United States Agency for International Development
Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance
Office of Food for Peace

Fiscal Year 2010/2011 FINAL RESULTS REPORT
Single-Year Assistance Program

Awardee Name/Host Country:
SAVE THE CHILDREN, FEDERATION INC/GUATEMALA

Award Number:
AID-FFP-A- 10-00002

Submission Date: May 31, 2011

Awardee HQ Contact Name	**Heather Danton** **Senior Director, Food Security & Livelihoods**
Awardee HQ Contact Address	**2000 L Street NW, Suite 500** **Washington, DC 20036**
Awardee HQ Contact Telephone Number	**(202) 413-8099**
Awardee HQ Contact Fax Number	**(202) 640-6950**
Awardee HQ Contact Email Address	**hdanton@savechildren.org**

Country Office Contact Name	**Carlos Cárdenas** **Country Office Director**
Host Country Office Address	**1a. Calle 21-19 zona 15** **Vista Hermosa II** **Guatemala, Guatemala**
Host Country Office Contact Telephone Number	**+502-2222-4444**
Host Country Office Contact Fax Number	**+502-2369-0466**
Host Country Office Contact Email Address	**Email: ccardenas@savechildren.org.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Acronyms…….. 3

1. Introduction: Annual Food Aid Program Results …….. 4
2. Success Stories…….. 10
3. Lessons Learned……. ... 13
4. Attachments..…… 14

C. Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire

D. Tracking Table for Beneficiaries and Resources

I. Completeness Checklist

J. SYAP Monitoring and Evaluation Matrix

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACF	Action against Hunger
BCC	Behavior Change Communication
CSB	Corn and Soy Blend
CMAM	Community Based Management of Acute Malnutrition
COCODE	Guatemalan Development Committee
CODESAN	Departmental Committee on Food Security
COS	Civil Organization Society
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FFP	Food for Peace
FFW	Food for Work
GOG	Government of Guatemala
HH	Households
INE	National Statistics Institute
LOA	Life of Agreement
MAGA	Ministry of Agriculture
MC	Mercy Corps
MFEWS	Mesoamerican Food Security Early Warning System
MOH	Ministry of Health
MUAC	Middle Upper Arm Circumference
MYAP	Multiyear Assistance Program
NGO	Non Government Organization
PROSANO	Food Security and Nutrition Program in the "Dry Corridor" of Eastern Guatemala
RUTF	Ready to Use Therapeutic Food
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
SAM	Severe Acute Malnutrition
SAMI	Automated Monitoring and Information System
SC	Save the Children Federation Inc.
SESAN	Food Security and Nutrition Secretariat of Guatemala
SILVYA	Local Warning and Surveillance System
SYAP	Single Year Assistance Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

1. INTRODUCTION: ANNUAL FOOD AID PROGRAM RESULTS

Save the Children Federation Inc. (SC) implemented a Single Year Assistance Program (SYAP) called PROSANO (Food Security and Nutrition Program in the "Dry Corridor" of Eastern Guatemala) starting October 1, 2009 and ending March 31, 2011. SC in partnership with sub-grantee Mercy Corps (MC) provided support to three of the five departments of the "Dry Corridor" Chiquimula, Zacapa, and El Progreso, located in a mountainous area characterized by depleted soils, water scarcity and recurring agricultural pest, as well as crop disease issues. PROSANO assisted a total of 10,863 vulnerable families (approximately 65,178 total beneficiaries) living in 161 communities at high risk for food insecurity.

The goal of PROSANO was to reduce the impact of the current food security crisis and to help vulnerable households (HH) to more effectively ***mitigate and manage future shocks to their health, nutrition, livelihoods, and overall food security***. PROSANO's main beneficiary groups were children under the age of 5, and pregnant and lactating women experiencing or at risk of malnutrition. PROSANO focused on three main outcomes:

(a) Increased household (HH) access to nutritious foods
(b) Improved nutritional status of children from vulnerable HHs
(c) Improved availability of nutritious foods

This report focuses the key activities and achievements of the program during FY 2011, as PROSANO's work in FY 2010 was detailed previously in the FY 2010 Annual Results Report; however LOA information is included to tie together the overall work of the 16-month project.

During the period October 2010 to March 2011, PROSANO continued to implement the following activities:

(1) Distributed food to selected beneficiaries on a monthly basis (completed the ten consecutive month's distribution schedule)
(2) Conducted monthly monitoring measurements of Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) and weight monitoring of all children under the age of 5 and pregnant and lactating women; cases found under SAM were referred to CMAM program.
(3) Conducted specialized individual nutritional counseling
(4) Trained *Madres Lideres* (Mother Leaders) in health, nutrition and hygiene messages;
(5) Trained *Agricultores Lideres* (Agricultural Leaders) in crop and animal production, agro forestry and soil conservation;
(6) Conducted nutritional, health and hygiene behavior change communication strategy (BCC).
(7) Provided nutrition and health education sessions for caregivers, trained on hygiene, proper use of food rations in the HH, infant and young child feeding practices, breastfeeding practices, and agricultural activities.
(8) Livelihood activities on recovering corn and bean production, family gardens, low cost irrigation systems, tree seedlings, and chickens raising.

Increased HH access to nutritious foods

During this period, a total of ***10,863 households*** (**65,178 direct beneficiaries**) were assisted with a monthly 58lb ration consisting of rice, pinto beans, fortified vegetable oil, and CSB. Each ration contributed to meet 27.6% of the total HH caloric needs (based on a family of six members)[1].

PROSANO continued to use its biometric software named SAMI -*Sistema Automatizado de Monitoreo e Informacion*-(Automated Monitoring and Information System), which was created and developed by SC and used in PROSANO for monitoring and evaluation. This system also enabled staff to determine which children were at risk for MAM/SAM and allowed staff to provide nutritional counseling immediately.

