Feed the Future FEEDBACK Project Year 1

ANNUAL REPORT 2012

November 2012
This publication was produced by Westat for review by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Prepared for the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID Contract Number GS-23F-8144H/AID-OAA-M-12-00006, Feed the Future FEEDBACK

Contact:
Detra Robinson, Chief of Party
Westat
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: 301-738-3653
Email: DetraRobinson@westat.com

Contents

Chapter				Page
	ACRONYMS			vi
1	Introduction and Project Start-Up			1
	1.1	Introduction		1
	1.2	Project Launch		1
		1.2.1	Project Kick-off Meeting	1
		1.2.2	Initial Technical Working Group Meeting	3
	1.3	Organization of an Executive Committee and Project Team Structure		4
		1.3.1	Executive Committee	4
		1.3.2	Subgroups	6
	1.4	Core Personnel		8
2	Progress by Project Component			11
	2.1	Component 1: Performance Monitoring		12
		2.1.1	Summary of Progress Against Performance Monitoring Objectives	12
		2.1.2	Changes in the Performance Monitoring Scope of Work and Work Plan	18
		2.1.3	Achievement of Performance Monitoring PMP Targets	18
		2.1.4	Performance Monitoring Focus for Next Time Period	18
	2.2	Component 2: Impact Evaluation		19
		2.2.1	Summary of Progress Against Impact Evaluation Objectives	19
		2.2.2	Changes in the Impact Evaluation Scope of Work and Work Plan	24
		2.2.3	Achievement of Impact Evaluation PMP Targets	24
		2.2.4	Impact Evaluation Focus for Next Time Period	24

Contents (continued)

Chapter Page

2.3 Component 3: Data Management 25

2.3.1 Summary of Progress Against Data Management Objectives 25
2.3.2 Changes in the Data Management Scope of Work and Work Plan 28
2.3.3 Achievement of Data Management PMP Targets 28
2.3.4 Data Management Focus for Next Time Period 28

2.4 Component 4: Knowledge Management 29

2.4.1 Summary or Progress Against Knowledge Management Objectives 29
2.4.2 Changes in the Knowledge Management Scope of Work and Work Plan 31
2.4.3 Achievement of Knowledge Management PMP Targets 31
2.4.4 Knowledge Management Focus for Next Time Period 31

2.5 Component 5: Project Administration 32

2.5.1 Summary or Progress Against Project Administration Work Plan Objectives 32
2.5.2 Changes in the Project Administration Scope of Work and Work Plan 35
2.5.3 Achievement of Project Administration PMP Targets 35
2.5.4 Project Administration Focus for Next Time Period 35

Tables

1-1 FTF FEEDBACK PROJECT KICK-OFF MEETING PARTICIPANTS 2

1-2 PBS RESPONSIBILITIES 4

1-3 FTF FEEDBACK PROJECT COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS 6

1-4 FTF FEEDBACK CORE PERSONNEL IN YEAR 1 8

Contents (continued)

Tables (continued) Page

2-1 WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 1, PERFORMANCE MONITORING 12

2-2 AVAILABILITY AND STATUS OF ANALYSIS OF DHS OR LSMS DATA FOR FTF FEEDBACK PBS COUNTRIES 15

2-3 COUNTRY VISITS AND PARTICIPATING TEAM MEMBERS 16

2-4 WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 2, IMPACT EVALUATION 19

2-5 STATUS OF PLANNED IMPACT EVALUATIONS 22

2-6 ACHIEVEMENT OF PMP TARGETS FOR IMPACT EVALUATION, YEAR 1 24

2-7 WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 3, DATA MANAGEMENT 25

2-8 WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 4, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT 29

2-9 WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 5, PROJECT ADMINISTRATION 32

2-10 ACHIEVEMENT OF PMP PROJECT ADMINISTRATION INDICATORS 35

ACRONYMS

BFS	Bureau for Food Security
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
EC	Executive Committee
FTF	Feed the Future
FTFMS	Feed the Future Monitoring System
IE	Impact Evaluation
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IP	Implementing Partner
IT	Information Technology
KM	Knowledge Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PBS	Population-based Survey
PM	Performance Monitoring
PMP	Performance Management Plan
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SOW	Statement of Work
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNC	University of North Carolina
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
ZOI	Zone of Influence

1 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT START-UP

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Westat is pleased to submit this Annual Report for the Feed the Future (FTF) FEEDBACK project for the period May 7 - September 30, 2012, for contract GS-23F-8144H/AID-OAA-M-12-00006. Though this contract had been underway for only five months, it was determined that the project year should coincide with the U.S. Government's (USG) fiscal year, which ended on September 30, 2012. This Annual Report provides details about the project launch and activities for each project component (Performance Monitoring, Impact Evaluation, Data Management, Knowledge Management, and Project Administration) for that time period. A separate financial report summarizes spending for Year 1 for Westat and each of our subcontractors.

1.2 PROJECT LAUNCH

The FTF FEEDBACK project, under the direction of the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), provides technical assistance and support for the monitoring and evaluation of the FTF Initiative. The FTF FEEDBACK project is responsible for providing impact evaluation (IE), performance monitoring (PM), and knowledge management (KM) services. To launch this work and to comply with Westat's standard operating procedures (SOPs) and other applicable procedures for project management, Westat participated in a project kick-off meeting with BFS and held an initial Technical Working Group meeting, described below.

1.2.1 PROJECT KICK-OFF MEETING

The contract with USAID was signed on May 7, 2012, and the project kick-off meeting was conducted on May 11, 2012, at the USAID offices in Washington, D.C. At this meeting, BFS provided an overview of its operations and discussed expectations of the FTF FEEDBACK contract. Roles, responsibilities, and background experiences of BFS and Westat staff participating in the meeting were discussed. Participants of this kick-off meeting are shown in Table 1-1.

TABLE 1-1. FTF FEEDBACK PROJECT KICK-OFF MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Organization	Project Role
Emily Hogue	USAID	Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)
Norman James	USAID	Contract Specialist
Joe Lentini	USAID	Contracting Officer
Tatiana Pulido	USAID	Alternate COR
Steve Durako	Westat	Corporate Officer
Barbara Huddleston	Westat	Chief of Party/Project Director
Rod Knight	Westat	Deputy Chief of Party
Tom Scialfa	Westat	Knowledge Management Specialist
Russ Walker	Westat	Contracting Officer

Discussions during the kick-off meeting included clarifications regarding the statement of work (SOW), and needed changes. BFS explained there is some flexibility in the SOW based on issuance of other USAID Requests for Proposals, and emerging needs of BFS and USAID Missions in the FTF focus countries.

