

INFORMATION BULLETIN (FFPIB)

Date: December 20, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL FOOD FOR PEACE OFFICERS AND TITLE II DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AWARDEES

TO: USAID/W and Overseas Distribution Lists; FFP Awardees

FROM: DCHA/FFP, Dina Esposito, Director

SUBJECT: Revision to Food for Peace Standard Indicators Collected in Baseline Surveys and Final Evaluations (Reissuance)

FFPIB 11-03 (Reissued)

Background and Purpose: The purpose of this document is to inform Food for Peace (FFP) Officers and awardees of Title II multi-year development food aid programs of recent changes to FFP Standard Indicators for baseline surveys and final evaluations. FFP is updating the standard indicators to better document and compare Title II programs' impact, improve FFP's ability to tell its story to stakeholders, and better coordinate with the Feed the Future (FTF) Initiative. These changes concern only impact and some outcome indicators that should be collected using a population-based survey in baseline and final evaluations. This FFPIB supersedes guidance in FFPIB 07-01 and FFPIB 07-02 regarding impact indicators. This Information Bulletin ensures that Title II development programs awarded in fiscal year (FY) 2011 will use the revised list of FFP standard indicators and respective guidance when conducting baseline surveys. FFPIB 11-03 does not update FFP's annual monitoring indicators as these are dependent on the indicator re-engineering effort that the U.S. Department of State and USAID recently completed. FFP will release another FFPIB to inform Title II Awardees of the revised annual monitoring indicators in the near future.

Title II Awardees implementing development food aid programs awarded in FY 2011 onward are required to include the applicable FFP standard indicators listed in Table 1 in their IPTTs and collect data on these indicators in baseline surveys. Applicability depends on the program objectives (refer to column 1 of Table 1). These new requirements do not apply to Title II awardees implementing development programs that were awarded prior to FY 2011. These programs have already collected baseline indicators and thus should plan to collect the same indicators in the final evaluation survey. However, FFP changes to annual monitoring indicators in the near future will affect all Title II programs, regardless of award year.

What has changed in the FFP Standard Indicators

FFP modified the list of indicators in the following ways:

- **Indicators eliminated:** “Average Months of Adequate Household Food Provisioning (MAHFP)” was eliminated. The MAHFP indicator was eliminated because the 12-month recall period is considered too long to provide reliable results and two other indicators also measure household access to food. Title II Awardees can opt to collect this indicator if useful for program purposes, but FFP will no longer require it.
- **Indicators modified:** The age range of the indicator “percentage of stunted children” was changed from 6-59 months to 0-59 months to align with FTF. Awardees may choose to disaggregate this indicator into smaller age ranges (e.g. 0-23 months, 24-59 months) for program purposes, but must report to FFP on the 0-59 month age range.
- **Indicators added:** Indicators were added to the list of FFP standard indicators to better align with U.S. Government (USG) initiatives, including FTF and Global Health (GHI), and to capture FFP results in a more compelling way.

Table 1 lists the revised FFP standard indicators to be collected in baseline and final evaluations from a population-based sample survey. In addition to the fifteen indicators listed in Table 1, all Title II programs are required to integrate gender, either as a cross-cutting or strategic objective. The gender objective must appear in the results framework. Since FFP cannot anticipate the aspects of gender equality that Title II programs will choose to address, no standard gender indicators are established at this time. However, **all Title II programs are required to identify at least one outcome level gender-sensitive indicator that will be collected at a minimum during baseline and final evaluation surveys** and that measure the gender objective identified in the programs’ results framework. Gender-sensitive indicators need to show to what extent and in what ways the Title II program has met gender equality objectives in a given sector and/or achieved results related to gender equality. These indicators should measure differences in how women and men have benefitted from or been impacted by the Title II program. Annex 1 provides further guidance and resources to help Title II Awardees identify gender-sensitive indicators.

Annex 2 contains Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) summarizing indicator data collection methodologies for the indicators in Table 1. The FFP Standard Indicators Handbook contains questionnaires and tabulation instructions for the indicators in Table 1 and can be found in the FFP website (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADZ580.pdf).

