (# of days to export; # of days to import) of the "Trading Across Borders" measurement found in the WB Doing Business report. Select applicable country to see details on each measurement. ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity (*Productivity) **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agriculture Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management, and Innovation**	
NDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-28 Hectares under new or improved/rehabilitated irrigation or drainage services as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG) * *Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.	
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of hectares served by existing or new irrigation or drainage services that are either constructed or rehabilitated with USG funding during the reporting year. **Irrigation and drainage services** refers to the better delivery of water to, and drainage of water from, arable land, including better timing, quantity, quality, and cost-effectiveness for the water users. Rehabilitation involves irrigation and drainage infrastructure that already existed, where the USG investment led to improved or restored operating capacity and/or efficiency. Only count those hectares brought under new or improved/reconstructed irrigation during the reporting year. Include all hectares within the service area of the new or improved/rehabilitated irrigation/drainage system regardless of whether or not they are under production during the reporting year.	
RATIONALE: Expansion of area under irrigation is an important means of increasing agricultural productivity, reducing risk and incentivizing investments by value chain actors in improved technologies and management practices, and expanding seasonal available of food.	
UNIT: *Hectares*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: *Implementing Partners*	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level; only those hectares under irrigation with USG assistance ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Direct measurement, activity records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG) *

*Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.

DEFINITION:

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

Examples of relevant technologies include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

New/Continuing Disaggregation: If a hectare is under more than one improved technology, some of which continue to be applied from the previous year and some of which were newly applied in the reporting year, count the hectare under new. Any first-time application of an improved technology categorizes a hectare as new, even if other improved technologies being applied are continuing.

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

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

UNIT:
Hectares

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Technology type (see explanation in definition, above):
crop genetics, pest management, disease management, soil-related (fertility and conservation, including tillage), irrigation, water management, climate mitigation or adaptation, other, total w/one or more improved technology

Duration (see explanation in definition, above):
--New = this is the first year the hectare came under improved technologies or management practices
--Continuing = the hectare being counted continues to be under improved technologies or management practices from the previous year (i.e. technology/practice was applied for two consecutive years – the reporting year and the year prior), and no additional improved technology/practice is being newly applied. If additional improved technology/practices were applied for the first time during the reporting year, count the hectare under "New".

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

Note: The sum of hectares under the Sex disaggregate and the sum under New/Continuing disaggregate should equal the total under the "Total w/one or more improved technology" Technology Type disaggregate.

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partners will collect this data through census or survey of direct beneficiaries, direct observations of land, farm records, and activity documents.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries; only those hectares affected by USG assistance, and only those newly brought or continuing under improved technologies/management during the current reporting year
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via survey or other applicable method
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG) *

*Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.

DEFINITION:

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

Relevant technologies could include:

• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging

• Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; biofortified commodities such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;

• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;

• Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices

A beneficiary is counted **once regardless of the number of technologies applied during the reporting year**. If **more than one beneficiary in a household** is applying improved technologies, count each beneficiary in the household who does so.
If a beneficiary **cultivates a plot of land more than once in the reporting year**, s/he should be counted once if s/he applied an improved technology during <u>any</u> of the production cycles during the reporting year. S/he should <u>not</u> be counted each time an improved technology is applied. For example, because of new access to irrigation as a result of a Feed the Future activity, a farmer can now cultivate a second crop during the dry season in addition to her/his regular crop during the rainy season. If the farmer applies Feed the Future promoted technologies to her/his plot during one season and not the other, or in both the rainy season and the dry season, s/he would only be counted once under this indicator. However, the area under improved technologies should be counted <u>each time</u> it is cultivated under indicators *4.5-15 Gross margin per unit of land* and *4.5.2-2 number of hectares of land under improved technologies.*

Beneficiaries who are part of a group and apply improved technologies on a demonstration or other **common plot** with other beneficiaries, **are not counted as having individually applied an improved technology** The group should be counted as one (1) beneficiary group and reported under 4.5.2-42 *Number of private enterprises, producers organizations… and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies* . The area of the communal plot should be counted under 4.5-15 *Gross margin per unit of land* and 4.5.2-2 *number of hectares of land under improved technologies.*

If a **lead farmer cultivates a plot used for training**, e.g a demonstration plot used for Farmer Field Days or Farmer Field School, the beneficiary farmer should be counted under this indicator, and the area of the demonstration plot counted under *4.5-15 Gross margin per unit of land*, if applicable and *4.5.2-2 number of hectares of land under improved technologies.* However, if the demonstration or training plot is cultivated by extensionists or researchers, e.g. a demonstration plot in a research institute, neither the area nor the extensionist/researcher should be counted under the respective indicators.