Prioritization of FTF FEEDBACK activities by country in the IE and PM components were discussed during the meeting, as shown below:

- Country priorities for IE:
  - Rwanda
  - Mozambique
  - Ghana
  - Uganda
  - Bangladesh
  - Malawi
  - Nepal
  - Zambia
  - Haiti

- Country priorities for PM:
  - Uganda
  - Malawi
  - Rwanda
  - Mozambique
  - Senegal
  - Tajikistan
  - Zambia
  - Cambodia
  - Mali

1.2.2 INITIAL TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

Team-building continued at a second project management meeting that took place in Tucson, Arizona, from June 6-8, 2012, where BFS, Westat, and subcontractor staff from TANGO International, University of North Carolina (UNC), and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) participated in discussions about upcoming project tasks. Participants in this meeting were:

- Emily Hogue (USAID)
- Anwer Aqil (Westat)
- Jeanne Downen (TANGO)
- Steve Durako (Westat)
- Jessica Fehringer (UNC)
- Tim Frankenberger (TANGO)
- Daniel Gilligan (IFPRI)
- Barbara Huddleston (Westat)
- Rod Knight (Westat)
- Mark Langworthy (TANGO)
- Leslie Rider (Westat)
- Tom Scialfa (Westat)

The primary purposes of this meeting were to introduce team members, discuss the initial tasks of the FTF FEEDBACK project, establish the Technical Working Group (TWG), and describe project operations as currently envisioned. The meeting participants decided that initial country visits should take place before the end of the calendar year in order to do the following:

- Introduce FTF FEEDBACK;
- Ascertain country capacity-building needs with regard to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and the Feed the Future Management System (FTFMS);
- Plan the population-based survey (PBS) baseline (where necessary);
- Gather information on all programs, projects, and surveys relevant to FTF that are underway (regardless of funding sources);
- Conduct exploratory discussions regarding the planned FTF IEs and set up the visit for the IE feasibility assessment (if required).

At the initial TWG meeting, assignment of responsibility for the PBSs in all FTF focus countries was shared with the team. This is summarized in Table 1-2.

TABLE 1-2. PBS RESPONSIBILITIES

Country	Staff Responsible	Survey Status
ASIA		
Bangladesh	IFPRI (baseline under separate contract)	Completed
Cambodia	Michigan State University (baseline under separate contract)	Data collection complete
Nepal	IFPRI (baseline under separate contract)	Not yet begun
Tajikistan	FTF FEEDBACK	Not yet begun
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN		
Guatemala	UNC (baseline under separate contract)	Not yet begun
Haiti	ICF Macro	Data collection complete
Honduras	IFPRI (baseline under separate contract)	Planning stage
EAST AFRICA		
Ethiopia	IFPRI (baseline under separate contract)	Planning stage
Kenya	FTF FEEDBACK (baseline in the North) Tegemeo (baseline in the South under separate contract)	Not yet begun In progress
Rwanda	FTF FEEDBACK	Not yet begun
Uganda	FTF FEEDBACK	Planning stage
South Sudan	Pending	Pending
SOUTHERN AFRICA		
Malawi	FTF FEEDBACK	Planning stage
Mozambique	FTF FEEDBACK	Planning stage
Tanzania	The Mitchell Group - (baseline under separate contract)	In progress
Zambia	FTF FEEDBACK	Not yet begun
WEST AFRICA		
Ghana	USDA/METSS - (baseline under separate contract)	Data collection complete
Liberia	Baseline under separate contract	Not yet begun
Mali	On hold	On hold
Senegal	FTF FEEDBACK	Not yet begun

The FTF FEEDBACK TWG made plans to meet every 2 weeks at a standing time. During these meetings, the group discusses updates on country activities, progress against the work plan, progress and challenges, assignments, and updates from ad hoc meetings.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND PROJECT TEAM STRUCTURE

1.3.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The project team established an Executive Committee (EC). The EC provides strategic oversight and guidance to the TWG, ensures adequate resources are available to the contract,

and discusses matters relating to contract obligations. In attendance at the July 6, 2012, EC meeting were Steve Durako, Chair, from Westat; Sian Curtis from UNC; Tim Frankenberger from TANGO; and Marie Ruel from IFPRI. Chief of Party Barbara Huddleston and Project Administrator Ben Lawrence were also in attendance. Members of the EC discussed the roles and expectations of the EC, indicating that this committee should provide overall oversight and technical guidance. This includes administration of the contract requirements when clarifications are needed from the Contracting Officer or the COR. Additional topics during the July EC meeting included the status of subcontract negotiations, the preference for invoicing from subcontractors, and the content of the Year 1 Work Plan. The EC decided to meet in person every 6 months (to coincide with the meeting for the TWG) and via conference call periodically.

1.3.2 SUBGROUPS

Project management identified a number of subgroups and working groups, as listed in Table 1-3.

TABLE 1-3. FTF FEEDBACK PROJECT COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

Committee, Team or Group	Members
Technical Working Group	Barbara Huddleston (Westat), Chair Benjamin Lawrence (Westat), Secretary Sian Curtis (UNC) Alan de Brauw (IFPRI) Jeanne Downen (TANGO) Jessica Fehringer (UNC) Timothy Frankenberger (TANGO) Daniel Gilligan (IFPRI) Rod Knight (Westat) Peter Lance (UNC) Mark Langworthy (TANGO) Adaline Muyeed (Westat) Tom Scialfa (Westat)
Project Management Team	Barbara Huddleston (Westat) Benjamin Lawrence (Westat) Jill Huss (TANGO) Melissa Markiewicz (UNC) Lynette Aspillera (IFPRI)
Performance Monitoring Subgroup	Mark Langworthy (TANGO), Lead <u>Team Leaders</u> Malawi: Frank Riely Mozambique: Don Nelson Senegal: Mamadou Baro Rwanda: Jeanne Downen Tajikistan: Stephanie Martin Uganda: John Wyeth Zambia: Mark Langworthy <u>Additional Staff</u> Lloyd Banwart Vicki Brown Brad Sagara

TABLE 1-3. FTF FEEDBACK PROJECT COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS (CONTINUED)

Committee, Team or Group	Members
DHS/LSMS Subgroup	Rod Knight (Westat), Lead Katie Andrzejewski Martin Wulfe
Indicators Review Subgroup	Jeanne Downen (TANGO), Co-Lead Timothy Frankenberger (TANGO), Co-Lead Anwer Aqil (Westat) Thomas Scialfa (Westat) Mark Langworthy (TANGO) Thomas Bower (TANGO) Gustavo Angeles (UNC)
Impact Evaluation Subgroup	Daniel Gilligan (IFPRI), Co-Lead Alan de Brauw (IFPRI), Co-Lead Rodney Knight (Westat) Adaline Muyeed (Westat) Timothy Frankenberger (TANGO) Lisa Smith (TANGO) Gustavo Angeles (UNC) Peter Lance (UNC)
Standards and Data Management Subgroup	Mark Langworthy (TANGO), Co-Lead Rodney Knight (Westat), Co-Lead Amanda Fournier (Westat) Eduardo Maruyama (IFPRI) Brad Sagara (TANGO) Rick O'Hara (UNC)
Capacity Building Subgroup	Sian Curtis (UNC), Co-Lead Jessica Fehringer (UNC), Co-Lead Adaline Muyeed (Westat) Alan de Brauw (IFPRI) Jeanne Downen (TANGO)
Knowledge Management Subgroup	Barbara Huddleston (Westat), Co-Lead Thomas Scialfa (Westat), Co-Lead Sara Gustafson (IFPRI) Kelley Lynch (TANGO) Hugh Rigby (UNC)

1.4 CORE PERSONNEL

Core personnel responsible for FTF FEEDBACK accomplishments in Year 1 are shown in Table 1-4.