Table 1. FFP Standard Impact and Selected Outcome Indicators

Applicable to development programs that aim to	No.	Indicator Title	Type: I=impact OC=outcome	FTF indicator
Improve household access to food	1	Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)	I	
	2	Household Hunger Scale (HHS): Percentage of households with moderate or severe hunger	I	X ¹
Improve nutritional status of children	3	Percentage of underweight (WAZ < -2) children aged 0-59 months	I	X
	4	Percentage of stunted (HAZ < -2) children aged 0-59 months	I	X
Improve child feeding behaviors	5	Percentage of children 0–5 months of age who are exclusively breastfed	OC	X
	6	Percentage of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet	OC	X
Improve nutritional status of women of reproductive age	7	Percentage of underweight (BMI < 18.5 kg/m ²) women of reproductive age (15–49 years)	I	X

¹ Title II programs should collect data for these indicators for FFP purposes. FTF will have an independent contractor collecting data for these indicators in FTF zones of influence, which will not always overlap with Title II program areas.

Applicable to development programs that aim to	No.	Indicator Title	Type: I=impact OC=outcome	FTF indicator
Improve women's dietary diversity	8	Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS): Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (15–49 years)	OC	X
Increase access to potable drinking water	9	Percentage of households using an improved drinking water source	OC	
Increase access to improved sanitation facilities	10	Percentage of households with access to an improved sanitation facility	OC	
Improve hygiene practices	11	Percentage of households with children aged 0–23 months that have water and soap or locally available cleansing agent at a hand washing place	OC	
Increase farmers' access to financial services	12	Percentage of farmers who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit and/or agricultural insurance) in the most recent season	OC	
Improve farmers' marketing of agricultural products	13	Percentage of farmers who practiced the value chain activities promoted by the project in the most recent season	OC	

Applicable to development programs that aim to	No.	Indicator Title	Type: I=impact OC=outcome	FTF indicator
Increase farmers' access to improved agriculture (crop/livestock and NRM) practices and/or technologies	14	Percentage of farmers who used at least [a project-defined minimum number of] sustainable agriculture (crop/livestock and/or NRM) practices and/or technologies in the most recent season	OC	
Increase farmers' use of improved storage techniques	15	Percentage of farmers who used at least [a project-defined minimum number of] improved storage techniques in the last post-harvest period	OC	

ANNEX 1:

Resources on gender-sensitive indicators

There is a distinction between *gender-sensitive* indicator and *sex-disaggregated* data. Gender-sensitive indicators point to gender-related changes in society. They demonstrate changes in the status and roles of women and men over time that can be used to measure whether outcomes related to gender equality are being achieved. Sex-disaggregated data are calculated and reported on separately in two categories: male or female. Collecting sex-disaggregated data is essential for constructing gender-sensitive indicators. However, data collection alone is not sufficient since reporting on the number of men and women who participate in activities does not provide enough information on whether the conditions that inhibit gender equality have been changed or improved.

Examples of gender-sensitive indicators include the following, which were adopted by USAID and the Department of State in November 2011:

- Proportion of females who report increased self-efficacy at the conclusion of USG-supported training/programming
- Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that women and men should have equal access to social, economic, and political opportunities
- Percentage of target population that views gender-based violence (GBV) as less acceptable after participating in or being exposed to USG programming

Title II Awardees may choose the required outcome level gender-sensitive indicator from among these three indicators or identify different ones as applicable to their programs. Draft of the PIRS for these indicators can be found at http://www.fanta-2.org/downloads/pdfs/Draft_USAID_Gender_Indicators_Nov2011.pdf.

The following resources provide further information about gender programming and examples of gender-sensitive indicators:

C-Change. FHI-360. Compendium of Gender Scales. <http://www.c-changeprogram.org/content/gender-scales-compendium/about.html> (accessed December 2011)

Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development: A Toolkit. Part I. General Guidelines for Integrating Gender in M&E.

http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSPContentServer/WDSP/IB/2008/07/21/000334955_20080721082201/Rendered/PDF/445520WP0BOX0327404B01PUBLIC10July02008.pdf (accessed December 2011)

ICF International Inc. Guidelines for the Measure DHS Phase III Main Survey Report. Chapter 15. Women's Empowerment and Demographic and Health Outcomes. August 18, 2011.

http://measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/DHSM6/DHS6_Final_Report_Tab_Plan_18Aug2011v2.pdf (accessed December 2011)

Inter-agency gender working group (IGWG). Population Reference Bureau.

<http://www.igwg.org/> (accessed December 2011)

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/daw/> (accessed December 2011)

USAID. Feed The Future. M&E Resources. Volume 6: Feed the Future Measuring Gender Impact Guidance: Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index. www.feedthefuture.gov (accessed December 2011)

World Bank. Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook. Agriculture and Rural Development. 2009. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENAGRLIVSOUBOOK/Resources/CompleteBook.pdf> (accessed December 2011)

USAID. Office of Office of Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment. http://www.fanta-2.org/downloads/pdfs/Draft_USAID_Gender_Indicators_Nov2011.pdf (accessed December 2011)

Annex 2:
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS
FFP STANDARD INDICATORS
 (for baseline and final evaluation surveys)

1. INDICATOR: Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve household access to food

DEFINITION:

All programs with food access components measure and report on the HDDS. Examples of project activities aiming to improve food access are:

- Agricultural production
- Agricultural product processing and marketing
- Microcredit and other income- and employment-generation activities

The HDDS consists of one question asked of the household food preparer: Did you or any member of your household consumed foods from a set of 12 different food groups in the day preceding the survey (24-hour recall period)?