This indicator, *4.5.2-5*, counts **individuals** who applied improved technologies, whereas indicator *4.5.2-28 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations…and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices* counts firms, associations, or other **group entities** applying association- or organization-level improved technologies or practices. *4.5.2-5 Number*

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

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

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

UNIT:
Number

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Duration
--New = This reporting year is the first year the person applied the improved technology/management practice
--Continuing = The person first applied the improved technology/practice in the previous year and continues to apply it (i.e. technology/practice was applied for two consecutive years). However, If the person applies more than one improved technology/practice, some of which continue to be applied from the previous year and some of which were applied for the first time in the reporting year, count the person under new. Any first-time application of an improved technology/practice categorizes the person as new, even if other improved technologies/practices being applied are continuing.

Sex: Male, Female

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Sample survey of direct beneficiaries, activity or association records, farm records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)	
DEFINITION: The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a degree-seeking bachelor's, master's or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term, degree-seeking advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. An example is a USDA Borlaug Leadership Enhancement Program. A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should be counted only once. Agricultural productivity includes cultured and natural production (farmers, fishers, ranchers). Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture, but do not 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 (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	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing Partners will review program documents to track individuals in long-term training programs.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program training records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture 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 (RiA) (WOG)

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

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

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

Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities. An example is a USDA Cochran Fellow.

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

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

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of individual: -Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.) -People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers) -People in private sector firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers) -People in civil society (e.g. NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations) *Note: While producers are included under MSMEs under indicators 4.5.2-30 and 4.5.2-37, only count them under the Producers and not the Private Sector Firms disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double-counting.* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program training records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	
DEFINITION: Total number of private enterprises, producers' associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, fishing associations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations, including those focused on natural resource management, that received USG assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. "Organizations assisted" should only include those organizations for which implementing partners have made a targeted effort to build their capacity or enhance their organizational functions. In the case of training or assistance to farmer's association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity.	
RATIONALE: Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) New/Continuing: --New = the entity is receiving USG assistance for the first time during the reporting year --Continuing = the entity received USG assistance in the previous year and continues to receive it in the reporting year *FTFMS note: In the FTFMS, you will enter the number of each type of organization receiving assistance for your activities, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator across all activities.*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiary organizations ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records of training and various USG assistance for these specific types of organizations/associations ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased 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 (S)

DEFINITION:
Number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to Feed the Future intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. Please count both Global Development Alliance (GDA) partnerships and non-GDA partnerships for this indicator. 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 an activity 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.

- 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, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.

NOTE: Each partnership's formation should only be reported once in order to add the total number of partnerships across years.

RATIONALE:
The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely 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 activity work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will be a reduction in poverty.

UNIT: Number *System note: In the FTFMS, you will enter the name of the partnership, label it for its type, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator.*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Partnership focus (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)
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

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

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improve agricultural productivity / 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 (S)	
DEFINITION: A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a direct beneficiary if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the activity. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as beneficiary. Individuals who receive training or benefit from activity-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. (An indirect beneficiary, on the other hand, does not necessarily have direct contact with the activity but still benefits, such as the population who uses a new road constructed by the activity or the individuals who hear a radio message but don't receive any other training or counseling from the activity.) The definition of "rural" should be the definition used by the respective national statistical service. This indicator can include vulnerable households if they are in rural areas.	
RATIONALE: Tracks access and equitable access to services in targeted area.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Duration: New, Continuing *Rural households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but were not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."* Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries; attributable to USG investment ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records, surveys, training participant lists, etc. ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 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 (S)

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

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, those vulnerable to climate change and variability, 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 benefiting directly from USG assistance, of which x number are vulnerable."

RATIONALE:
Inclusive agriculture sector growth is dependent on equitable access, and it is a key tenet of Feed the Future to bring in typically marginalized groups.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Duration: New, Continuing *Vulnerable households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but were not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."* Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)

TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: From definition of "vulnerable" in OU's RF, with info from Activity records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program 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 (RiA)

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

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

The number of direct beneficiaries of Feed the Future activities often increases over time as the activity rolls-out. Unless an activity has identified all prospective direct beneficiaries at the time the baseline is established, the baseline sales value will only include sales made by beneficiaries identified when the baseline is established during the first year of implementation. The baseline sales value will not include the "baseline" sales made prior to their involvement in the Feed the Future activity by beneficiaries added in subsequent years. Thus the baseline sales value will underestimate total baseline sales of all beneficiaries, and consequently overestimate incremental sales for reporting years when the beneficiary base has increased. To address this issue, Feed the Future requires reporting the number of direct beneficiaries along with baseline and reporting year sales so that baseline sales and reporting year sales data can be better interpreted, and actual incremental sales better estimated.

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

If a direct beneficiary sample survey is used to collect incremental sales data, sample **survey estimates must be extrapolated** to total beneficiary estimated values before entry into FTFMS to accurately reflect total sales by the activity's direct beneficiaries.

Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator #4.5-15, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value reported here.