TABLE 1-4. FTF FEEDBACK CORE PERSONNEL IN YEAR 1

OUTPUT	IFPRI	TANGO	UNC	WESTAT
Performance Monitoring				
Design and organization of PBS surveys in 7 countries		Coordinator Mark Langworthy Team Leaders Malawi: Frank Riely Mozambique: Don Nelson Senegal: Mamadou Baro Tajikistan: Stephanie Martin Uganda: John Wyeth Zambia: Mark Langworthy Additional Staff Lloyd Banwart Vicki Brown Brad Sagara Laurie Starr		Rodney Knight Anwer Aqil Thomas Scialfa
Extraction of usable DHS and LSMS data				Coordinator Rodney Knight Team Members Catherine Andrzejewski Martin Wulfe
Preparation of manuals for PBS enumerators and supervisors				Coordinator Rodney Knight Team Members Leslie Rider Martin Wulfe
Management of IRB approval process		Mark Langworthy (for countries)		Anwer Aqil (for Westat)

TABLE 1-4. FTF FEEDBACK CORE PERSONNEL IN YEAR 1 (CONTINUED)

OUTPUT	IFPRI	TANGO	UNC	WESTAT
Impact Evaluation				
Review of potential FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluations	Alan de Brauw Dan Gilligan	Tim Frankenberger Lisa Smith	Gustavo Angeles Peter Lance	Rodney Knight Adaline Muyeed
Assignment of lead responsibility for each IE	Alan de Brauw Dan Gilligan	Tim Frankenberger	Sian Curtis Gustavo Angeles Peter Lance	Barbara Huddleston Rodney Knight
Data Management				
Migration of FTFMS to Westat server				Charisse McBride
Testing of hardware and software options for in-country data collection		Mark Langworthy Lloyd Banwart		Rodney Knight Amanda Fournier Jason Ives Rob Myers Monica Tolentino
Specification, and procurement of tablets and accessories and configuration trials				Rodney Knight Rick Mitchell Abie Reifer
Configuration of ODK aggregator and SQL database and programming of standard forms for PBS surveys				Amanda Fournier Jason Ives Rob Myers Monica Tolentino
Specification of programmable, visual and statistical data quality checks for PBS surveys				Bernadette Tretta
Knowledge Management				
Preparation of materials for sessions on indicators and on mixed methods for impact evaluation for five regional BFS workshops	Alan de Brauw	Jeanne Downen Tom Bower Laurie Starr Mark Langworthy Tim Frankenberger Lisa Smith	Sian Curtis Jessica Fehringer	Rodney Knight Thomas Scialfa Adaline Muyeed
Comments on Agrilinks web site enhancements and review of its suitability for use by FTF FEEDBACK			Hugh Rigby	Barbara Huddleston Thomas Scialfa

TABLE 1-4. FTF FEEDBACK CORE PERSONNEL IN YEAR 1 (CONTINUED)

OUTPUT	IFPRI	TANGO	UNC	WESTAT
Project Administration				
Work Planning	Alan de Brauw Dan Gilligan	Tim Frankenberger Mark Langworthy Jeanne Downen	Sian Curtis Jessica Fehringer Peter Lance	Barbara Huddleston Rodney Knight Thomas Scialfa
Contracts	Lynette Aspillera	Jill Huss		Benjamin Lawrence Danny Kleinman Torrise Woody
Accounts				Benjamin Lawrence Claire Greening
SharePoint site development				Doris Ryba Timothy Quinlan Benjamin Lawrence Jeffrey Elmer

2 PROGRESS BY PROJECT COMPONENT

In this section, for each of the five project components we will:

- Summarize progress against the Year 1 work plan and describe challenges, solutions, and impact on downstream targets;
- Describe any changes in the SOW and work plan; and
- Report achievement of Performance Management Plan (PMP) Year 1 targets.

We provide summaries of progress against the work plan in tables for each component. These tables use the following codes to summarize the status of activities and to identify implications for future reporting and management focus.

Status Code	Definition	Implication
E	Completed early	No further reporting required
C	Completed on time	No further reporting required
OT	On target (but not completed)	Reporting on this activity will continue in the next quarterly report
LS	Late start (not started on time; not on a critical path for subsequent activities)	• Reporting on this activity will continue in the next quarterly report; • If not already started, may require management attention to get it started
D	Delayed (started but not completed on time; not on a critical path for other activities)	• Reporting on this activity will continue in the next quarterly report; • Management attention needed to prompt completion
A !	Focused attention required (not completed on time; on the critical path for subsequent activities)	• Reporting on this activity will continue in the next quarterly report; • Focused management attention will be provided to get this on track

2.1 COMPONENT 1: PERFORMANCE MONITORING

2.1.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AGAINST PERFORMANCE MONITORING OBJECTIVES

In this section, we first illustrate progress in completing performance monitoring component activities in Table 2-1, Work Plan Achievements, then describe progress and challenges in completing the objectives.

TABLE 2-1. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 1, PERFORMANCE MONITORING

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
1.O1	**OBJECTIVE 1. Exploit existing data sources for monitoring population-based indicators**			
1.O1.A1	DHS/LSMS subgroup established	7/12	7/12	C
1.O1.A2	Evaluation of feasibility of using available DHS or LSMS data for ZOI population-based indicators completed	7/12	7/12	C
1.O1.A3	Available data from secondary sources obtained and analysis begun	9/12	8/12	E
1.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in MALAWI**			
1.O2.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	6/12	E
1.O2.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS
1.O3	**OBJECTIVE 3. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in MOZAMBIQUE**			
1.O3.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	7/12	C
1.O3.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS
1.O4	**OBJECTIVE 4. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in RWANDA**			
1.O4.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	--	LS
1.O4.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS

TABLE 2-1. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 1, PERFORMANCE MONITORING (CONTINUED)

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
1.O5	**OBJECTIVE 5. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in SENEGAL**			
1.O5.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	7/12	C
1.O5.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS
1.O6	**OBJECTIVE 6. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in TAJIKISTAN**			
1.O6.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	9/12	LS/C
1.O6.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS
1.O7	**OBJECTIVE 7. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in UGANDA**			
1.O7.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	6/12	E
1.O7.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS
1.O8	**OBJECTIVE 8. Plan baseline PBS for the Zone of Influence in ZAMBIA**			
1.O8.A1	Consultation with Mission regarding its requirements for PBS completed	7/12	9/12	LS/C
1.O8.A2	Agreement with Mission and BFS on the PBS work plan reached	9/12	--	LS
1.O9	**OBJECTIVE 9. Analyze FTF indicator use and provide recommendations for the Indicators System**			
1.O9.A1	Indicators Review subgroup established	8/12	8/12	C
1.O9.A2	Compilation of inventory of FTF interventions in each focus country begun	8/12	9/12	LS
1.O9.A3	Preparation of standard profiles of FTF interventions (based on available documentation) begun	9/12	9/12	OT
1.O9.A4	Mapping of FTF interventions and contextual information for Zone of Influence in each focus country begun	9/12	9/12	OT
1.O9.A5	Report on selection of indicators by Missions and implementing partners (IPs) prepared	9/12	8/12	C
1.O9.A6	Concept note on classification of indicators according to expected impacts that they imply prepared	8/12	--	LS
1.O9.A10	Materials for Indicators Session at BFS workshops in October 2012 submitted	8/12	9/12	D/C

A discussion of progress and challenges by objectives for Component 1 follows.