The standard questionnaire has the following 12 food groups. As appropriate, locally available foods should be added into the food groups.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| A. Cereals | G. Fish and seafood |
| B. Root and tubers | H. Pulses/legumes/nuts |
| C. Vegetables | I. Milk and milk products |
| D. Fruits | J. Oil/fats |
| E. Meat, poultry, offal | K. Sugar/honey |
| F. Eggs | L. Miscellaneous (e.g. tea, coffee, condiments, etc.) |

The HDDS food groups are not based on nutrition outcomes or guidance. Thus, the HDDS is not a nutrition indicator but a proxy for household socioeconomic status.

Responses produce a household dietary diversity score ranging from 0–12.

The average HDDS of the population is calculated and reported.

Note: The respondent should be instructed to include the food groups consumed by household members in the home or prepared in the home for consumption by household members outside the home (e.g., at lunchtime in the fields). As a general rule, foods consumed outside the home that were not prepared in the home should not be included. While this may result in an underestimation of the dietary diversity of individual family members who may, for example, purchase food in the street, HDDS is designed to reflect household dietary diversity, on average, among all members. Including food purchased and consumed outside the household by individual members may lead to overestimating HDDS overall. However, in situations where consumption outside the home of foods not prepared in the household is common, survey implementers may decide to include those foods. Such decisions should be clearly documented so that subsequent surveys use the same protocol and can be correctly interpreted and compared.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and SAPQ:

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

Average HDDS	
TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT): Impact	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL of COLLECTION? FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? All development programs aiming to improve household access to food will collect this data in the project target area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey. 	
REPORTING: <p>After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the total number of households living in the target geographic area in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.</p>	
FURTHER GUIDANCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anne Swindale and Paula Bilinsky. 2006. <i>Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) for Measurement of Household Food Access: Indicator Guide. Version 2.</i> Available at http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/hdds_mahfp.shtml. 	

2. INDICATOR: Household Hunger Scale (HHS): Percentage of households with moderate or severe hunger

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve household access to food

DEFINITION:

All programs with food access components measure and report on the HHS. Examples of project activities aiming to improve food access are:

- Agricultural production
- Agricultural product processing and marketing
- Microcredit and other income- and employment-generation activities

The HHS is a food deprivation scale that measures the percentage of households experiencing the following three categories of food deprivation:

- Little to no hunger
- Moderate hunger
- Severe hunger

To collect data for this indicator, the person in the household in charge of food preparation is asked about the frequency with which three events were experienced by any household member in the last four weeks: No (Never), Rarely, Sometimes, or Often.

1. No food at all in the house
2. Went to bed hungry
3. Went all day and night without eating

If the event is reported as having not been experienced in the last four weeks, the response is coded as 'never' (value = 0). If the event is reported as having been experienced in the last four weeks, a frequency of occurrence question is asked to determine how often the event was experienced. For each frequency of occurrence question, the following responses are possible: 'rarely' (value=1), 'sometimes' (value=2), and 'often' (value=3). For tabulation purposes, the responses are then recoded into three frequency categories: 'never' (new recoded value = 0), 'rarely or sometimes' (new recoded value=1), and 'often' (new recoded value=2).

Values for the three questions are summed for each household, producing a HHS score ranging from 0–6.

Households scoring 0 to 1 are classified as households experiencing little to no hunger.

Households scoring 2 to 3 are classified as households experiencing moderate hunger.

Households scoring 4 to 6 are classified as households experiencing severe hunger.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
Percentage of households with moderate or severe hunger

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve

household access to food will collect this data in the project target area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of households living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Terri Ballard, Jennifer Coats, Anne Swindale, and Megan Deitchler. 2011. *Household Hunger Scale: Indicator Definition and Measurement Guide*. Available at http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/hhs_2011.shtml.

3. INDICATOR: Percentage of underweight (WAZ < -2) children aged 0-59 months

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve nutritional status of children

DEFINITION:

Underweight is a reflection of acute and/or chronic undernutrition and is measured using weight-for-age. This indicator measures the percentage of children aged 0–59 months who are underweight, as defined by weight-for-age z-score (WAZ) < -2.