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

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

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
US dollar *Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.* ***Volume (metric tons)** and **number of direct beneficiaries** covered under the indicator must also be entered into FTFMS.*	Commodity *Note, Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for the Incremental Sales indicator; the overall "Horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired. Partners may also choose to report only on sales of the five most*

FTFMS Note: First enter baseline value of sale (sales in year before Feed the Future efforts) and then enter value of sales in the reporting year in USD. FTFMS ***will automatically calculate the Value of incremental sales*** *between the baseline year and the reporting year.*	*important horticultural products, but this is not recommended.*
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partner	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity level; those affected by USG activity reach ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Ideally, implementing partner will collect in a census of all target beneficiaries. Sample survey-based approaches are also acceptable. ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: The value of incremental sales can be collected directly from a census or sample of farmer beneficiaries, from recorded sales data by farmer's associations, from farm records. ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-25 Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance (S)	
DEFINITION: This indicator counts the number of people who first acquired a savings account or insurance policy during the reporting year as a result of USG assistance. A savings account refers to any type of an account in a financial institution that serves as a store of an individual's financial wealth as well as savings in traditional institutional structures such as community savings groups. An insurance policy refers not only to agricultural insurance in the case of crop failure but also any other type of insurance, such as property, fishing access rights, health or life insurance that cushions an individual/household against financial shocks that could otherwise potentially make the individual or household food insecure. Obtaining the value of a savings account can be difficult, and therefore will not be collected. The purpose of this indicator is to measure progress towards changed behavior of saving money as a buffer to the shock of income loss, and counting the number of savings or insurance accounts begins to measure this.	
RATIONALE: Food insecurity is often a result of financial shocks that may come from both agricultural production as well as loss of property or sickness or death of a household family member. Having a financial reserve in a savings account or an insurance policy is a means to buffer a household against these types of financial shocks that could leave the individual/household food insecure.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Type of account/policy: Savings, Insurance Sex of account owner or policy holder: Male, Female, Jointly-held
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity level; those affected by scope of USG activity ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing partner records or bank records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
A producer organization in this context is any grouping of people involved in agriculture including input suppliers, transporters, farmers, fishers, ranchers, processors, etc. that is organized around adding value to agricultural production. A community based organization (CBO) in this context is simply an organization involved in supporting any type of agricultural activity (including post-harvest transformation) and is based in a community and made up principally of individuals from the local community. Producer associations are often CBOs, but are reported as a distinct disaggregate USG assistance can include any help provided to either type of organization to expand coverage, services provided, information, etc. Some examples are organizational capacity building, training, other technical assistance, provision of supplies and materials, encouragement and motivation for improvements, etc. The indicator includes any person within the agricultural value chain who is a member of one of these organizations and thus directly received USG assistance.

This indicator counts the number of members within these types of organizations which receive assistance. It does not count the number of institutions, the amount of the assistance or the change in the value of agricultural commodities. Note that individuals counted under this indicator would also be part of households counted in the total number under indicator #4.5.2-13 (number of rural households benefiting), as applicable.

RATIONALE:
Helping the members of these institutions directly strengthens those organizations, which in turn will assist in improving the overall value of production in the agricultural value chain, improving productivity and contributing to a reduction in poverty, as most of the poor are in rural areas either as farmers, farm workers or workers in rural enterprises.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of organization: Producer organization, Non-producer-organization CBO Sex: Male, Female
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity level; those affected by USG activity scope
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
This indicator sums cash loans made (i.e. disbursed) during the reporting year to direct beneficiary producers (farmers, fishers, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, and loans to other MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain, as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.

This indicator only counts cash loans; do not include in-kind loans. It also only counts loans made by financial institutions, and not informal groups such as village savings and loan groups that are not formally registered as a financial institutions.

RATIONALE:
Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This in turn will help expand markets and trade (and ought to also contribute to IR1's expanding agricultural productivity) which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive (the MSMEs) agriculture sector growth (with agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production). In turn this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
US Dollars *Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.*	Type of loan recipient: producers, local traders/assemblers, wholesalers/processors, others. Sex of recipient: --Male --Female --Joint --n/a *For producers, the sex of the loan recipient should be used.* *For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available)*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Bank/lending institution records or survey of targeted beneficiaries
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)

DEFINITION:
Total number of micro (1-10) small (11-50) and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs). Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent workers during the previous month. MSMEs include producers (farmers). Producers should be classified as micro, small or medium-enterprise based on the number of FTE workers hired (permanent and/or seasonal) during the previous 12 months. If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise. To be counted an MSME must have received USG assistance which resulted in a loan from any financial institution, formal or informal, including MFIs, commercial banks, or informal lenders, as well as from in-kind lenders of equipment (e.g. tractor, plow) or other agricultural inputs (e.g., fertilizer or seeds), or transport, with repayment in cash or in kind. USG assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan.

The indicator does not measure the value of the loans, but the number of MSMEs that received USG assistance and accessed loans. Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple loans are accessed.