PROSANO also continued to use the two volumetric feeders for liquids and solids to pack food rations in plastic bags and containers, which were placed in a large oxford bag that had a nutritional message printed on each side to promote positive health and nutrition behaviors among caregivers within the communities. Bags were printed according to USAID branding policies. This methodology allowed PROSANO to improve cost effectiveness, provide for food safety, and contributed to prepare and deliver commodity distribution more efficiently in the context of emergency programming.

PROSANO conducted hands-on training at the HH level in proper use of distribution commodities and food storage. PROSANO staff conducted follow-up home visits to beneficiary HH as needed and documented the following: all the families (100%) gladly accepted and consumed the commodities (there was no evidence of sales of the commodity seen in the community and local market); 94% of the families stored commodities properly; 84% of the families recognized the origin of the commodities; and no beneficiary paid or provided any other kind of contribution to obtain the commodities.

In November, MC received some complaints about the pinto beans (related to smell, a bad metallic aftertaste and taking a long cooking time). MC took immediate action to inspect the remaining batches reported to have a problem and the quality of the rations was verified prior to distribution, to help with these issues. No other issues arose during the life of the program regarding the distributions of commodities.

Improved nutritional status of children from vulnerable HHs

PROSANO worked closely with SESAN and MOH and established a surveillance system at the local and national levels. This facilitated the timely identification, referral, and treatment of moderate and severe acute malnutrition (MAM and SAM respectively) in children under five. Referral for treatment and counseling followed International Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) guidelines and protocols. Children with SAM who also had additional complications were referred to the nearest

[1] Ongoing Nutritional Census Assessment conducted by SC and MC from December 2009 to March 2010. Results vary from original proposal based on SESAN September 2009 Report.

MOH facility. During October 2010 to March 2011, PROSANO identified children suffering SAM with complications and all children (100%) were referred to the nearest MOH facility. For each of these cases a Notification Sheet was completed in accordance with GOG laws. PROSANO, during these months, identified 3.90% decrease of cases of SAM among children (0-23.9 months and 24-59.9 months), see attachment J M&E Matrix for more information).

Additionally, SC/MC Health and Nutrition staff completed weekly follow-up home visits to SAM affected children with no complications and to Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) children every two weeks. A total of **274 *Madres Lideres*** (Mother Leaders) were identified and trained in malnutrition, health and nutrition, breastfeeding, infant and young children feeding practices, hygiene, safe drinking water as well as food ration use and preparation. These mothers received a food ration as food for work (FFW) incentive for their support on the achievement of project objectives, as well as a Training Kit, which contained a bag, MUAC tape, recipe book, *Madre Lider* Notebook and pen, apron with nutritional messages, and kitchen utensils for food preparation training. PROSANO monitoring activities determined, in the final evaluation, that 29% of mothers trained by PROSANO know at least two signs of malnutrition in children under the age of five.

From October 2010 to March 2011, PROSANO conducted monthly monitoring of malnourished children, pregnant, and lactating women in the 161 communities collecting weight, height, and MUAC. SC conducted CMAM training for 30 members of the surveillance team, as part of larger mobile MOH team that has been regularly visiting and supporting MOH facilities at the community level. MC trained 120 MOH staff on how to properly fill out the new MOH Form for monitoring and nutritional status of children in the community.

SC developed and designed, as part of the Behavioral Change Communication (BBC) strategy, a calendar with nutritional messages printed for each month. At the same time, SC developed and designed with MOH a 'Signs of Acute Malnutrition" Poster that was distributed, along with the calendar, among the MOH facilities at local level and provided to Mother Leaders.

During the months of October 2010 to March 2011 several tragic deaths occurred among newborns and infants (program beneficiaries) in the Chiquimula area. In October 2010, SC reported 3 deaths: 1 newborn, 1 child with gastrointestinal disease and 1 child with bronchitis. In November 2010, SC reported 5 deaths: 1 child with pneumonia and 4 children died in the community for unknown reasons (there are typically no records or death certificates registered in the communities). In December 2010, there were no reports of children dying. In January 2011, SC reported 2 deaths: 1 child with bronchopneumonia and 1 stillbirth and February 2010, SC reported 1 death: 1 child suffered bronchitis and in March but no deaths were reported that month. All these cases were reported to MOH authorities.

Due to the continued incidence of malnutrition and reporting of deaths that occurred during FY 2011, SC continued conducting training courses on Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) for local and international NGOs and MOH staff. Educational posters were printed and were delivered in October 2010 to all Nutritional Recovery and Stabilization Centers as well as the Public National hospitals in the area.

PROSANO delivered medical equipment to the MOH facilities for proper SAM children care.

In March 2011, MC held a last meeting with MSPAS Regional Offices in Zacapa and El Progreso authorities to ensure follow-up and monitoring of the cases identified by the program, and prevent possible relapses. SC worked closely at local level with SESAN, MAGA and ACF. SC monitoring results were reported and included in SESAN and MOH monthly alert reports on severe acute malnutrition cases in Chiquimula.

PROSANO provided 495 water harvesting tanks (SC 400 and MC 95) to HHs that lacked access to safe water for health, hygiene and sanitation purposes. SC also provided 636 firewood-saving stoves, which not only reduce the need for wood, but also generate less smoke which helps prevent chronic pulmonary diseases and respiratory infections. MC delivered 5,101 kitchen kits (kitchen utensils) and 2,296 sets of cookware (pots and pans) and to families in El Progreso and Zacapa.

In the final evaluation, 3,623 HH implemented improved food production activities, and 41% of beneficiaries reported adoption of promoted livelihood practices.

PROSANO conducted its close-out plan as follows: final food distribution and home visits for proper use were conducted on February-March 2011; children, lactating and pregnant women were monitored until February 2011included; livelihood activities were carried out until mid-March 2011; and all administrative activities were completed by the end of March 2011.