The numerator for this indicator is the number of children 0–59 months with WAZ < -2. The denominator is the number of children 0–59 months in the survey.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and SAPQ:
 Percentage of underweight (WAZ < -2) children aged 0–59 months
 a. Overall
 b. Male
 c. Female

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve the nutritional status of children will collect this data in the project target area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of children 0–59 months of age living in target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Bruce Cogill. 2003. *Anthropometric Indicators Measurement Guide*. Revised Edition. Available at <http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/anthropom.shtml>.

4. INDICATOR: Percentage of stunted (HAZ < -2) children aged 0-59 months

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve nutritional status of children

DEFINITION:

Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that reflects chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children aged 0–59 months, i.e., under 5 years, who are stunted, as defined by a height-for-age z-score (HAZ) < -2. This indicator data is reported for all children under 5 to align with the Feed the Future initiative.

The numerator for this indicator is the number of children aged 0–59 months with a HAZ < -2. The denominator is the number of children aged 0–59 months in the survey.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
 Percentage of stunted (HAZ < -2) children aged 0–59 months
 a. Overall
 b. Male
 c. Female

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve the nutritional status of children will collect this data in the project target area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of children 0–59 months of age living in target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Bruce Cogill. 2003. *Anthropometric Indicators Measurement Guide*. Revised Edition. Available at <http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/anthropom.shtml>.

5. INDICATOR: Percentage of children 0–5 months of age who are exclusively breastfed

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve child feeding behaviors

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percentage of children 0–5 months of age, i.e., under 6 months, 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 might have received oral rehydration solution (ORS), vitamins, minerals, and/or medicines, but did not receive any other food or liquid.

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

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
Percentage of children 0–5 months of age who are exclusively breastfed

- Overall
- Male children
- Female children

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve child-feeding behaviors will collect this data in the project target area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of children 0–5 months of age living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- WHO. 2008. *Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices – Part 1: Definitions*. Available at <http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/infantfeeding/9789241596664/en/index.html>.
- WHO. 2010. *Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices – Part 2: Measurement*.

Available at <http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/infantfeeding/9789241599290/en/index.html>.

6. INDICATOR: Percentage of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve child-feeding behaviors

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percentage of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet, apart from breast milk. The MAD 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 his or her age group and breastfeeding status, then the child is considered to be receiving a minimum acceptable diet.

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

Total number of breastfed children 6–23 months of age who had at least
the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

Total number of breastfed children 6–23 months of age in the survey

AND

Total number of non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age who received at least two milk feedings
and had at least the minimum dietary diversity not including milk feeds

and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

Total number of non-breastfed children 6–23 months of age in the survey

Minimum dietary diversity for *breastfed children* 6–23 months is defined as four or more food groups out of the following *seven* food groups:

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

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

<p>UNIT: Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ: Percentage of children 6–23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overall b. Male c. Female 	<p>DISAGGREGATE BY: Sex</p>
<p>TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome</p>	<p>DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better</p>
<p>DATA SOURCE: Population-based survey (see ‘Measurement Notes’)</p>	
<p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL of COLLECTION? FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? All development programs aiming to improve child feeding practices will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey. 	
<p>REPORTING:</p> <p>After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the total number of children 6–23 months of age living in target geographic area in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.</p>	
<p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHO. 2008. <i>Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices – Part 1: Definitions</i>. Available at http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/infantfeeding/9789241596664/en/index.html. • WHO. 2010. <i>Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices – Part 2: Measurement</i>. Available at http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/infantfeeding/9789241599290/en/index.html. 	

7. INDICATOR: Percentage of underweight (BMI < 18.5 kg/m²) women of reproductive age (15–49 years)

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve nutritional status of women of reproductive age

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percentage of non-pregnant women of reproductive age (15–49 years) who are underweight, as defined by a body mass index (BMI) < 18.5 kg/m². To calculate an individual's BMI, weight and height data are needed. BMI is equal to weight (in kg) divided by height squared (in meters).

The numerator for this indicator is the number of non-pregnant women 15–49 years with a BMI < 18.5 kg/m². The denominator for this indicator is the number of non-pregnant women 15–49 years in the survey.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and SAPQ:
Percentage of underweight (BMI < 18.5 kg/m²) women of reproductive age (15–49 years)

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Impact

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve the nutritional status of women of reproductive age will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of women 15–49 years of age living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Bruce Cogill. 2003. *Anthropometric Indicators Measurement Guide*. Revised Edition. Available at <http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/anthropom.shtml>.