OBJECTIVE 1	Exploit existing data sources for monitoring population-based indicators

Summary of Progress. BFS principals determined that data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and the Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) could be used to calculate the population-based indicators for the seven countries where FTF FEEDBACK was mandated to collect and report on the population-based indicators. Progress in working with that data was as follows:

- In July 2012, FTF FEEDBACK management staff established a subgroup (Activity 1.O1.A1) to evaluate the available DHS and LSMS survey data.
- Assessment of the feasibility of using this data (determining if data files were available for what appeared to be sufficient sample - Activity 1.O1.A2) was completed in July 2012.
- The subgroup started obtaining and analyzing the data in August 2012 (Activity 1.O1.A3).

Availability of DHS and LSMS data for these countries is summarized in Table 2-2.

TABLE 2-2. AVAILABILITY AND STATUS OF ANALYSIS OF DHS OR LSMS DATA FOR FTF FEEDBACK PBS COUNTRIES

Country	Survey and Date	Usability of Data	Status of Analysis
Malawi	• DHS 2010 • IHS 2010-11 (LSMS-type survey)	• Data can be used • Data can be used	• Team has calculated 8 FTF indicators in the Malawi ZOI with the DHS 2010 data • Team is calculating 2 indicators in the Malawi ZOI with IHS 2010-11 data
Mozambique	• DHS 2011	• Data can be used	• The data will be analyzed when it comes available in 12/2012 or 01/2013
Rwanda	• DHS 2010	• Data can be used	• Team has calculated 8 FTF indicators in the Rwanda ZOI with the DHS 2010 data
Senegal	• DHS 2010-11	• Only one of the three areas in the ZOI has enough data; data must be collected	• No analysis of existing data will be done

TABLE 2-2. AVAILABILITY AND STATUS OF ANALYSIS OF DHS OR LSMS DATA FOR FTF FEEDBACK PBS COUNTRIES (CONTINUED)

Country	Survey and Date	Usability of Data	Status of Analysis
Tajikistan	• DHS 2012 • LSMS 2009	• Data will not become available in time for reporting in 01/2013; data must be collected • Sample size was too small; data must be collected	• No analysis of existing data will be done • No analysis of existing data will be done
Uganda	• DHS 2011 • UNHS 2009/10 (LSMS-type survey)	• Data can be used • Data can be used	• Team has calculated 8 FTF indicators in the Uganda ZOI with the DHS 2011 data • FTF FEEDBACK cannot get access to this data; the Uganda Bureau of Statistics has been asked to tabulate and report the expenditures and poverty indicators from this data
Zambia	• DHS 2007	• Too old for the baseline; data must be collected.	• No analysis of existing data will be done

These reviews have informed the decisions about which of the modules in *Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators* are to be included in the data collection effort in each country.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream (Future) Targets. Activities for this objective have proceeded largely on schedule, though there were some delays. There was a delay in setting up a subcontract for the Uganda Bureau of Statistics to analyze the UNHS for expenditure and poverty indicators, though this should have no downstream impact because the results of the analysis are expected by mid-December 2012. One item outside the control of FTF FEEDBACK may have a bearing on the downstream target of entering indicator values into the FTFMS in January 2013: delay in receipt of the Mozambique DHS 2011 data (scheduled to be available in December 2012 or January 2013).

OBJECTIVES 2 - 8	Plan and conduct baseline, midterm, and final surveys for the Zone of Influence in Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, Tajikistan, Uganda and Zambia

Summary of Progress. During the period June-September 2012, FTF FEEDBACK technical teams visited six of the seven countries (all but Rwanda) where baseline surveys for population-based indicators at the level of the zone of influence (ZOI) are to be conducted (Activity 1 for each of these objectives). During these visits, the teams made assessments of the geographic areas, consulted with USAID Mission staff on requirements for the surveys, and developed work plans for implementing the surveys in accordance with BFS guidance and local requirements. Countries visited and FTF FEEDBACK technical team members who made the initial visits or otherwise contributed to the work involved in-country (Activities 1.O2.A1, 1.O3.A1, 1.O4.A1, 1.O5.A1, 1.O6.A1, 1.O7.A1, and 1.O8.A1) are listed in Table 2-3.

TABLE 2-3. COUNTRY VISITS AND PARTICIPATING TEAM MEMBERS

Country Visited	FTF FEEDBACK Team Members	Visit Dates
Malawi	Rod Knight, Brad Sagara	Starting June 18, 2012
Mozambique	Don Nelson, Vicki Brown	Starting July 1, 2012
Rwanda	Jeanne Downen, Anwer Aqil	Planned October 2012
Senegal	Mamadou Baro, Tom Scialfa	Starting July 26, 2012
Tajikistan	Stephanie Martin, Anwer Aqil	Starting September 10, 2012
Uganda	Rod Knight, Brad Sagara	Starting June 11, 2012
Zambia	Mark Langworthy	Starting September 1, 2012

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. There were two main challenges associated with this set of objectives:

- Delay in visiting Rwanda – USAID/Rwanda informed BFS that it could not receive an early visit from FTF FEEDBACK due to the workload in the Mission. Given scheduling constraints with the Mission, the initial FTF FEEDBACK visit was finally planned for October. While planning and preparations for the Rwanda PBS are on a very condensed schedule, with timely approvals it will be possible to complete data collection for entry of indicator values into the FTFMS in January 2013.

- Delay in reaching agreement on work plans for conducting the surveys – Following the country visits, local organizations were asked to prepare proposals to implement the baseline surveys. Information from these proposals needed to be included in the survey work plans. Neither the subcontractor proposals nor the work plans were submitted or approved in Year 1, though work on these was underway at the end of the reporting period (Activities 1.O2.A2, 1.O3.A2, 1.O4.A2, 1.O5.A2, 1.O6.A2, 1.O7.A2, and 1.O8.A2). Delays in approving work plans will

delay start of data collection, which only is possible in a limited time window (given weather issues and holidays).

OBJECTIVE 9	Analyze FTF indicator use and provide recommendations for keeping the Indicators System applicable and relevant

Summary of Progress

- FTF FEEDBACK management staff established the Indicators Review subgroup (Activity 1.O9.A1) in August 2012;
- The team initiated compilation of an inventory of FTF interventions in each focus country (Activity 1.O9.02);
- A template for a profile of FTF interventions was developed in September 2012 (Activity 1.O9.A3);
- Collection of information on FTF interventions' ZOIs was begun (Activity 1.O9.A4);
- A TANGO specialist worked with BFS to review data entry problems associated with indicators. He prepared a worksheet with information about indicators in the FTFMS. This was done in August 2012 (Activity 1.O9.A5); and
- TANGO organized IPs to present sessions on best practices and challenges in measuring indicators at the regional workshops, starting the fourth week of September 2012 (Activity 1.O9.A10).

Though not in the work plan, the team also provided guidance on the experience of FTF partners with use of agricultural indicators for M&E. Agreement was reached with BFS on a strategy to compile experiences from FTF IPs that were to be presented at the FTF regional workshops. Compilation of findings from these workshops is expected to start in December 2012.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream (Future) Targets. There were no particular challenges in activities under Objective 9, though several activities had a late start due to pre-occupation with preparations for the PBSs. Work on a concept note classifying indicators according to expected impacts was not started (Activity 1.O9.A6).

2.1.2 CHANGES IN THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING SCOPE OF WORK AND WORK PLAN

There were no changes in the performance monitoring scope of work or work plan during the Year 1 period (May 7, 2012 to September 30, 2012).