Improved availability of nutritious foods

As described in previous reports, once communities were selected PROSANO implemented an intensive livelihoods strategy to accelerate the reestablishment of beneficiaries' livelihoods and strive towards self-sufficiency, taking into consideration the seasonal calendar (rainy and dry season). During FY 2011, PROSANO continued to train ***143 Agricultores Lideres*** (Agricultural Leaders) in improved corn and bean production, family gardens, establishment of cassava, yam, pineapple, papaya, and native plant cultivation (chipilin, chaya, hierba mora, tomatillo, and loroco), poultry production, agro forestry practices and soil conservation techniques. These *Agricultores Lideres* received a monthly food ration as FFW for their support on the achievement of project objectives. They trained other community members through Campesino a Campesino (farmer to farmer) methodology in horizontal transfer of knowledge which provided an opportunity to promote Agricultural Best Practices among community member to apply them in their own crops.

During October 2010 to March 2011, SC provided 4,800 / 18 week laying hens to 1000 vulnerable HH that were identified through nutritional indicators. Each HH received chicken feed and 6 hens that produced 5 eggs a day each. This provided each family with approximately 210 eggs per week for HH protein consumption to improve their nutritional status. SC trained these HH in animal health practices, native chicken-feed production and poultry management. Most of the families, in order to maintain their livestock, crossed these hens with native ones. The result was birds resistant to disease and adapted to native food for better survival.

In November 2010, SC reported that 30% of the corn yield was lost due to fungal diseases caused by torrential rains from May to September 2010. SC also reported that 80% of the bean yield was lost due earlier than expected end of the rains in October 2010. MFEWS' May 2011 Updated Food Security Perspective states that corn prices significantly increased up to 39% since December and prices are above the ones recorded in the previous five years due to international market prices as well as agricultural losses in 2010[2]. SC foresees a food security crisis for vulnerable HH beginning in March 2011 due to lack of food reserves, low employment opportunities and high food prices in Chiquimula.

PROSANO continued to implement vegetable gardens and established agro forestry plants in the communities. SC conducted poultry livestock training Agro forestry Systems and Corn production and continued training in the Centros *de Enseñanza Aprendizaje* (Teacher Learning Field Area) in Jocotan and Camotan in Chiquimula. This field area is located in beneficiary's agricultural property, where small plots are being planted and improvements to agricultural production are being promoted through the teaching of Best Agricultural Practices and soil conservation to all community members and beneficiaries.

SC worked closely at local level with MAGA. SC developed a Poultry Production Guide and Vegetable Garden Production Guide, which was distributed among Agricultural Leaders and MAGA field offices as part of PROSANO's hands-on-training program.

SC provided 335 tool kits, 629 silos of 120 lbs storage capacity, 244 irrigation systems, and 10,800 laying egg hens. Benefiting 680 families with corn seeds, 311 families with bean seeds, 106 families with micro irrigation systems, 264 families with forest plants, and 2,642 families with laying egg hens.

In El Progreso and Zacapa, Mercy Corps implemented in 77 communities (32 in Zacapa and 45 in El Progreso) 14 agricultural activities: domestic composting, corn production, bean production, vermicompost, soil conservation, gray water treatment systems, family vegetable gardens, chicken coops, egg production, edible mushrooms, animal husbandry, and use of hand tools, micro-irrigation systems and pressurized irrigation systems. These activities benefited a total of 2,410 families. MC and MAGA signed a letter of understanding detailing the responsibility to ensure the sustainability of the program's agricultural and livestock activities.

FFP/Washington authorized a no-cost extension for PROSANO until March 2011. The no-cost extension helped SC and MC provide further assistance to vulnerable HH and allow continued monitoring of the food security situation.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

PROSANO coordinated with Red Humanitaria (UN Humanitarian Network) in October 2009 to conduct the baseline survey. The results were shared with local, national, and international stakeholders in December 2009.

[2] MFEWS. Mayo 2011. Actualización de la Perspectiva Alimentaria.

By the end of the program, PROSANO had achieved and exceeded its goals:

Input	Goal	Final Results
# of beneficiaries from food insecure HH that received direct food assistance	60,000	65,178
# HH that received direct food assistance	10,000	10,863
Madres Lideres	170	274
Agricutlores Lideres	75	143

PROSANO conducted different training sessions and courses on health, nutrition, agriculture and a rapid livelihoods strategy implementation in the intervention area. P

The no-cost extension until March 2011 enabled SC, sub-grantee MC and other stakeholders to continue helping families in need, especially since the drought and severe rainfall reduced corn by 30% and bean yields by 80% in 2010. Food rations lasted until March 2011.

Save the Children used two state-of-the-art systems developed by PROSANO: SAMI (**S**istema **A**utomatizado para el **M**onitoreo de **I**nformacion -Automated Monitoring and Information System) and SILVIA **Si**stema **L**ocal de **Vi**gilancia y **A**lerta -Local Warning and Surveillance System) for monitoring and evaluation activities during LOA program. SAMI is a biometric software that keeps track of beneficiaries data (picture, fingerprint, GPS) and project activities such as monthly distribution of food and non-food items, nutritional surveillance (weight and MUAC measurements), and livelihood interventions. SAMI-Web is a web based system accessible to all stakeholders that provides information on progress of activities and indicators using a geo referential database and Google Maps.

SILVIA uses text messages sent by trained community members using simple SMS and cell phones that alert authorities on emergencies and evacuations. Messages received and decoded by SILVIA and using emails will notify all GOG decision takers, MOH authorities and SC project managers on emergency events that need immediate action. These systems provided information fast and efficiently, in order to take managerial decisions on a daily basis more effectively.