8. INDICATOR: Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS): Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (15–49 years)

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve women’s dietary diversity

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

From the collected data, calculate the mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age. The 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.

Note: Title II Awardees might also want to calculate (although it should not be included in the IPTT or SAPQ), the number and percentage of women of reproductive age consuming each of the nine food groups. This can be useful programmatic information because it can give an indication of important food groups that are not being widely consumed among the target population.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
Mean number of food groups consumed by women 15–49 years of age

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see ‘Measurement Notes’)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve women’s dietary diversity will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and the SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of women 15–49 years of age living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data

that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- Mary Arimond et al. 2010. 'Developing Simple Measures of Women's Diet Quality in Developing Countries: Methods and Findings.' *Journal of Nutrition* 140(11): Supplement. Available at http://www.fantaproject.org/publications/JofN_Oct2010.shtml.
- FAO. Guidelines for measuring household and individual dietary diversity. 2011. Available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/i1983e/i1983e00.pdf>

9. INDICATOR: Percentage of households using an improved drinking water source

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Increase access to potable drinking water

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the percentage of households using an improved drinking water source. To determine whether a household is using an improved drinking water source, the household head or a responsible adult in the household is asked:

1. To identify the main source of drinking water for household members
2. Whether the water is normally available from the identified source(s)
3. Whether the water was unavailable from the identified source(s) in the past two weeks for a day or longer

An improved water source is an infrastructure improvement to a water source, a distribution system, or a delivery point. By nature of its design and construction, the improvement is likely to protect the water source from external contamination, in particular fecal matter.

Improved drinking water sources are:

- Piped water into dwelling, plot, or yard
- Public tap/standpipe
- Tube well/borehole
- Protected dug well
- Protected spring
- Rainwater collection

Unimproved drinking water sources are:

- Unprotected dug well
- Unprotected spring
- Cart with small tank/drum
- Tanker truck
- Surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal, or irrigation channel)
- Bottled water

Note: Bottled water is considered unimproved drinking water by default. However, NGOs can opt to consider 'bottled water' an improved drinking water source if they can determine that the bottled water is of reliable quality and that the household members use bottled water for all drinking, cooking, and personal hygiene.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and SAPQ:
Percentage of households using an improved drinking water source

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to increase access to potable drinking water will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.

- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of households living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- USAID Hygiene Improvement Project (HIP). 2010. *Access and Behavioral Outcome Indicators for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene*. Available at <http://www.hip.watsan.net/page/4148>.

10. INDICATOR: Percentage of households with access to an improved sanitation facility

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Increase access to improved sanitation facilities

DEFINITION:

This indicator requires the use of questions that determine whether there is a sanitary facility in the household and whether that sanitary facility meets the improved sanitation standards defined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Improved sanitation is defined as:

- Flush or pour/flush facilities connected to a:
 - Piped sewer system
 - Septic system
 - Pit latrine
- Pit latrines with a slab
- Composting toilets
- Ventilated improved pit latrines

Unimproved sanitation includes:

- Flush or pour/flush toilets without a sewer connection
- Pit latrines without slab/open pit
- Bucket latrines
- Hanging toilets/latrines
- No facilities, open defecation

The household head or a responsible adult is asked to identify the kind of toilet facility that household members usually use.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
Percentage of households with access to an improved sanitation facility

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to increase improved sanitation facilities will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

The indicator data will be reported to FFP through the SAPQ, which is submitted with the ARR each November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of households living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

- USAID Hygiene Improvement Project (HIP). 2010. *Access and Behavioral Outcome Indicators for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene*. Available at <http://www.hip.watsan.net/page/4148>.

11. INDICATOR: Percentage of households with children aged 0–23 months that have water and soap or locally available cleansing agent at a hand washing place

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve hygiene practices

DEFINITION:

This indicator was adapted from the USAID Hygiene Improvement Project (HIP) document *Access and Behavioral Outcome Indicators for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene* (2010).

It measures the percentage of households with children aged 0–23 months that have soap and water at a hand washing station. The enumerator asks a responsible adult in the household to show him or her where the members of the household most often wash their hands. The enumerator then observes whether water and soap or other locally available cleansing agents are present at the hand washing place.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
 Percentage of households with children 0–23 months that have water and soap or locally available cleansing agent at a hand washing place

DISAGGREGATE BY:

None

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve hygiene practices will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of households with children 0–23 months living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

There is no further guidance for this indicator, as it was significantly adapted from a HIP indicator.