RATIONALE:
The lack of access to financial capital is frequently cited as a major impediment to the development of MSMEs, thus helping MSMEs access finances is likely to increase investment and the value of output (production in the case of farmers, value added for agricultural processing). This will directly contribute to the expansion of markets, increased agricultural productivity, and the reduction of poverty.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Size: Micro, Small, Medium Sex of owner/producer: Male, Female, Joint, n/a *If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available)*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records, MSME financial records, etc.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-32 Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance (S)	
DEFINITION: This indicator tracks decision-making among individual stakeholders with whom USG programs are specifically working to increase knowledge and use of climate information. Relevant climate data and information will vary according to the program context, but should be used by stakeholders (in the case of this indicator, defined as individual policy and decision makers) in the process of identification, assessment, and management of climate risks to improve resilience. Climate data may include monitored weather or climate projections (e.g., anticipated temperature, precipitation and sea level rise, changing frost-free dates, changing soil moisture and/or temperature, risk projections for extreme weather events, speed of soil erosion and water availability under future scenarios). Climate information might include the outputs of impact assessments, for example, the consequences of increased temperatures on crops, livestock, invasive species, pests and disease incidents, changes in stream flow due to precipitation shifts, or the number of people likely to be affected by future storm surges. If more than one individual from an organization (e.g. Early Warning and Response Unit of Ministry of Agriculture) is directly using climate information for identification, assessment, and management of climate risks as a result of USG assistance, all such individuals from that organization should be counted. Practices and actions taken as a result of the climate information will aim to increase predictability/ productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.	
RATIONALE: The use of climate information reflects that access to and quality of data (raw observations or facts) and information (interpreted) are sufficient, and reflects sufficient capacity of users to access and appropriately make use of data and information. Data and information as the basis for climate risk identification, assessment, and planning may be lacking, OR, rather, awareness and capacity of decision makers to access and make use of this data may be lacking. Where the use of information is lacking, outreach, training, collaboration on pilot activities, and other efforts may be necessary to build capacity for using available data and information in planning and action.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Increase is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Vian activity records, survey or other applicable method ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2:Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: GCC and FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-34 Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (S)	
Definition: There is strong scientific and evidence-based information that stakeholders (in the case of this indicator defined as "producers") involved in sectors such as agriculture, livestock, fishing, other areas of natural resources can mitigate the effects of climate change by using appropriate new and tested management practices or implement measures that reduce the risks of climate change impacts. For example, risk-reducing management practices in agriculture and livestock might include changing the exposure or sensitivity of crops (e.g., switching crops, using a greenhouse, or changing the cropping calendar), soil management practices that reduce rainwater run-off and increase infiltration, changing grazing practices, or adjusting the management of other aspects of the system. Risk reducing measures might include applying new technologies like improved seeds or irrigation methods, diversifying into different income-generating activities or into crops that are less susceptible to drought and greater climatic variability. Any adjustment to the management of resources or implementation of an adaptation action that responds to climate-related stresses and increases resilience can be considered. Practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.	
RATIONALE: While many management practices and technologies exist and can be diffused, others may not be well suited to perform under emerging climate stresses. Improved management and new technologies are available and others are being developed to perform better under climate stresses. Resource management experiences from other parts of the world may be useful as climate conditions shift geographically.	
UNIT: Number of stakeholders	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Type of Risk reducing practice: -Agriculture – practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change. -Water – practices and actions will aim to improve water quality, supply, and efficient use under anticipated climate variability and change. -Health – practices and actions will aim to prevent or control disease incidence and outcomes under anticipated climate variability and change outcomes. -Disaster Risk Management – practices and actions will aim to reduce the negative impacts of extreme events associated with climate variability and change. -Urban – practices and actions will aim to improve the resilience of urban areas, populations, and infrastructure under anticipated climate variability and change. Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Field surveys by local activity partners, including extension agents and farmer/producer organizations (and other types of organizations)	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiaries ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via Implementing Partner records, survey or other applicable method ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)

DEFINITION:
This indicator tracks the direction and magnitude of annual change in the value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities within a sub-region or regional economic community. The intent of this indicator is to monitor regional trade in selected agricultural commodities, even outside of direct USG attribution, and should be reported by the regional missions who historically monitor this information. Note that regional exports counted in the indicator #4.5.2-36 "Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance") would be included in those counted here, while non-regional exports counted in #4.5.2-36 would not be counted here.

"Region" should be defined by the regional mission, who can best determine the applicable countries involved in a trade region. **Trade outside of this defined region should NOT be included in this indicator.**

In summary, indicator #4.5.2-35 collects trade ONLY within a region, but more than USG attributable, while #4.5.2-36 collects all trade within and outside of a region, but ONLY that which is USG-attributable.