PROSANO was designed around a core set of indicators. Data was collected as part of baseline and final evaluation to enable SC determine project impact at the end of the program. (Please refer to Attachment J SYAP Monitoring and Evaluation Matrix). SYAP was able to assist more vulnerable households in the region than originally planned..

3. SUCCESS STORIES:

The day that Mrs. Ofelia learned to dream!

Mrs. Ofelia Perez at her home in El Durazno Chiquimula.
Photographer: Andrea Aragon

The drought doesn't only affect the land. Mrs. Ofelia and her four daughters also had their hopes and any possibility of change dry up. Or at least, so they thought, until a visit changed the course of their lives. A woman, who is born poor in a context where there are no other references for a different kind of life, thinks this is normal. Living in the dirt with her hands dirty and her children sick, growing up with no education and without dreams for a better life, and growing old watching the dust go by. Mrs. Ofelia from El Durazno village finally understood it after several visits from Save the Children personnel. When health technicians from PROSANO first visited, Mrs. Ofelia did not answer. She was shy and scared and these people were talking about changing her lifestyle. First the Mother Leader invited her to learn how to cook the food that the program has given her. They gave her strange flour that she did not know how to use. Because she was curious she went with the other 114 other women that had signed up for the program in her village. She came back happy since she came back home knowing how to cook patties for her four daughters, Rosa age 12, Malia age 6, Elbia age 4, and Ligia age 2. The message went even deeper when she went for a follow up on her smallest daughter's weight control and size, and she had signs of malnutrition. After placing her finger in a special sensor, her print was recorded and now; every time she goes for her check-up, the computer takes her chart and knows if Ligia has grown. It's a special kind of magic that Save the Children called SAMI. Mrs. Ofelia looks happily at the growth curve of her youngest daughter; recently saved from malnutrition but what surprises her most is how much the program has changed her life. Now her two older daughters go to school (they are in first grade), they draw and write letters, an adventure that up till now, they had never imagined for themselves and much less for their mother, who never learned how to read. Ofelia is thankful for USAID´s help; she is left speechless out of pure emotion and because her short vocabulary in Spanish does not make things easier, but her big smile says a lot. Mrs. Ofelia Perez Molina, a woman whose smile and hope is already a promise for new Guatemala.

Medrano´s family at Carrizal Chiquimula
Photographer: Andrea Aragon, SC Lessons Learned Consultant

September arrived and not a drop of rain had fallen. The people from Chiquimula are not used to downpours, but this was too much. Jobs were scarce, given the global economic crisis that also affected the country, and with the drought, corn and bean crop and harvest were also scarce. Kids in that area, known for being chronically malnourished, started showing signs of acute malnourishment. It was time to do something. The government declared a state of calamity and immediately, thanks to the help of USAID and Save the Children, an emergency plan was started in order to provide help under the name of PROSANO. The aid from the United States, through USAID, came as giant sacks of CSB of 25 kilos, rice and pinto beans sacks of 50 kilos and 20 liters cans of oil. The challenge was how to distribute all the help in family rations. The first thing that was done was to rent a warehouse in order to store all the goods. The second step was designing machines that could dispense the food; which did not exist in the market at that time. With the help of several national mechanical engineers, in a few weeks everything was figured out; and this is how, after two attempts and several broken compressors the dispensing machines were ready. The warehouse has 5 operators who are qualified to handle and take care of goods once they have been repackaged, so they reach destination, 10 thousand families in 161 communities, in complete hygienic conditions. It's Friday and the trucks are leaving very early loaded with 10 thousand food rations, as is done every month. With great effort they go up to the narrow roads made of stones and dirt on their way to the delivery. At the Carrizal Nutritional Center people are anxiously waiting under the hot morning sun. The unloading begins. Every family will receive the food ration in 18 lb bags, in the case of grains, and the oil in 2 lts bottle. The line is formed. Each head of the family has an ID, and with his or her fingerprint as a signature, he or she receives the rations and is grateful. Some of them are not families with children, pregnant or lactating women suffering malnutrition. They entered into the program as Agricultural Leaders or Mother Leaders that the program trained so they could cultivate and use crops in a nutritional way. A beautiful recipe book, a set of plastic dishes and pewter pots, an apron and a complete training kit are their teaching materials. They train mothers on how to use the CSB and add it to their beans and soups. They go and check on the small children. Such has been their contribution that the Ministry of Health has appointed them as Voluntary Personnel, an appointment that fills them with pride, and

their villages with good results. El Carrizal´s malnutrition was reduced from 12% to 5%, an accomplishment that could not have been possible without the Mother Leaders.

Mrs. Norma Dubon at her garden in Los Aristondos Morazan, El Progreso. Photographer: Andrea Aragon, SC Lessons Learned Consultant.

The filter system is made up of pumice stones and sand. From the outside they seem like uninteresting concrete boxes, but inside there's whole water recycling system that provides great benefits. Let's start by remembering that in Los Aristondos Village, in Morazan, El Progreso, water is never abundant. Sitting in the small terrace of her house made of concrete blocks, Mrs. Norma point s at the dust that flies around everywhere. It looks like it hasn't rained in a decade. But in this house there is no lack of water for irrigation. When Mercy Corps arrived, with the help of USAID, at her village, Mrs. Norma signed on for the Food for Work Program as Mother Leader. Ever since, she makes house visits, trains and receives community mothers in her home to teach them how to cook the food that USAID donates to the families that participate in the program. Mrs. Norma also served as an example by allowing the construction of these completely new irrigation systems in her home. It's very simple. The water she uses in her shower, kitchen sink and for laundry goes through pipes into a box which cleans it of large waste. The water goes to a second box where grease and soil accumulate so in that in the third box the water gets neutralized through a system of gravel and rice shells. The result is water that is free of harmful substances and is appropriate for drip irrigation. That's how in their vegetable garden, the Dubon family has corn, beans, radishes, squash and carrots. In her home, her family eats well ever since, because there are always vegetables. 8 year old Byron and 11 year old Alan look up to their mom. She is the perfect role model of someone who makes the most out of the resources and shares what she knows in order to improve the quality of life of her family and neighbors.