12. INDICATOR: Percentage of farmers who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit, and/or agricultural insurance) in the most recent season

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Increase farmers' access to financial services

DEFINITION:

Farmers: Farmers (including herders and fishers) are: 1) men and women who have access to a plot of land (even if very small) over which they *make decisions* about what will be grown, how it will be grown, and how to dispose of the harvest; AND/OR 2) men and women who have animals and/or aquaculture products over which they have *decision-making power*. Farmers produce food, feed, and fiber, where 'food' includes agronomic crops (crops grown in large scale, such as grains), horticulture crops (vegetables, fruit, nuts, berries, and herbs), animal and aquaculture products, as well as natural products (non-timber forest products or wild fisheries). These farmers may engage in processing and marketing of food, feed, and fiber and may reside in settled communities, mobile pastoralist communities, or refugee/internally displaced person camps.

For the purpose of this indicator, an adult member of the household who does farm work but does *not* have decision-making responsibility over the plot OR animals would *not* be considered a 'farmer.' For instance, a woman working on her husband's land who does not control a plot of her own would not be interviewed.

Financial services: This refers to services provided by formal or non-formal groups for the management of money. This includes credit (loans), savings, and insurance schemes run by for-profit, non-profit, and governmental organizations. Examples of financial services for farmers include, but are not limited to, loans, savings schemes, and insurance plans obtained from:

- Private banks
- Microfinance institutions for start-up business and business expansion
- Credit unions, savings and loan facilities within farmer associations, cooperatives society, village savings and loan associations, and other types of communal/social funds

Most recent season: Each program should define what is meant by 'season' depending on the type of agricultural activity being targeted.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and SAPQ:
 Percentage of farmers who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit, and/or agricultural insurance) in the most recent season
 a. Overall
 b. Male farmers
 c. Female farmers

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to increase farmers' access to financial services will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be

reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of farmers living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

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

13. INDICATOR: Percentage of farmers who practiced the value chain activities promoted by the project in the most recent season

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Improve farmers' marketing of agricultural products

DEFINITION:

Farmers: Farmers (including herders and fishers) are: 1) men and women who have access to a plot of land (even if very small) over which they *make decisions* about what will be grown, how it will be grown, and how to dispose of the harvest; AND/OR 2) men and women who have animals and/or aquaculture products over which they have *decision-making power*. Farmers produce food, feed, and fiber, where 'food' includes agronomic crops (crops grown in large scale, such as grains), horticulture crops (vegetables, fruit, nuts, berries, and herbs), animal and aquaculture products, as well as natural products (non-timber forest products or wild fisheries). These farmers may engage in processing and marketing of food, feed, and fiber and may reside in settled communities, mobile pastoralist communities, or refugee/internally displaced person camps.

For the purpose of this indicator, an adult member of the household who does farm work but does *not* have *decision-making responsibility* over the plot OR animals would *not* be considered a 'farmer.' For instance, a woman working on her husband's land who does not control a plot of her own would not be interviewed. In addition, for the purposes of this indicator, a farmer will be interviewed about the value chain activities that he or she practiced that are directly related to *the plot, animals, and/or aquaculture products over which he or she makes decisions*.

Value chain activities include, but are not limited to, pre- and post-harvest activities such as joint purchase of inputs, bulking transporting, sorting, grading, processing, trading/marketing (wholesale, retail, export). Projects for which this indicator is applicable need to pre-identify a list of value chain activities that the project will be promoting during the life of the project so that the baseline survey is able to measure the percentage of farmers that are already practicing these specific value chain activities. This will later be compared to the percentage of farmers practicing these value chain activities during the final evaluation survey at the end of the project. More on value chain activities can be found at the USAID's value chain wiki link:

http://apps.develebridge.net/amap/index.php/Value_Chain_Development.

Most recent season: Each program should define what is meant by 'season' depending on the type of agricultural activity being targeted.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
 Percentage of farmers who practiced the value chain activities promoted by the project in the most recent season
 a. Overall
 b. Male farmers
 c. Female farmers

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex

TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT):

Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:

Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes').

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION?** FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** All development programs aiming to improve farmers'

marketing of agricultural products will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** The development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of farmers living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

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

14. INDICATOR: Percentage of farmers who used at least [a project-defined minimum number of] sustainable agriculture (crop/livestock and/or NRM) practices and/or technologies in the most recent season

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Increase farmers' access to improved agriculture (crop/livestock and NRM) practices and/or technologies

DEFINITION:

Farmers: Farmers (including herders and fishers) are: 1) men and women who have access to a plot of land (even if very small) over which they *make decisions* about what will be grown, how it will be grown, and how to dispose of the harvest; AND/OR 2) men and women who have animals and/or aquaculture products over which they have *decision-making power*. Farmers produce food, feed, and fiber, where 'food' includes agronomic crops (crops grown in large scale, such as grains), horticulture crops (vegetables, fruit, nuts, berries, and herbs), animal and aquaculture products, as well as natural products (e.g., non-timber forest products, wild fisheries). These farmers may engage in processing and marketing of food, feed, and fiber and may reside in settled communities, mobile pastoralist communities, or refugee/internally displaced person camps.