RATIONALE:
Increased agricultural trade is one of the end results of efficient markets. Note that this indicator is meant for reporting by regional missions, not bilateral missions.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent *Volume (in metric tons) sold and Value (in USD) should be entered in FTFMS.* *Note: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period* *FTFMS note: Both volume of regional trade (in metric tons) and value (in USD) should be entered each year and FTFMS will automatically calculate the percent change in value.*	Commodity Exporting country
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
To be tracked and reported to USAID by regional partner or team with appropriate analytical capacity as selected by the regional mission.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This is a contextual indicator that, although not USG-attributable at the regional level, should still be measured to assess this important aspect of Feed the Future and regional mission strategies. Because this is a contextual indicator, no targets need to be set.

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Targeted commodities at the regional level (non-regional trade not included here)
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Regional missions, through appropriate partners, as necessary
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Where available, informal trade data should be taken into account. Regional Missions should work with appropriate partners to develop best measurement. FEWSNET could be one source of trade on specific commodities.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

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 (S)

DEFINITION:
This indicator will measure the value of regional and non-regional exports in USD attributable to USG assistance. Exports should be counted against the baseline of existing export levels from the previous year (existing exports before USG intervention for the first year, or additional exports for subsequent years). 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.

In summary, indicator #4.5.2-35 collects trade ONLY within a region, but more than USG attributable, while #4.5.2-36 collects all trade within and outside of a region, but ONLY that which is USG-attributable.

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

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
US dollar *Volume (in metric tons) sold and Value (in USD) should be entered in the FTFMS.* *Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.*	Commodity Destination: -Regional (value of exports sent within the region), -Outside of Region (value of exports going outside of region) .
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity level; only those exports attributable to the USG activity
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Producer records, available trade data, etc.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (S)

DEFINITION:
Total number of micro (1-10) small (11-50) and medium (51-100) enterprises (parenthesis = number of employees) receiving services from Feed the Future-supported enterprise development providers. Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent (FTE) workers during the previous month. MSMEs include producers (farmers). Producers should be classified as micro, small or medium-enterprise based on the number of FTE workers hired (permanent and/or seasonal) during the previous 12 months.). If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise. Services may include, among other things, business planning, procurement, technical support in production techniques, quality control and marketing, micro-enterprise loans, etc. . Clients may be involved in agricultural production, agro-processing, community forestry, fisheries, input suppliers, or other small businesses receiving USG assistance. Additional examples of enterprise-focused services include: **Market Access:** These services identify/establish new markets for small enterprise (SE) products; facilitate the creation of links between all the actors in a given market and enable buyers to expand their outreach to, and purchases from, SEs; enable SEs to develop new products and produce them to buyer specifications. **Input supply:** These services help SEs improve their access to raw materials and production inputs; facilitate the creation of links between SEs and suppliers and enable the suppliers to both expand their outreach to SEs and develop their capacity to offer better, less expensive inputs. **Technology and Product Development:** These services research and identify new technologies for SEs and look at the capacity of local resource people to produce, market, and service those technologies on a sustainable basis; develop new and improved SE products that respond to market demand. **Training and Technical Assistance:** These services develop the capacity of enterprises to better plan and manage their operations and improve their technical expertise; develop sustainable training and technical assistance products that SEs are willing to pay for and they foster links between service providers and enterprises. **Finance:** These services help SEs identify and access funds through formal and alternative channels that include supplier or buyer credits, factoring companies, equity financing, venture capital, credit unions, banks, and the like; assist buyers in establishing links with commercial banks (letters of credit, etc.) to help them finance SE production directly. **Infrastructure:** These services establish sustainable infrastructure (refrigeration, storage, processing facilities, transport systems, loading equipment, communication centers, and improved roads and market places) that enables SEs to increase sales and income. **Policy/Advocacy:** These services carry out subsector analyses and research to identify policy constraints and opportunities for SEs; facilitate the organization of coalitions, trade organizations, or associations of business people, donors, government officials, academics, etc. to effect policies that promote the interests of SEs.

Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple services are received.

RATIONALE:
This indicator measures directly the sub-IR of access to business development services which contributes to the IR of expanding markets and trade. The IR impacts on the Key Objective of increasing agricultural productivity which will help achieve the goal of reducing poverty and hunger.

UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Size: Micro, Small, Medium, as defined above MSME Type: Agricultural producer, Input supplier, Trader, Output processors, Non-agriculture, Other *Sex* of owner/producer: Male, Female, Joint, n/a. *Most enterprises are likely to be small (or very small), probably single proprietorships, in which case the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, n/a (not available) should be used*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
In the case that an individual MSME participates in multiple trainings or technical assistance in one year, it should be counted as one MSME enterprise. This indicator should count MSMEs receiving trainings or development services within the reporting year, not an accumulation of all trainings that MSME received in the life of USG activity.