3. LESSONS LEARNED:

During LOA, the following lessons were learned:

1. SC/MC's good relationship with local authorities (municipalities) has been key in the successful launch and implementation of PROSANO. Local authorities have helped determine complementary activities and avoid duplicating activities of other organizations.

2. The good relationship established with the MOH regional offices has ensured successful implementation of the nutritional census. During nutritional census activities and monthly monitoring of child, lactating, and pregnant women a MOH official is on site. All data collected and the analysis is sent to the MOH for follow-up of most urgent cases.

3. SC has increased sub-grantee MC staff capacity to meet USAID regulations, implement livelihoods activities, monitor and evaluate programming, implement CMAM and BBC strategies and conduct and report on the Nutritional Census. MC is using, at no cost, SC's SAMI (Biometric System).

4. Hands-on-training is a good methodology for teaching purposes in food preparation as well as livelihoods training. This method is easy to apply and beneficiaries learn quickly and transfer knowledge to other community members.

5. The heavy rainfall during May-September, far more than expected and compared to previous years, delayed project activities in several communities due to landslides and rivers overflow causing road damage. PROSANO was able to address these problems in coordination with COCODES, *Madres Lideres*, and *Agricultores Lideres*, to streamline food distribution and other activities so that time delay was not significant.

6 PROSANO designed, created and developed two unique state-of-the-art systems: SAMI (**S**istema **A**utomatizado para el **M**onitoreo de **I**nformacion -Automated Monitoring and Information System) and SILVIA (**Si**stema **L**ocal de **Vi**gilancia y **A**lerta -Local Warning and Surveillance System). SAMI is a biometric software that kept track of beneficiaries data (picture, fingerprint, GPS) and project activities such as monthly distribution of food and non-food items, nutritional surveillance (weight and MUAC measurements), and livelihood interventions. SAMI-Web is a web based system accessible to all stakeholders that provided information on progress of activities and indicators using a geo referential database and Google Maps. SILVIA used text messages sent by trained community members using simple SMS and cell phones that alert authorities on emergencies and evacuations. Messages received and decoded by SILVIA and using emails notified all GOG decision takers, MOH authorities and SC project managers on emergency events that need immediate action. These two systems provide a transparent method for keeping beneficiaries and interventions in the field. This system can be used by other stakeholders in emergency and non emergency situations.

4. ATTACHMENTS

SC is submitting the following attachment to this final report, prepared according to USAID guidelines found at http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/ffp/resultrep.html :

C. Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire
D. Tracking Table for Beneficiaries and Resources
I. Completeness Checklist
J. M&E Matrix

FFP Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ) - FY 2010

AWARDEE FOOD AID PROGRAM INFORMATION	
Awardee Name(s)	Save the Children
Host Country *(or Countries, for Regional Programs)*	Guatemala
Program location(s) in the host country	Chiquimula, Zacapa and El Progreso
Program Start Date *(mm/dd/yy)*	10/1/09
Program Expiration Date *(mm/dd/yy)*	3/31/11
Program Name	SYAP
Award Number	AID-FFP-A-10-00002
AWARDEE CONTACT INFORMATION	
Contact Name (person filling out the SAPQ)	Selvyn Fuentes
Contact Email	sfuentes@savechildren.org
Contact Address	1a calle 21-19 zona 15 Vista Hermosa II
Contact Phone	(502) 2222-4444

Please follow the instructions that appear in the yellow boxes!

YOUR COMMENTS

You may make comments, if desired in this column. i.e., if you are uncertain whether a particular indicator is what FFP is looking for, mention it here.

SECTION 1: Data from a Representative Population-based Survey

This section asks for impact data coming from a quantitative survey such as a baseline or final evaluation

1 **Did your food aid program conduct a quantitative, population-based, statistically representative survey such as a baseline or final evaluation in FY10 or in FY09 and did not report the results in last year's SAPQ?**

Answer "Yes, '10" if you conducted a survey in FY10. Answer "Yes, '09" if you conducted a survey in FY09 but you did not report on it in last year's FY09 SAPQ because the final data were not yet available. If you conducted a survey in FY09 and already reported the results in the FY09 SAPQ, choose "No".

Yes/No
Yes, '09

2 **Which type of quantitative survey did your program conduct in FY10?**

Choose your answer from the drop down menu.

Baseline Survey

3 **Are the final data from your program's survey available at this time?**

Do not answer "Yes" if you have preliminary data only. If final data are not yet available, answer "No" and report on them in next year's SAPQ. Only final data should be entered into the SAPQ.

Yes/No
Yes

1A: Months of Adequate Food Provisioning (Impact Indicator)

4 **What is the estimated total number of households in your target geographic area?**

How many households live in your target geographic area? (This is not the *sample* size, it's the *population* size)

FY 09
households in target areas
18,891

5 **In the survey, did your program measure *average number of months of (in)adequate food provisioning,* following the standard FANTA methodology for this indicator?**

See the "Definitions" tab for a description of the standard methodology for this indicator.

Yes/No
No

If No, skip ahead to Question 7

6 **What was the *average number of months of adequate food provisioning* ?**

Fill out the table below with the final data from your survey. If you measured INADEQUATE instead of ADEQUATE months, convert your data to ADEQUATE months (12 - number of inadequate months). Only provide data if you used the standard FANTA methodology.