For the purpose of this indicator, an adult member of the household who does farm work but does *not* have decision-making responsibility over the plot OR animals would *not* be considered a 'farmer.' For instance, a woman working on her husband's land who does not control a plot of her own would not be interviewed. In addition, for the purposes of this indicator, a farmer will be interviewed about the sustainable agriculture practices and/or technologies used *only for the plot, animals and/or aquaculture products over which he or she makes decisions*.

Agriculture: Agriculture is the cultivation of animals, plants, fungi, and other life forms for food, fiber, fuel, and other products used to sustain life.

Project-defined minimum number: Each program will define a set of practices/technologies appropriate for the production systems in the program area and the minimum number of these targeted for adoption by the farmers in the project geographic area.

Natural resource management (NRM): NRM refers to the management of natural resources such as land, water, soil, plants, and animals, with a particular focus on how management affects the quality of life for both present and future generations.

Sustainable: A sustainable agriculture production system provides needed nutrition and economic growth while promoting sound NRM to protect or enhance the environment. Such a system is economically viable and market driven, while ensuring local replicability, social acceptability, and gender and ethnic equity. It uses crop, animal, agriculture, and/or NRM practices and technologies to improve/increase diet quality and/or marketability of crops or animal products (e.g., quality enhancements, improved breeds/seeds, and value addition) while maintaining and/or regenerating soil fertility and preventing erosion and degradation of topsoil. This system also safely manages pests and diseases; protects water quality and quantity; reduces post-harvest storage losses; raises animals under low-stress, low-impact conditions; protects biodiversity; and enhances resilience to climatic and other environmental fluctuations. It responds to market-driven demands to maximize return and predictability of income generation. It considers the capacity and seasonality of labor inputs that households can allocate to crop and/or animal agriculture, particularly households that are affected by chronic disease or are otherwise vulnerable. It balances community needs with community capacity to maintain and scale up interventions once the USAID program has ended.

The USAID sustainable agriculture web page

(http://transition.usaid.gov/our_work/agriculture/sustainable_ag.htm) offers guidance on developing appropriate and sustainable agricultural systems. The page includes the USAID Agricultural Strategy *Linking Producers to Markets* (July 2004) second strategic theme ('improve the social, economic, and environmental sustainability of agriculture'). Title II implementing partners operating multi-year development programs in conflict-prone areas may wish to refer to USAID's Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation's *Livelihoods and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention* (2005) (transition.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-

[cutting_programs/conflict/publications/docs/CMM_Livelihoods_and_Conflict_Dec_2005.pdf](#)).

Agriculture practices/technologies: These are the techniques and tools used for combining land, labor, capital, and knowledge to produce, market, distribute, utilize, and trade food, feed, and fiber products.

Illustrative sustainable agriculture practices/technologies include, but are not limited to:

- Conservation and accumulation of soil organic matter and soil moisture through crop rotation, reduced tillage, perennial forages, cover crops, planting trees/bushes as wind breaks, and use of composted manure and crop residues
- Improved crop varieties (e.g., hybrid) and animal breeds adapted to local conditions
- Integrated pest management using physical, biological, cultural, and (only if needed) chemical control measures to maintain pest populations below economic threshold levels while having the least negative effect on non-target organisms and agro-ecological function
- Integrated, diversified farming systems (e.g., tree, field crop, fish pond, or livestock systems)
- Improved water management techniques, such as more efficient irrigation techniques, water harvesting and storage, surface water management to enhance infiltration and groundwater recharge, and community-based watershed management
- Animal practices, such as sustainable rangeland management practices, appropriate provision of fodder plants, adequate access to water, feed (e.g., zero grazing and semi-zero grazing), and housing/paddock; appropriate animal vaccination and animal disease prevention and treatment (e.g., dips, culling, effective traditional medical remedies); nutritional supplements during times of stress; and appropriate strategies to protect primary breeding stock
- Other NRM practices/techniques that are not directly related to on-farm production, such as afforestation and reforestation on communal or government land, biodiversity conservation, and climate change mitigation (including Reducing Emissions for Deforestation and Forest Degradation [REDD]-related interventions like fuel-efficient stoves)

Most recent season: Each program should define what is meant by 'season' depending on the type of agricultural activity being targeted.