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiary MSME; only those MSMEs receiving trainings/service within the scope of the USG activity in the reporting year.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Training participant records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased 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 (RiA)	
DEFINITION: Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, to improve the sustainable use of agriculture-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), to improve water or land management, etc. 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 managed by a for-profit formal company. A CBO or NGO resources may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural activity. "Leveraged by FTF implementation" indicates that the new investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the Feed the Future initiative. Investments reported should not include funds received by the investor from USG as part of any grant or other award. New investment means investment made during the reporting year.	
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 Feed the Future goal to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger."	
UNIT: US Dollars	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level; new investment (within reporting year) leveraged within scope of USG activity ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Private sector financial records, program data ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-39 Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development:

- ***…in Phase I*: under research as a result of USG assistance**
- ***…in Phase II*: under field testing as a result of USG assistance**
- ***…in Phase III*: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)**

DEFINITION:
Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture), and may relate to any of the products at any point on the supply chain.

Relevant technologies include:

• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including packaging, sustainable water management practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices;
• Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; biofortified crops such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;
• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;
• Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning risk management strategies, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices

Significant improvements to existing technologies should also 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, tools modified to suit a particular management practice, and improved fishing gear.

- *…in Phase I*: under research as a result of USG assistance

  New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice under research in a previous year but not under research in the reporting year should not be included. Technologies under research are as follows:

  a. For biotech crop research: When technologies are under research, the process is contained in a laboratory or greenhouse; once the possibility of success is judged high enough, a permit is required to move to field testing. The change of location from a contained laboratory or greenhouse to a confined field and the receipt of a permit indicate that the research has completed the "under research" stage.
  b. For non-biotech crop research: When technologies are under research, plant breeders work on developing new lines on research plots under controlled conditions. All research should have a target, often expressed in terms of traits to be combined into a specific cultivar or breed. When the research achieves "proof of concept" (by accumulating technical information and test results that indicate that the target is achievable), the "under research" phase is completed. Note that for crops, much or all of this phase might be conducted outdoors and in soil; these attributes do not make this work "field testing."
  c. For non-crop research: "under research" signifies similarly research conducted under ideal conditions to develop or support the development of the product or process.

- *…in Phase II*: under field testing as a result of USG assistance

  "Under field testing" means that research has moved from focused development to broader testing and this testing is underway under conditions intended to duplicate those encountered by potential users of the new technology. This might be in the actual facilities (fields) of potential users, or it might be in a facility set up to duplicate those conditions. More specifically:

  a. For biotech crop research: Once a permit has been obtained and the research moves to a confined field, the research is said to be "under field testing."
  b. For non-biotech crop or fisheries research: During this phase the development of the product or technology continues under end-user conditions in multi-location trails, which might be conducted at a research station or on farmers'/producer's

fields/waters or both. Note that for crops, all of this phase would be conducted outdoors and in soil, but this is not what makes this work "field testing."

c. For non-crop research: "under field testing" signifies similarly research conducted under user conditions to further test the product, process, or practice. In the case of research to improve equipment, the endpoint of field testing could be sales of equipment (when the tester is a commercial entity). In other cases it could be distribution of designs (when the tester is a noncommercial entity) and also distribution of publications or other information (on the force of the good results of field testing).

- *…in Phase III*: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance.

  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.

RATIONALE:
This indicator tracks the three stages in research and technology investments and progress toward dissemination.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Phase of development: -Under research as a result of USG assistance; -Under field testing as a result of USG assistance; -Made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level; only those technologies under development by the USG activity
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records or survey
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improve agricultural productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-41 Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (S)	
DEFINITION: Water Resources Sustainability Assessments are evaluations of the water resources availability and use in a country. Attention is specifically devoted to environmental water requirements and sustainability of water use in the face of climate variability and change at the basin level	
RATIONALE: Water is frequently diverted for different uses without sufficient consideration for the larger impacts of that use. As a result, basin level sustainability is often compromised and conflicts arise between uses and users in different parts of basins. To help mitigate this outcome, water resources sustainability assessments can foster a broader approach to integrated water resources management that facilitates more optimal and harmonious outcomes.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Location: Transboundary, National Scale: Basin-level, Sub-basin level, Field level
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via Implementing partner records ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-42 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG) *

*Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in FactsInfo. FTFMS and FactsInfo numbering is the same.

DEFINITION:

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

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

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

RATIONALE:

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

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) Duration: New, Continuing --New = entity applied a targeted new technology/management practice for the first time during the reporting year --Continuing = entity applied new technology(ies)/practice(s) in a previous year and continues to apply in the reporting year
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiary organization
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation, activity records, etc.
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities/Sub IR 3.2: Increased private sector investment**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-43 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance (RiA)	
DEFINITION: To measure sustainable private sector investment, we will look at profitability of applicable firms and financial self-sufficiency of civil society organizations (CSOs) as a marker of viability. A CSO is financially self-sufficiency when the COS's annual income is more than annual operating expenses and annual amortization and depreciation of permanent assets. Although profitability or self-sufficiency measured during the period the USG is providing assistance does not demonstrate all aspects of a whether a business or a CSO will remain sustainably successful after withdrawal of USG assistance, it is certainly an important measure of its capacity to function effectively. Only the profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of CSOs who are receiving USG capacity-building assistance that is intended to increase profitability or viability should be tracked. A firm should be counted if it operated more profitably in the reporting year than it did the previous reporting year. A CSO should be counted if it was financially self-sufficient in the reporting year and it had **not** been financially self-sufficient in the previous reporting year.	
RATIONALE: A main goal of local capacity building is to leave behind viable businesses and service providers to contribute to the economic growth of the agriculture and food-security sector. Profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations is one way to demonstrate that viability and sustainability of the businesses/firms/CSOs in which we invest.	
UNIT: Number	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Type of entity: Firm, CSO
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing Partner records	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: *FTFMS Note: Please enter the name of the firms or CSO and its stage in the indicator comment box to track movement to increased profitability of individual organizations assisted.* ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Targeted beneficiaries ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners working directly with firms and NGOs ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Accounting records of the targeted firms and NGOs ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved agricultural productivity
Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: CBLD-5 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)

DEFINITION:
The reporting of the combined key area score will represent the capacity of FTF-assisted local organizations measured across seven key capacity areas using the Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) tool. A copy of this tool can be found at the following link J:\Procurement Reform Objective Two\Organizational Capacity Assessment\OCA Overview.docx. The key capacity areas include:

- Governance
- Administration
- Human Resources Management
- Financial Management
- Organizational Management
- Program Management
- Project Performance Management

The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator.
Numerator: the total number of points scored.
Denominator: the total number of points possible, which may vary depending on the inclusion of optional OCA sections where relevant. (e.g. the sub-grant management section may or may not be relevant to the organization depending on program)

Operating units should record score data for each organization in their performance management plan files so changes in scores for each organization can be monitored over time (it is not necessary to report each organization's score in the PPR). In addition, each operating unit must include in their performance management plan files: the assessment tool used, a description of the methodology employed for its implementation, and the data source identified as the basis for the rating of each factor.
For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a "local organization" must,

- Be organized under the laws of the recipient country;
- Have its principal place of business in the recipient country;
- Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and
- Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country.

The term "controlled by", means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above , or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization's managers or a majority of the organization's governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of law.

"Foreign entity" means an organization that fails to meet any part of the "local organization" definition.

Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization.

For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria:

- Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform;
- Have its principal place of business in the region;
- Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region; and
- Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region.

Both direct and indirect awardees should be included.

Regional platforms and bilateral missions also may include obligations or sub-obligations to international organizations composed principally of countries to which membership is limited to countries within the region, provided the funds are to be implemented directly by or through the regional international organization. Note: If an operating unit wishes to use an alternative assessment tool, for example one generated through the human and institutional capacity development (HICD) methodology or the IDF tool, it should at a minimum include the factors identified in the OCA.	
RATIONALE: Building the capacity of local institutions is crucial to sustainable development and long-lasting changes in a community. This indicator measures progress in actual local capacity development and will be used by USAID management to report on progress towards achieving USAID Forward local capacity development objectives.	
UNIT: Percent Please enter these two data points: 1. Numerator: the total number of points scored. 2. Denominator: the total number of points possible	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* None for reporting purposes; however each operating unit should keep separate files to track the percentage change by organization.
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing Partner	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL OF COLLECTION: Activity-level, direct beneficiary organizations only for FTF reporting ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing Partner Records/Survey of institutions if needed ➢ FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annually reported	

Appendix 1. List of changes to April 2012 version of the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook

Summary of Numbering Changes

April 2012 number	September 2013 Number (aligned with FactsInfo)
3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)	3.1.9.2-2
4-16 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day (R)	4-17
4-17 Ease of Doing Business rank (S)	4-16
4.5-? Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	4.5-19
4.5-4 Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (RiA)	4.5-16,17,18
4.5.2-28 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	4.5.2-42

Indicator SPS # Indicator and Title, April 2012	Changes in September 2013 version
General	1. Emphasized that mechanism-level indicators cover direct beneficiaries, not indirect beneficiaries or the population-level 2. Clarified that where population numbers are required, the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category. FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level *3.* For indicators where local currency is to be converted to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year, added a note to convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation. *4.* For PBS nutrition indicators, clarified that mission should enter ZOI-level data in the FTFMS and national-level values from the DHS in the PPR. 5. Clarified that the term "attribution" in the Handbook uses the ADS 200[5] definition of "Ascribing a causal link between observed changes (results) and a specific intervention. A result is attributable to the USAID, or USAID can claim credit for a result, even when other partners are involved in achieving the result, if USAID can claim that without USAID intervention the outcome would not have taken place."
3.1.9-1 Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs (S)	Clarified that 1) indicator counts training participants, not unique individuals (in contrast to 4.5.2-7, which counts unique individuals trained); 2) mothers/caregivers, policy-makers, researchers also counted under the indicator
3.1.9-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	Duplicate indicator - dropped. Use 3.1.9.1-4.
3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.