If this is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the average number of months of adequate food provisioning data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY10 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

	FY 10	Most recent FY prior to FY10 (enter n/a if FY10 was the baseline)		Final Evaluation Target	
Indicator	# months	From which FY?	# months	What FY is the final evaluation?	# of months
Average number of months of ADEQUATE food provisioning	#	FY	#	FY	#

1B: Household Dietary Diversity (Impact Indicator)

7 **In the survey, did your food aid program measure *household dietary diversity,* following the standard FANTA methodology for this indicator?**

See the "Definitions" tab for a description of the standard methodology for this indicator.

Yes/No
No

If No, skip ahead to Question 9

8 **What was the *average household dietary diversity score* ?**

Fill out the table below with the data from your survey. Only provide data if you used the standard FANTA methodology.

If this is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the average dietary diversity score from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY10 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

	FY 10	Most recent FY prior to FY 10 (enter n/a if FY 10 was the baseline)		Final Evaluation Target	
Indicator	# of food groups	From which FY?	# of food groups	What FY is the final evaluation?	# of food groups
Average household dietary diversity score	#	FY	#	FY	#

1C: Underweight (Impact Indicator)

9 **In the survey, did your food aid program measure the prevalence of underweight (WAZ <-2) in children 0 - 59 months of age?**

If you measured underweight for a different age group, or you used a different measure or cutoff, answer NO.

Yes/No
No

If No, skip ahead to Question 12

10 **What was the prevalence of underweight (WAZ <-2) in children 0 - 59 months of age?**

If this survey is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the underweight data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY09 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

Indicator	FY 10	Most recent FY prior to FY 10 (enter n/a if FY 10 was the baseline)		Final Evaluation Target	
	% underweight	From which FY?	% underweight	What FY is the final evaluation?	% underweight
% of underweight (WAZ<-2) children 0-59 months of age					

11 **What is the estimated total number of children 0-59 months of age, living in your target geographic area?**

How many children 0-59 months live in your geographic area? (This is the *population* size, not the *sample* size)

FY 09
0-59 mo

1D: Stunting (Impact Indicator)

12 **In the survey, did your food aid program measure the prevalence of stunting (HAZ <-2) in children 6 - 59 mo of age?**

If you measured stunting for a different age group, or you used a different measure or cutoff, answer NO.

Yes/No
No

If No, skip ahead to Question 15

13 **What was the prevalence of stunting (HAZ <-2) in children 6 - 59 mo of age?**

If this survey is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the stunting data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY09 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

Indicator	FY 10	Most recent FY prior to FY 09 (enter n/a if FY 09 was the baseline)		Final Evaluation Target	
	% stunted	From which FY?	% stunted	What FY is the final evaluation?	% stunted
% of stunted (HAZ<-2) children 6-59 months of age	%	FY	#	FY	%

14 **What is the estimated total number of children 6-59 months of age, living in your target geographic area?**

How many children 6-59 months of age live in your geographic area? (This is the *population* size, not the *sample* size.)

FY 10
6-59 mo
#

SECTION 2: Annual Monitoring Data

This section asks for data about direct beneficiaries, coming from your routine monitoring system

15 **Did your food aid program implement activities (deliver goods and services (assistance) to beneficiaries) in FY10?**

Yes/No
Yes

2A: Anthropometry (Monitoring Indicators)

16 **Did your food aid program implement activities to maintain or improve the nutritional status of beneficiaries in FY10?**

Yes/No
Yes

17 **What anthropometric indicators does your program use for regular monitoring of the nutritional status of beneficiaries?**

For each indicator, fill in the desired direction of change (increase or decrease) and the data for FY 10 and the previous year, FY 09. It is OK to leave prior year data blank if you do not have beneficiary data from the prior year.

Fill out the table below with the ANTHROPOMETRIC indicators used by your program for annual monitoring of the nutritional status of your program's beneficiaries. Please write the precise definition for each indicator, including the measure used and the age group (e.g. % of children 0 - 23 mo old with WAZ < -2). In other words, do not write simply "Malnutrition rate" or "Recovery rate" or "% graduating from feeding program" without explaining what anthropometric measure and cutoff is used.

Please provide only ANTHROPOMETRIC indicators which are a measure of the physical body. Acceptable anthropometric measures include prevalence of stunting (height for age Z - HfA), underweight (weight for age - WfA), wasting (weight for height WfH), weight gain, growth faltering (trend of weight gain), body mass index (BMI), middle-upper arm circumference (MUAC); average HfA Z score (HAZ), WfA Z score (WAZ), WfH Z score (WHZ); proportion of children/adults recuperating to defined cutoffs (e.g. WAZ 80% median). Measures such as breastfeeding, vaccination rates, or numbers of ration recipients are NOT anthropometric.

Only include data for indicators that you monitor annually among direct beneficiaries. These data will be based on regular monitoring of your program beneficiaries and not on a representative sample survey of a broader population. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION

	Indicators	Desired direction (+ / -)	FY 10 actual %	FY 09 actual %
17.1	% of cases of SAM (red MUAC)	+ increase	0.25%	0.5%
17.2	% of cases of SAM (Yellow MUAC)	- decrease	1.75%	5.4%
17.3		+ increase		
17.4			%	%

2B: Behavior Change: Health, Nutrition, Hygiene (Monitoring Indicators)

18	**Did your program implement activities to improve the health, nutrition or hygiene behaviors of beneficiaries in FY10?**	Yes/No: No

If No, skip ahead to Question 20

19 **What behavior change indicators does your program use for regular monitoring of beneficiaries?**

For each indicator, fill in data on the FY 10 indicator value (i.e. the result achieved) and the number of beneficiaries reached in FY10. Please provide future year targets for the indicator, as applicable.

Use the drop down menu to select the indicator on which you are reporting. Give the percentage (%) of **beneficiaries** adopting the improved health, nutrition or hygiene behaviors. You may take a census or a sample of your beneficiaries. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION. Only the indicators on the drop down menu can be included.