<p>UNIT: Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ: Percentage of farmers who used at least [a project-defined minimum number of] sustainable agriculture (crop, livestock, and/or NRM) practices and/or technologies in the most recent season</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overall b. Male farmers c. Female farmers 	<p>DISAGGREGATE BY: Sex</p>
<p>TYPE (OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome</p>	<p>DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better</p>
<p>DATA SOURCE: Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')</p>	
<p>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL of COLLECTION? FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? All development programs aiming to increase farmers' access to improved sustainable agriculture (crop, livestock, and NRM) practices and/or technologies will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ. 	

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data.
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION?** Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey.

REPORTING:

After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the **total number of farmers living in the target geographic area** in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.

FURTHER GUIDANCE:

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

15. INDICATOR: Percentage of farmers who used at least [a project-defined minimum number of] improved storage techniques in the last post-harvest period

APPLICABLE TO PROGRAMS THAT AIM TO: Increase farmers' use of improved storage techniques

DEFINITION:

Farmers: Farmers (including herders and fishers) are: 1) men and women who have access to a plot of land (even if very small) over which they *make decisions* about what will be grown, how it will be grown, and how to dispose of the harvest; AND/OR and 2) men and women who have animals and/or aquaculture products over which they have *decision-making power*. Farmers produce food, feed, and fiber, where 'food' includes agronomic crops (crops grown in large scale, such as grains), horticulture crops (vegetables, fruit, nuts, berries, and herbs), animal and aquaculture products, as well as natural products (e.g., non-timber forest products, wild fisheries). These farmers may engage in processing and marketing of food, feed, and fiber and may reside in settled communities, mobile pastoralist communities, or refugee/internally displaced person camps.

For the purpose of this indicator, an adult member of the household who does farm work but does *not* have decision-making responsibility over the plot OR animals would *not* be considered a 'farmer.' For instance, a woman working on her husband's land who does not control a plot of her own would not be interviewed. In addition, for the purposes of this indicator, a farmer will be interviewed about the storage techniques used *only for products coming from the plot over which he or she makes decisions*.

Improved storage techniques: 'Improved' storage techniques are methods for storing crops, animal feed, and aquaculture products that are cost-effective and allow for long-term storage. 'Improved' storage techniques allow a farmer to safely store excess harvest from the plot where the farmer has *decision-making power* (see 'farmers' definition above) for subsequent sale and/or consumption.

Improved storage techniques should minimize post-harvest losses and maximize profits by allowing farmers to sell their products later in the season when excess product supply has diminished.

Examples of cost-effective storage techniques include, but are not limited to:

- Improved locally made structure/granary
- Modern storage structure like cribs or silos
- Sealed/airtight containers
- Improved cereal banks
- Improved community storing facilities

Project-defined minimum number: Programs for which this indicator is applicable need to pre-identify a list of improved storage techniques that the program will promote so that the baseline survey is able to measure the percentage of farmers that are already using these types of storage techniques. This will later be compared to the percentage of farmers using these types of storage techniques during the final evaluation survey at the end of the program.

Post-harvest period: Each program should identify the last post-harvest period for its target population.

UNIT:

Estimates to enter in the IPTT and the SAPQ:
 Percentage of farmers who used at least [a project-defined minimum number of] improved storage techniques in the last post-harvest season
 a. Overall
 b. Male farmers

DISAGGREGATE BY:

Sex

c. Female farmers	
TYPE: OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT Outcome	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Population-based survey (see 'Measurement Notes')	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEVEL of COLLECTION? FFP will monitor this indicator in Title II-targeted project areas to measure results attributable to Title II-funded projects. • WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? All development programs aiming to increase farmers' access to improved storage will collect this data in the targeted project area. The indicator data will be reported for baseline and final evaluations in the IPTT and SAPQ. • HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED? Development programs will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted project area to collect this data. • FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION? Indicator data will be collected at a minimum in baseline and final evaluations via a population-based survey. 	
REPORTING: After the baseline survey and final evaluation results are available, indicator data should be reported to FFP through the SAPQ form found in the Annual Results Report, which Title II Awardees submit in November. Development programs will also be asked to provide an estimate of the total number of farmers living in the target geographic area in the SAPQ. FFP needs this information to aggregate the indicator data across all programs. Title II Awardees can estimate this information by using the census data that would have been obtained to construct their survey sampling frame.	
FURTHER GUIDANCE: There is no source document for this indicator as FFP developed this indicator through consultations with several stakeholders.	