[5] http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/200.pdf. Page 60.

3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)	Numbering change to 3.1.9.2-2. Location disaggregate dropped
3.1.9-11 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9-12 Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9-13 Prevalence of underweight women (R)	Clarified that the indicator data are reported for non-pregnant women only, and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9-14 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9-16 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9.1-1 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9.1-2 Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)	Location disaggregate dropped. Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that upcoming DHS data can be used if mission includes optional WDDS module in the DHS questionnaire and timing of the DHS is appropriate.
3.1.9.1-3 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that upcoming DHS data can be used if mission includes optional HHS module in the DHS questionnaire and timing of the DHS is appropriate.
3.1.9.1-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing DHS data can be used under certain circumstances.
3.1.9.2-3 Number of children under five who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)	Location and sex disaggregates dropped
4-16 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day (R)	Numbering change to 4-17. Expanded the explanation on how to calculate the indicator. Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing LSMS or similar data can be used under certain circumstances.
4-17 Ease of Doing Business rank (S)	Numbering change to 4-16. Responsibility for entering data in FTFMS shifted to Missions that select the indicator.
4.5-? Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	Numbering change to 4.5-19. Corrected 5DE and GPI formula notations.
4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	Added definition of Full Time Equivalent

4.5-3 Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)	Added requirement to present baseline in 2010 local currency and annual reporting in constant 2010 local currency, and explanation on how to treat lagged data
4.5-4 Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (RiA)	Numbering change to 4.5-16,17,18 to align with FactsInfo indicator numbering. Title change ("per hectare, animal or cage") to make denominator units clearer. Substantial revisions and additional explanation provided, including emphasizing that indicator should focus on small-holder farmers. **PLEASE READ REVISED PIRS.**
4.5-9 Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries (R)	Title changed: "Daily" added and "of USG targeted beneficiaries" changed to "in USG-assisted areas" to make clear that indicator is measured at the population level and not only among direct beneficiaries. Added instructions on converting to 2010 USD. Clarified that the population numbers provided should be the total ZOI sub-population covered under each disaggregate category (FTFMS will calculate the total ZOI population at the overall indicator level), and that existing LSMS or similar data can be used under certain circumstances.
4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)	Small edits to indicator description to clarify different between adjudication and formalization
4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)	Clarified that only the highest stage reached during the reporting year should be reported when a policy passes through more than one stage during the reporting year.
4.5.1-26 Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time) (S)	Responsibility for entering data in FTFMS shifted to Missions that select the indicator.
4.5.1-27 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	Duplicate indicator - dropped. Use USAID Forward indicator CBLD-5
4.5.1-28 Hectares under new or improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	New RiA WOG indicator. This new indicator complements the *4.5.2-2 # hectares under improved technologies* indicator. *4.5.1-28* counts all hectares that become potentially irrigable during the reporting year as a result of new/improved irrigation services, while *4.5.2-2* only counts those newly irrigable hectares that were actually cultivated during the reporting year.
4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	Substantial revisions and additional explanation provided, including revising the technology type disaggregate categories to include only land-based technologies and practices. **PLEASE READ REVISED PIRS.**
4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	"New" changed to "improved" technologies in Title. Substantial revisions and additional explanation provided. **PLEASE READ REVISED PIRS.**
4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)	Added additional explanation on what constitutes short-term training. Emphasized that individuals should only be counted once regardless of the number of trainings received and whether the trainings covered different topics during the reporting year.
4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	Aligned definition of beneficiary household with 4.5.2-14

4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	Clarified that indicator measures all sales by smallholder farmer or primary producer, not just farm-gate sales. i.e. that "farm-level" does not equal "farm-gate". **Added requirement that number of direct beneficiaries be reported for proper interpretation of the indicator.** Emphasized importance of baseline for this indicator and provided guidance on creating baseline when actual baseline is not available. Clarified that disaggregation of specific horticulture products is not required for this indicator.
4.5.2-28 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	Numbering change to 4.5.2-42. Changed "new" to "improved" technologies in title
4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)	Emphasized that indicator only counts cash loans and does not include in-kind loans, and only counts loans made by financial institutions, and not informal groups, such as village savings and loan groups, that are not formally registered as a financial institutions.
4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)	Aligned definition of micro and small enterprise with USAID definition
4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)	Dropped requirement to set targets, because this is a non-USG-attributable, context indicator.
4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (S)	Aligned definition of micro and small enterprise with USAID definition
4.5.2-40 Number of hectares of agricultural land (fields, rangeland, agro-forests) showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (RiA)	Indicator dropped because simple, standard measurement method could not be defined
CBLD-5 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	Clarifies that FTF programs should report this indicator only for organizations that are the direct beneficiaries of organizational capacity building activities