See FFP Information Bulletin 07-02 (http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/ffp/fy08_ffpib_new_reporting.pdf) for further information on these indicators. For indicators with an *, the specific behaviors that comprise these indicators are to be defined by the awardee. See the "*Definitions*" tab for a definition of "beneficiaries".

	Indicators	FY 10		Future Targets			
				FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
		actual %	# beneficiaries	target %	target %	target %	target %
19.1		%	#	%	%	%	%
19.2		%	#	%	%	%	%
19.3		%	#	%	%	%	%
19.4		%	#	%	%	%	%

2C: Agricultural Extension (Monitoring Indicator)

20	**Did your food aid program provide farmers with extension/outreach services in FY10?**	Yes/No: Yes

21 **How many farmers (individuals, not households) received extension/outreach services in FY10?**

Please provide future year targets for number of farmer beneficiaries, as applicable.

FY 10	Future Targets			
	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
# farmers	# farmers	# farmers	# farmers	# farmers
2,846	3,623	#	#	#

22	**How many sustainable agricultural technologies did your program transfer in FY10?** See the "Definitions" tab for more information about "agricultural technologies"	# technologies: 5

23 **What are the sustainable agricultural technologies your program made available for transfer in FY10?**

If you transferred more than 10 technologies, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

23.1	18 week laying hens distribution and training
23.2	Certified corn and bean seeds resistant to drought and training
23.3	Agro Forestry plants and training
23.4	Family gardens and training
23.5	Irrigation system and training
23.6	
23.7	
23.8	
23.9	
23.10	

24	**What is the minimum number of sustainable agricultural technologies your program would like an individual farmer to use/adopt as a result of your program's assistance?** See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "minimum number." This number should be less than the response to question 22.	# technologies: 2

25 **What percentage (%) of program beneficiaries (farmers) adopted the minimum number of technologies in FY10?**

Please provide the future year targets, as applicable.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

FY 10	Future Targets			
	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
% beneficiary farmers	% beneficiary farmers	% beneficiary farmers	% beneficiary farmers	% beneficiary farmers
42%	41%	%	%	%

2D: Disaster Early Warning Systems (Monitoring Indicator)

26	**Did your food aid program assist communities to develop disaster early warning and response systems in FY10?** See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "disaster early warning and response system".	Yes/No: No

If No, skip ahead to Question 29

27	**How many communities does your program plan to assist to develop disaster early warning and response systems over the life of the award?**	# communities: #

28 **How many of your program's targeted communities had disaster early warning and response systems in place in FY10 as a result of your program's assistance?**

Please provide the future year targets for # of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have early warning systems in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

	FY 10	Future Targets			
		FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
	#	#	#	#	#
(Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

2E: Infrastructure To Mitigate Shocks (Monitoring Indicator)

29 **Did your food aid program assist communities to improve or develop physical infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks in FY10?**

See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "infrastructure"

Yes/No
No

If No, skip ahead to Question 33

30 **How many communities does your program plan to assist to improve or develop infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks over the life of the award?**

communities
#

31 **What kinds of physical infrastructure did your program improve or develop in FY10?**

If there are more than 5 kinds of infrastructure, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

31.1	
31.2	
31.3	
31.4	
31.5	

32 **How many of your program's targeted communities had improved physical infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks in FY10 as a result of your program's assistance?**

Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have infrastructure in place in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

	FY 10	Future Targets			
		FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
	#	#	#	#	#
(Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

2F: Safety Nets (Monitoring Indicator)

33 **Did your food aid program assist communities to strengthen safety nets to address the needs of their most vulnerable members in FY10?**

A community-based safety net supported under a MYAP can be a broadly defined system for addressing the food security needs of a community's most vulnerable members during a shock. A community-based safety net is: managed and maintained by the community; internally resourced, at least in part; and can be year round or seasonal. Examples include community food banks or insurance schemes.

Yes/No
No

If No, skip ahead to Question 36

34 **How many communities does your program plan to assist to strengthen safety nets over the life of the activity?**

communities
#

35 **How many of your programs targeted communities that had safety nets in place in FY10 as a result of your program's assistance?**

Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have safety nets in place in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

	FY 10	Future Targets			
		FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
	#	#	#	#	#
(Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

2G: Community Capacity (Monitoring Indicator)

36 **Did your food aid program assist communities to strengthen community capacity in FY10?**

Community capacity refers to a community's ability to govern itself; to organize, analyze, plan, manage, problem-solve, implement actions, and represent its interests and participate in broader fora. This goes beyond targeted efforts to strengthen communities in nutrition, agriculture, infrastructure, early warning, or other topics covered elsewhere in the SAPQ.

Yes/No
No

If No, you are FINISHED. Submit the SAPQ.

37 **How many communities does your program plan to assist to strengthen community capacity over the life of the award?**

communities
#

38 **What are the components of community capacity that your program strengthened in FY10?**

Select from the drop down menu. If there are more than 10 components, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

38.1	
38.2	
38.3	
38.4	
38.5	
38.6	
38.7	
38.8	
38.9	
38.10	

39 **How many of your program's targeted communities had strengthened community capacity in FY10 as a result of your program's assistance?**

Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have strengthened capacity in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

FY 10	Future Targets			
	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14
# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities	# communities
#	#	#	#	#
(Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place #VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

Congratulations! You have finished the SAPQ

Fiscal Year 2010 Beneficiary Data by Technical Sector

Remember: Food aid pograms operating in more than one host country should provide an aggregate total on the Beneficiaries by Sector tab, and then provide totals disaggregated by individual country of operation on the Regional Beneficiaries by Sector tab. The instructions for both tabs are the same.