2.1.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING PMP TARGETS

There were no PMP indicators for the performance monitoring component for Year 1 that required reporting.

2.1.4 PERFORMANCE MONITORING FOCUS FOR NEXT TIME PERIOD

The focus of performance monitoring activities for the next quarter will be to launch and complete field data collection for the PBSs on time. Data review and cleaning will proceed alongside data collection so calculation of indicator values can be completed in time to enter the values into the FTFMS in early 2013.

Additionally, the DHS/LSMS subgroup will need to finalize calculation of values for all population-level indicators from secondary data, and the Indicators Review subgroup will need to continue its analysis of FTF indicator use.

2.2 COMPONENT 2: IMPACT EVALUATION

2.2.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AGAINST IMPACT EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In this section, we first illustrate progress in completing impact evaluation activities in Table 2-4, Work Plan Achievements, then describe progress and challenges in completing the objectives.

TABLE 2-4. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 2, IMPACT EVALUATION

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
2.O1	**OBJECTIVE 1. Obtain BFS approval for standard impact evaluation design protocol and at least 20 rigorous impact evaluations**			
2.O1.A1	Impact Evaluation subgroup will have been established and team leaders for each approved impact evaluation will have been identified	09/12	6/12	E
2.O1.A2	An assessment of FTF interventions potentially suitable for an FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluation will have been submitted and accepted	07/12	8/12	D/C
2.O1.A3	20 or more impact evaluations that could be conducted by FTF FEEDBACK will have been identified	08/12	8/12	C
2.O1.A4	20 impact evaluations to be conducted by FTF FEEDBACK will have been approved by senior management of BFS	08/12	8/12	C
2.O2.A6	A template for FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluation design protocols will have been developed and agreed	09/12	--	D
2.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Develop an evaluation design and implementation plan for each approved impact evaluation**			
2.02.A2.1	**Bangladesh Integrated Value Chains** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.2	**Nepal Interventions in High Value Vegetable Value Chains and Literacy** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.3	**Tajikistan Water Users Associations** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.4	**Bangladesh/India Bt Eggplant** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.5	**Ethiopia Pastoralist Resiliency Improvement and Market Expansion (PRIME)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D

TABLE 2-4. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 2, IMPACT EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
2.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Develop an evaluation design and implementation plan for each approved impact evaluation**			
2.02.A2.6	**Kenya REGAL** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	9/12	C
2.02.A2.7	**Kenya Feed the Future Innovation Engine (KFIE)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.8	**Rwanda Rural Feeder Roads** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.9	**Rwanda Integrated Livelihoods Program** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.10	**Uganda E-verification System** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	9/12	OT
2.02.A2.11	**Africa Alliance for Improved Food Safety (AAIFS)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.12	**Malawi Integrating Nutrition into Value Chains (INVC)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.13	**Mozambique Agriculture and Nutrition Linkages** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	9/12	OT
2.02.A2.14	**Mozambique Mobile Money** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	9/12	OT
2.02.A2.15	**Tanzania Land Titling Impact Assessment** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.16	**Zambia Upgrading Groundnut Value Chains and Changing Gender Role** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.17	**Ghana Resilience in Northern Ghana (RING)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	9/12	OT
2.02.A2.18	**Liberia Urea Deep Placement** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.19	**Senegal Agriculture, Health and Nutrition Linkages (Peace Corps)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	9/12	OT

TABLE 2-4. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 2, IMPACT EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
2.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Develop an evaluation design and implementation plan for each approved impact evaluation**			
2.02.A2.20	**Niger Food for Peace** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.21	**Haiti Gender Mainstreaming in Agricultural Productivity (FTF North)** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D
2.02.A2.22	**Global Research and Development: Aquafish CRSP** - Initial planning visits will have been carried out or planned for the approved impact evaluation	09/12	--	D

A discussion of progress and challenges by objectives for Component 2 follows.

OBJECTIVE 1	Obtain BFS approval for standard impact evaluation design protocol and at least 20 rigorous impact evaluations

Summary of Progress. FTF FEEDBACK completed the following activities related to finalizing an IE design protocol and selecting impact evaluations in Year 1:

- FTF FEEDBACK management staff established an Impact Evaluation subgroup in June 2012 (Activity 2.O1.A1).
- In August 2012, the subgroup submitted its assessment of FTF interventions potentially suitable for an FTF FEEDBACK IE with recommendations (Activity 2.O1.A2).
- The COR and IE subgroup developed recommendations from the assessment and conversations with USAID Mission staff (Activity 2.O1.A3) and provided those recommendations to FTF senior management, which approved a list of 22 IEs for implementation (Activity A.O1.A4) in August 2012.

Members of the IE subgroup also contributed to the preparation of training materials on use of mixed methods and quasi-experimental design options for IEs to be used at the regional BFS workshops in October.

An FTF FEEDBACK IE design template (Activity 2.O2.A6) was started but not completed in Year 1.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. Given the timing of the selected IEs, completion of the IE design template was not urgent in Year 1, but this activity should be a priority in early Year 2.

OBJECTIVE 2	Develop an evaluation design and implementation plan for each approved impact evaluation

Summary of Progress. Following receipt of the BFS management decision on the IEs to be conducted, the IE subgroup agreed on a lead partner to conduct each approved evaluation. Members established contact between FTF FEEDBACK and the USAID Mission in each country where an evaluation was to be conducted, with BFS staff serving as managers for each IE. A summary of the status of planned IEs is provided in Table 2-5.

TABLE 2-5. STATUS OF PLANNED IMPACT EVALUATIONS

Project	FTF FEEDBACK Partner	Status of Project to Be Evaluated	Projected Field Visit
Bangladesh Integrated Value Chains	Westat	Project is in procurement. Mission will inform on start date.	Year 2, Qtr 2
Nepal Interventions in High Value Vegetable Value Chains and Literacy	Westat	Project is in procurement. Mission will inform on start date.	Year 2, Qtr 2
Tajikistan Water Users Associations	Westat	Project has started	Year 2, Qtr 1 or 2
Bangladesh/India Bt Eggplant	Westat	Commercialization of Bt eggplant in India is under moratorium; presentation to Bangladeshi authorities is expected soon	TBD; conversations with Mission to be conducted in Nov 2012
Ethiopia Pastoralist Resiliency Improvement and Market Expansion (PRIME)	TANGO	Awarded and in initial startup.	
Kenya REGAL	TANGO	Project is being re-designed. Re-design should take through end of 2012	
Kenya Feed the Future Innovation Engine (KFIE)	IFPRI	Call for proposals ending in Oct 2012; proposals will need to be selected before IE can be planned	Year 2, Qtr 2
Rwanda Rural Feeder Roads	IFPRI	Evaluation to be conducted jointly with World Bank; concept paper is being developed	World Bank is doing initial planning visit; IFPRI will visit in Year 2, Qtr 2

TABLE 2-5. STATUS OF PLANNED IMPACT EVALUATIONS (CONTINUED)

Project	FTF FEEDBACK Partner	Status of Project to Be Evaluated	Projected Field Visit
Rwanda Integrated Livelihoods Program	TANGO	In second year of implementation. Proposing to drop this evaluation.	
Uganda E-verification System	IFPRI	Project is in procurement with decision expected in Nov 2012	Oct 2012
Africa Alliance for Improved Food Safety (AAIFS)	Westat/UNC	Follow-on mechanism to be awarded in October 2012	
Malawi Integrating Nutrition into Value Chains (INVC)	UNC	Contract has been awarded; IE is in planning stages	Year 2, Qtr 1
Mozambique Agriculture and Nutrition Linkages	IFPRI	Project is being designed, with RFP due out in Nov 2012	Year 2, Qtr 1
Mozambique Mobile Money	IFPRI	Pilot will be conducted in Spring 2013 with full roll out in 2014	Year 2, Qtr 1
Tanzania Land Titling Impact Assessment	Westat	Project underway	Year 2, Qtr 1 or 2
Zambia Upgrading Groundnut Value Chains and Changing Gender Role	UNC	Contract has been awarded; IE is in planning stages	Year 2, Qtr 1
Ghana Resilience in Northern Ghana (RING)	IFPRI	Project underway	Nov 2012
Liberia Urea Deep Placement	Westat	Urea deep placement work projected to start in Jan 2013	Year 2, Qtr 2
Senegal Agriculture, Health and Nutrition Linkages (Peace Corps)	IFPRI	Project was not extended so FTF FEEDBACK is submitting concept for another evaluation to Mission	TBD
Niger Food for Peace	TANGO/UNC	Contracts awarded with new activities starting in early 2013	Year 2, Qtr 2
Haiti Gender Mainstreaming in Agricultural Productivity (FTF North)	UNC	Project is in procurement	TBD
Global Research and Development: Aquafish CRSP	IFPRI (tentative)	Project ended Sep 2012 but follow-on likely. When follow-on is planned, a component linked to dissemination will be selected for impact evaluation	TBD

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. Planning visits for the proposed IEs (Activities 2.O2.A2.1 – 2.O2.A2.22) were not completed or planned for all IEs by the end of Year 1. The fact that a number of projects to be evaluated are still in procurement means detailed planning for their impact evaluations is somewhat premature. Projects that get started by the end of 2013 still will allow for a baseline/follow-up design (though midterm surveys for these projects may be unlikely). The IE subgroup will regularly review the status of projects slated for IEs with BFS.

2.2.2 CHANGES IN THE IMPACT EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK AND WORK PLAN

There were no changes in the impact evaluation scope of work or work plan during the Year 1 period (May 7, 2012 to September 30, 2012).

2.2.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF IMPACT EVALUATION PMP TARGETS

Achievement of PMP targets for the impact evaluation component for Year 1 is depicted in Table 2-6 below.

TABLE 2-6. ACHIEVEMENT OF PMP TARGETS FOR IMPACT EVALUATION, YEAR 1

ID No	Output Indicator	Target (due date met)	Achievement
2.D.1	Review of potential FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluations submitted	7/12	Submitted 8/12
2.D.2	Standard template for FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluation designs submitted	9/12	Late

While these deliverables were submitted late, their delay does not have an impact on the development and conduct of the planned impact evaluations.

2.2.4 IMPACT EVALUATION FOCUS FOR NEXT TIME PERIOD

The IE subgroup plans to submit a standard template for FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluation designs early in the next reporting period. Planning activities for the impact evaluations and development of impact evaluation protocols (based on the protocol template) will ramp up in the next time period.

2.3 COMPONENT 3: DATA MANAGEMENT

2.3.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AGAINST DATA MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

In this section, we first illustrate progress in completing data management activities in Table 2-7, Work Plan Achievements, then describe progress and challenges in completing the objectives.

TABLE 2-7. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 3, DATA MANAGEMENT

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
3.O1	**OBJECTIVE 1. Establish standards and protocols for all survey activities to be carried out by FTF FEEDBACK**			
3.O1.A1	Standards and Data Management subgroup will have been established	8/12	8/12	C
3.O1.A2	Development of a Data Management Plan for FTF FEEDBACK will be well advanced	9/12	--	D
3.O1.A3	Work on development of survey standards protocol will have begun	9/12	9/12	OT
3.O1.A4	Software programming for testing tablets will have been completed and field testing will have begun	9/12	9/12	C
3.O1.A5	Process of documenting hardware and software requirements for data entry and in-country verification for all FTF FEEDBACK surveys will have begun	9/12	9/12	OT
3.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Create databases for cleaning, storing, and analyzing FTF FEEDBACK survey data**			
3.O2.A1	Process of configuring the database for storing PBS data will be well advanced	9/12	--	D
3.O2.A3	Data flow procedures for performance monitoring surveys will have been defined	9/12	--	D
3.O3	**OBJECTIVE 3. Migrate FTFMS to Westat server**			
3.O3.A1	FTFMS migration plan will have been developed	7/12	6/12	E
3.O3.A2	Security review of Westat hosting facilities for FTFMS will have begun	9/12	8/12	E
3.O3.A3	Implementation of FTFMS migration plan will have begun	9/12	9/12	OT

A discussion of progress and challenges by objectives for Component 3 follows.

OBJECTIVE 1	Establish standards and protocols for all survey activities to be carried out by FTF FEEDBACK

Summary of Progress. Progress in the planned activities for Objective 1 was as follows:

- A Standards and Data Management subgroup (Activity 3.O1.A1) was established in August 2012. That subgroup has not started meeting as a subgroup, though members (and many other staff) were actively involved in data management activities in Year 1, and many ad hoc subgroups formed to complete data management activities in the work plan.

- Westat appointed a Data Manager to the project team in July 2012 and work began immediately thereafter on the development of a Data Management Plan (DMP) for the FTF FEEDBACK project (Activity 3.O1.A2).

- Work on an enumerator's manual and a supervisor's manual for the PBSs to be conducted under the performance monitoring component was started in late September 2012. Elements of these will form the basis of a survey standards protocol (Activity 3.O1.A3) that will be used on FTF FEEDBACK surveys and as a basis for assessing surveys (as relevant) for the Global Data Quality reports.

- From June-August, FTF FEEDBACK management staff met with Westat corporate, information technology (IT), data management, and systems staff to determine the feasibility of using tablets for data collection. Systems and data management staff worked with TANGO principals to test various software packages and tablets (Activity 3.O1.A4) in Uganda. Open Data Kit (ODK) was selected as the software, to be used on Nexus tablets. (Factors that led to the selection of ODK included learning curve of participants during the Uganda pilot and specific features of the software. Factors that led to the selection of the Nexus tablets were their field performance and lower cost.)

- Based on planned sample sizes and the projected sizes of data collection teams in each country, decisions were made about the number of tablets that would be required to complete largely simultaneous data collection in seven countries (part of Activity 3.O1.A5). By mid-September, Westat corporate, systems, IT and data management staff were participating in frequent internal meetings to plan for Westat to procure and lease a sufficient number of electronic tablets to FTF FEEDBACK to permit their use for all seven PBSs. (Ultimately 900 tablets were procured, configured, and programmed.)

- A software programming team was tasked with completing and customizing for each country an electronic version of the standard questionnaires for PBSs contained in Volume 8 of the BFS guidance for FTF M&E (part of Activity 3.O1.A5). As part of this process, three levels of data quality checks were developed. These include: (1) checks to be performed by the software; (2) visual checks to be made by field supervisors; and (3) statistical checks to be carried out after transfer of the data to the SQL database at Westat. (Items 1 and 2 comprise in-country verification for the FTF FEEDBACK surveys – part of Activity 3.O1.A5.)