Host Country or Countries **Guatemala**	**Awardee** **Save the Children Federation Inc**	**Food Aid Program Category** **Single-Year Assistance Program**
Award Number	**Life of Award *(mm/yy to mm/yy)***	**FFP Funding Source** **Emergency Funding**
Submission Date *(mm/dd/yy)* **5/24/2011**	**Submission Type** Original	**Fiscal Year** **2011**

Technical Sector	FY10 Results Report Data						Outyear Estimates					
	Planned Beneficiaries FY10			Reached Beneficiaries FY10			Planned Beneficiaries FY11			Outyear Estimates		
	Male	Female	FY10 Planned Total	Male	Female	FY10 Planned Total	Male	Female	FY11 Planned Total	FY12 Planned Total	FY13 Planned Total	FY14 Planned Total
Emergency Prep. / Disaster Mitigation - Non HIV	29,400	30,600	60,000	31,937	33,241	65,178	31,937	33,241	65,178			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (applicable only those food aid programs receiving BEHT resources)												
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
			-			-			-			
Total Direct Beneficiaries	**29,400**	**30,600**	**60,000**	**31,937**	**33,241**	**65,178**	**31,937**	**33,241**	**65,178**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IDP and Refugee Beneficiary Data		Planned FY10	Reached FY10	Planned FY11
Does your food aid program implement activities to benefit IDPs or refugees?				
If yes, what was the number of IDP beneficiaries in FY10?				
If yes, what was the number of refugee beneficiaries in FY10?				

Name and Contact Information of Individual Completing this Form	
Name:	
Complete Address:	
Phone:	
Email:	

Save the Children in Guatemala PROSANO (SYAP) Program - Master M&E Matrix

Goal: Mitigate the impact of the current crisis and help vulnerable families to more effectively mitigate and manage future shocks to their health, nutrition, livelihoods, and overall food security

Indicator	Description of Indicator	Goal	Baseline	Progress October 09-March 11	Responsible Personnel	Data Collection Events (Frequency)	Methods	Verification Source	Population Covered	Application (How will data be used / communicated)
SO 1: Increased access to nutritious food by vulneable HH										
Number of beneficiaries from food insecure households that received direct food assistance.	Number of beneficiaries from food insecure households that received direct food assistance. **Absolute Value**	60,000	0	65,178	M&E Coordinator	Monitoring system/Monthly	Nutritional census and monthly food distribution report	Baseline report and Final Evaluation Survey	All households served by the project	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report
Number of households that received direct food assistance	Number of households that received direct food assistance. **Absolute Value**	10,000	0	10,863	M&E Coordinator	Monitoring system/Monthly	Nutritional census and monthly food distribution report	Baseline report and Final Evaluation Survey	All households served by the project	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report
SO2: Improved nutritional status of children from vulnerable households										
% decrease of identified cases of SAM among children (0-23.9 months and 24.59.9 months)	Number of identified SAM children (0-23.9 and 24-59.9 months) /Total number of monitored children (0-23.9 and 24-59.9 months) X 100. **Percentage Value**	n/a	0.48%	3.90%	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, Monthly Monitoring and Final Performance Report	Nutritional census, monthly measurement MUAC and weight, and HH visit	Baseline report, Child Health File and Final Evaluation Survey	All children selected in nutritional census (0-59 months)	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report, and to the surveillance system managed by MOH
% of cases of SAM (red MUAC) with complications referred to a hospital or stabilization center	Number of SAM (red MUAC) with complications referred to a Hospital or Stabilization center/Total number of identified SAM cases with complications X 100. **Percentage Value**	n/a	0%	100%	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, Monthly Monitoring and Final Performance Report	Nutritional census, monthly measurement MUAC and weight, and HH visit	Baseline report, Child Health File and Final Evaluation Survey	All children selected in nutritional census (0-59 months)	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report and to the surveillance system managed by MOH
% of mothers and caretakers that know at least 2 signs of malnutrition in children	Number of mothers and caretakers that know at least 2 signs of malnutrition in children/ Total number of surveyed mothers and caretakers X 100. **Percentage Value**	n/a	0%	29%	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, Monthly Monitoring and Final Performance Report	Survey of mothers and caretakers during monitoring activities and Final Evaluation.	Baseline report, Child Health File and Final Evaluation Survey	All mothers and caretakers with children under 5 in project intervention area	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report
% of children aged 0-23.9 months recovered from SAM (red MUAC)	Number of children aged 0-23.9 months recovered form SAM (red MUAC)/ Total number of monitored children aged 0-23.9 months X 100. **Percentage Value**	n/a	0%	11%	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, Monthly Monitoring and Final Performance Report	Nutritional census, monthly measurement MUAC and weight, and HH visit	Baseline report, Child Health File and Final Evaluation Report	All children selected in nutritional census	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report, and reporting to surveillance system managed by MOH
SO3: Improved availability of food at the HH Level										
Number of households implementing improved food production activities	Number of families implementing improved food production activities **Absolute Value**	n/a	0	3623	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, and Final Performance Report	Agricultural Census in intervention communities	Agricultural Census Report in Livelihoods component	All households served by the project	Progress assessment; reporting
% of beneficiaries reporting adoption of promoted livelihood practices	Beneficiaries (farmers) reporting use of at least half of promoted practices/Total number of beneficiaries reached X 100: **Percentage Value**	n/a	0%	41%	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, and Final Performance Report	Agricultural Census in intervention communities	Agricultural Census Report in Livelihoods component	All households served by the project	Progress assessment; reporting
Average # of months of adequate household food provisioning	Sum of months of adequate HH food provisioning for each HH Interviewed /Total Number of HH Interviewed. **Absolute Value**	n/a	0	6	M&E Coordinator	Baseline, and Final Performance Report	Agricultural Census in intervention communities	Baseline report, and Final Evaluation Survey	All households served by the project	Progress measurement, reporting, final performance report