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. The end of Year 1 was the start of an extremely busy time for FTF FEEDBACK data management and IT staff, who had to prepare quickly for simultaneous customization of programmed surveys for eight countries in four languages, while adhering to Westat SOPs for planning and testing. Plans for temporary assignment of substantial resources were being made to support the programming and testing of the software and the configuration and shipment of approximately 900 tablets.

OBJECTIVE 2	Create databases for cleaning, storing, and analyzing FTF FEEDBACK survey data

Summary of Progress. Progress in activities for this objective was as follows:

- Planning for a SQL database for managing data from PBSs (Activity 3.O2.A1) was started in Year 1, but the configuration was not underway.
- Data flow procedures for the PBSs (Activity 3.O2.A3) were discussed starting in September 2012 but were not completed in Year 1.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. Data flow procedures will need to reflect the decision made late in Year 1 to manage data on Nexus tablets using the ODK software. These procedures will need to be finalized early in Year 2 so they can be reflected in the enumerator's and supervisor's manuals and be incorporated into the training. Configuration of the SQL database for storing and supporting review of PBS data will need to reflect the final, approved surveys in all countries. Configuration will need to be completed early in Year 2 so the team is able to review data received from the field on a daily basis, which is an important quality assurance procedure.

OBJECTIVE 3	Migrate FTFMS to Westat server

Summary of Progress. Preparation for migrating the FTFMS to a Westat server started very early in the project. Working relations were quickly established among the developer of FTFMS, BFS and the FTF FEEDBACK IT team. Progress was as follows:

- A detailed FTFMS migration plan was drafted (Activity 3.O3.A1) and submitted for review by BFS and the current host (Synergy) in June 2012.
- A security review (Activity 3.O3.A2) by David Zimmerman (Westat hosting facilities) and John Spears (BFS) was started in August 2012. This task was put on

hold as the hardware was identified. The activity is scheduled to be re-activated in early December 2012.

- In preparation for the FTFMS migration (Activity 3.O3.A3), Westat received backups of database and web site source code, verified that all source code was received, identified reporting source code that was missing, restored database and web site components to the internal server, and performed a “smoke test” of web site functioning on an internal server in September 2012.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. Preparation for the FTFMS migration is proceeding largely as planned and major challenges are not foreseen.

2.3.2 CHANGES IN THE DATA MANAGEMENT SCOPE OF WORK AND WORK PLAN

There were no changes in the data management scope of work or work plan during the Year 1 period (May 7, 2012 to September 30, 2012).

2.3.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF DATA MANAGEMENT PMP TARGETS

There were no PMP indicators for the data management component for Year 1 that required reporting.

2.3.4 DATA MANAGEMENT FOCUS FOR NEXT TIME PERIOD

The next time period will be extremely busy for the data management component with programming of the country-specific surveys, shipment of tablets to the field, receipt and review of data from the PBSs, and migration of the FTFMS to Westat servers.

2.4 COMPONENT 4: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

2.4.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AGAINST KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

In this section, we first illustrate progress in completing knowledge management activities in Table 2-8, Work Plan Achievements, then describe progress and challenges in completing the objectives.

TABLE 2-8. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 4, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
4.O1	**OBJECTIVE 1. Develop and manage evidence-based knowledge to improve program design and encourage replication and expansion of successful interventions**			
4.O1.A1	Knowledge Management subgroup will have been established	9/12	9/12	C
4.O1.A2	Approach to information needs assessment will have been decided	9/12	--	D
4.O1.A3	Elements to be included in Knowledge Management Strategy will have been decided	9/12	9/12	OT
4.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Develop capacity-building tools and training materials and carry out specific training and capacity-building activities**			
4.O2.A1	FTF FEEDBACK contributions to BFS regional workshops in October 2012 will have been defined and training materials prepared	9/12	--	OT
4.O3	**OBJECTIVE 3. Develop and deploy a web-based system for sharing knowledge**			
4.O3.A1	Agrilinks update demo will have been reviewed and recommendations provided for its utilization by FTF FEEDBACK	9/12	9/12	C
4.O4	**OBJECTIVE 4. Include explicit coverage of gender in FTF monitoring and reporting**			
4.O4.A1	Participation in relevant global events will have been assured	9/12		

A discussion of progress and challenges by objectives for Component 4 follows.

OBJECTIVE 1	Develop and manage evidence-based knowledge to improve program design and encourage replication and expansion of successful interventions

Summary of Progress. FTF FEEDBACK management staff established a Knowledge Management (KM) subgroup (Activity 4.O1.A1) in September 2012. At its first meeting, the KM subgroup supported the suggestion of recruiting a consultant with an appropriate professional profile to conduct an information needs assessment for FTF FEEDBACK (Activity 4.O1.A2). The subgroup also reviewed a draft KM Strategy document at its initial meeting, and identified missing elements (Activity 4.O1.A3). Further work on the strategy has been postponed until results of the needs assessment are available.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream (or Future) Targets. The KM subgroup needs to finalize recruitment of a consultant for the information needs assessment so that assessment can be completed and inform refinement of the KM Strategy.

OBJECTIVE 2	Develop capacity-building tools and training materials and carry out specific training and capacity-building activities

Summary of Progress. Project team members from all partner organizations contributed to the preparation of background and training materials for the regional FTF workshops to be held in October (Activity 4.O2.A1). Two FTF FEEDBACK team members were assigned to provide technical support to each of the workshops.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. There were no challenges in completing activities for Objective 2.

OBJECTIVE 3	Develop and deploy a web-based system for sharing knowledge

Summary of Progress. FTF FEEDBACK team members reviewed the Agrilinks platform demo in advance of the KM subgroup meeting and provided comments and suggestions on how to enhance its utility for FTF FEEDBACK (Activity 4.O3.A1).

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. There were no challenges in reviewing the Agrilinks platform.

OBJECTIVE 4	Include explicit coverage of gender in FTF monitoring and reporting

Summary of Progress. An FTF FEEDBACK team member attended a summer school session in Indonesia on *Capability and Multidimensional Poverty* led by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, University of Oxford (Activity 4.O4.A1). The purpose of this summer school session was to provide a thorough conceptual and technical introduction to quantitative techniques of measuring multidimensional poverty. It is expected that the FTF FEEDBACK participant will be able to use techniques learned from the course to deepen the analysis of gender issues in project reports.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. Additional events or other activities in which FTF FEEDBACK can participate to better prepare the project to address gender in FTF monitoring and reporting need to be identified.

2.4.2 CHANGES IN THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT SCOPE OF WORK AND WORK PLAN

There were no changes in the knowledge management scope of work or work plan during the Year 1 period (May 7, 2012 to September 30, 2012).

2.4.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PMP TARGETS

There were no PMP indicators for the knowledge management component for Year 1 that required reporting.

2.4.4 KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT FOCUS FOR NEXT TIME PERIOD

The KM component will focus on the following activities in the next time period:

- Recruit the consultant and complete the user needs assessment;
- Complete the KM Strategy;
- Develop FTF FEEDBACK project pages for Agrilinks and populate it; and
- Develop a work plan to implement the KM Strategy.

2.5 COMPONENT 5: PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

2.5.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AGAINST PROJECT ADMINISTRATION WORK PLAN OBJECTIVES

In this section, we first illustrate progress in completing project administration activities in Table 2-9, Work Plan Achievements, then describe progress and challenges in meeting the objectives.

TABLE 2-9. WORK PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR COMPONENT 5, PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

ID No.	Planned Achievements Year 1	Targeted Completion	Actual Completion	Activity Status
5.O1	**OBJECTIVE 1. Launch project activities in a timely manner**			
5.O1.A1	Launch meetings will have been held	05/12	05/12	C
5.O1.A2	Core team planning meetings will have been held	06/12	06/12	C
5.O1.A3	Subcontracts with partners will have been executed	09/12	partial	A!
5.O1.A4	Work plan for Year 1 will have been submitted and approved	09/12	06/12; 09/12	C
5.O1.A5	Management structure will have been established	08/12	08/12	C
5.O1.A6	Performance Management Plan will have been submitted and approved	09/12	--	D
5.O1.A7	FTF FEEDBACK brochure will have been developed and released	09/12	--	D
5.O1.A8	SharePoint site will be operational	09/12	partial	D
5.O2	**OBJECTIVE 2. Monitor and report on project execution**			
5.O2.A4	Recurring TWG telcon schedule will have been established	09/12	09/12	C
5.O2.A5	Recurring Chief of Party (COP)/COR telcon schedule will have been established	09/12	--	D
5.O2.A7	Quarterly Executive Committee telcon schedule will have been established	06/12 09/12	06/12 07/12	C
5.O3	**OBJECTIVE 3. Coordinate and support project-wide capacity-building activities**			
5.O3.A1	Capacity Building subgroup will have been established	08/12	08/12	C

A discussion of progress and challenges by objectives for Component 5 follows.

OBJECTIVE 1	Launch project activities in a timely manner

Summary of Progress. Progress against the work plan for Project Administration Objective 1 was as follows:

- A project kick-off meeting with BFS (Activity 5.O1.A1) was held on May 11, 2012, within four days of execution of the contract.
- A core team planning meeting (Activity 5.O1.A2) with participation from all partners (including all Technical Working Group members and subgroup leads) and BFS was held June 6 – 8, 2012, in Tucson, Arizona.
- Management staff worked internally to draft three subcontracts (Activity 5.O1.A3), one of which was executed prior to the end of Year 1.
- Draft 1 of the Work Plan for Year 1 was submitted on June 13, 2012, and approved on September 13, 2012 (Activity 5.O1.A4).
- A management structure for the project (Activity 5.O1.A5) was developed and documented in the Year 1 Work plan.
- A first draft of the Performance Management Plan (Activity 5.O1.A6) was being developed but was not submitted by the deadline in Year 1.
- The project team submitted a draft FTF FEEDBACK brochure (Activity 5.O1.07) on October 1, 2012. Subsequently, it was approved and printed for distribution to USAID Mission staff at the regional BFS workshops.
- Finally, a SharePoint site for internal use (Activity 5.O1.A8) was developed and has been used for some management and tracking activities since July 2012. The expanded SharePoint site with additional functionality of relevance to BFS will not be available until the end of December 2012.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream (Future) Targets. The project team faced challenges associated with the following project administration activities associated with Objective 1:

- Two of the three subcontracts (for IFPRI and UNC) were delayed while issues regarding intellectual property were addressed. Delay in execution of these subcontracts has led to delay in invoicing by these two subcontractors, which has artificially reduced the “burn rate” (expenditures against the budget) on the contract. These subcontractors’ work on the contract has not been impeded.
- The need to provide greater management support to the contract was identified and, by the end of Year 1, discussions about bolstering the project management

team were underway. While progress against the most urgent activities (i.e., the PBSs under the performance monitoring component) continued, submission of several deliverables and effective launch of some of the subgroups slipped.

- The first draft of the PMP was not submitted by the deadline. Additional resources were assigned so that the PMP could be finalized early in the subsequent period.

- Internal feedback on the SharePoint site was that additional development was required before expanding access to it, so the site was not operational for all project team members and BFS by the projected date. While unavailability of the SharePoint site does not delay progress on other project activities, it does increase communications and document-sharing burden on team members and BFS.

OBJECTIVE 2	Monitor and report on project execution

Summary of Progress. Progress against the work plan for Project Administration Objective 2 was as follows:

- Recurring TWG teleconferences started early in the project and have taken place on a regular biweekly schedule (Activity 5.O2.A4) since September 14, 2012.

- COP/COR teleconferences schedule started early in the project and have taken place on a regular weekly schedule (Activity 5.O2.A5) since October 8, 2012.

- The Executive Committee (Activity 5.O2.A7) met by teleconference in June 2012 and July 2012. At least during Year 1, it was preferred to schedule Executive Committee meetings on an ad hoc, as-needed basis rather than on a regular basis.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. There were no major challenges associated with activities under Objective 2 of the project administration component.

OBJECTIVE 3	Coordinate and support project-wide capacity-building activities

Summary of Progress. The only Year 1 activity under the capacity-building objective was to establish a Capacity-Building subgroup. This group was identified in the Work Plan for Year 1.

Challenges, Solutions, and Impact on Downstream Targets. The Capacity-Building subgroup has yet to be formally activated, though there have been no delays in fulfilling capacity-building responsibilities (support for the regional BFS workshops in October) on the contract in Year 1.

2.5.2 CHANGES IN THE PROJECT ADMINISTRATION SCOPE OF WORK AND WORK PLAN

There were no changes in the project administration scope of work or work plan during Year 1.

2.5.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT ADMINISTRATION PMP TARGETS

Achievement of PMP targets for the project administration component for Year 1 is depicted in Table 2-10 below.

TABLE 2-10. ACHIEVEMENT OF PMP PROJECT ADMINISTRATION INDICATORS

ID No	Output Indicator	Target	Achievement	Performance
5.D.1	Annual work plans submitted and approved	Due date: 9/30/2012	Submitted 6/13/2012; Approved 9/13/2012	Submitted on time; Approved on time
5.D.3	PMP submitted and approved	Due date: 9/30/2012	Submitted 10/3/2012; Still not approved	Submitted late; Approved late
5.D.4	Progress reports and PMP reviews (quarterly and annual) submitted	Due date: 10/15/2012	Submitted 10/22/2012	Submitted late
5.D.5	Financial reports (quarterly and annual) submitted	Due date: 10/15/2012	Submitted 10/22/2012	Submitted late

Comment on achievement of PMP Project Administration indicators: The project team submitted the majority of the deliverables listed in the PMP for Year 1 late. The need for improved timeliness has been recognized by project leadership, contributing to decisions to reorganize the management structure and to add management resources to the project. In addition, while it has taken more time than anticipated to reach agreement with BFS on the structure and content of these important project documents, the dialogue has been very productive and the project now has solid templates for these documents that will facilitate their timely submission in the future.

2.5.4 PROJECT ADMINISTRATION FOCUS FOR NEXT TIME PERIOD

In addition to the activities outlined in the Year 2 work plan for the next quarter, the project team will focus on addressing the following areas that require additional attention:

- Resolve remaining issues and finalize pending subcontracts with UNC and IFPRI;
- Clarify roles and responsibilities for the revised project management structure;
- Improve functionality of the SharePoint site and expand access to it; and
- Increase timeliness of submission of deliverables.