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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2012, the United States Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Office of Food for Peace (FFP) awarded three five-year development food assistance projects (DFAPs) in Niger to a consortium of U.S. private voluntary organizations (PVOs) to implement integrated development food assistance projects in the target regions of Maradi and Zinder. The three awards were:

1. The Livelihoods, Agriculture, and Health Interventions in Action (LAHIA) project in the Maradi region, implemented by Save the Children (SC), in partnership with World Vision (WV);
2. The Programme d'Aide à la Sécurité Alimentaire des Ménages (PASAM-TAI) in the Maradi and Zinder regions, implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS), in partnership with the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT); and
3. The Sawki project in the Maradi and Zinder regions, implemented by Mercy Corps (MC), in partnership with Helen Keller International (HKI) and Africare.

Given that these three projects were originally projected to close out in 2017, USAID/FFP requested that a performance evaluation (PE) be undertaken in that year. The purpose of this summative PE was to: measure the development outcomes of the PASAM-TAI, LAHIA, and Sawki projects; assess the functionality and performance of systems and processes established independently by the projects to achieve project outcomes and sustainability; evaluate the effectiveness and relevance of the technical interventions in terms of achieving project outcomes; and identify best practices, strengths, and challenges in project design, including in their theories of change. The objective was to derive conclusions and recommendations that FFP and the USAID Mission in Niger should consider in the design and development of future projects to achieve food and nutrition security, and strengthen the resilience capacities of households and communities in the Sahel region.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation are expected to have primary accountability and learning value for USAID stakeholders (FFP/Washington, USAID/Niger, FFP West Africa Regional Office, and the FFP learning network). Additional stakeholders include the three implementing partner (IP) organizations (CRS, MC, and SC) and their sub-partners, as well as Nigerien government officials from key collaborating ministry offices.

THEORY OF CHANGE

The projects were designed to address critical problems of food insecurity, poverty, and malnutrition, as well as to increase the resiliency of communities and households in targeted areas within these regions. The approach for each DFAP is quite similar, as indicated by their respective strategic objectives, and based on the FFP strategy and theory of change. Key interventions include: promotion of positive behavior change in nutrition, health, hygiene, sanitation, and agriculture; involvement of women in project activities as participants and beneficiaries; and interventions to diversify livelihoods through livestock, savings and lending, and literacy activities.

The common goal across the three DFAP activities is that food insecurity and malnutrition will be reduced among poor, vulnerable households in rural Niger. The working hypothesis is that if the nutritional status of pregnant and lactating women and children under five is improved [Strategic Objective (SO) 1], access to food by vulnerable households is increased (SO 2), vulnerability to food security shocks is decreased and community resilience is increased (SO 3), and the status of women is improved (SO 4), then decreases in food insecurity and malnutrition among poor households should be achieved. The hypothesis stresses the close interrelationship between malnutrition and food insecurity, and the important and necessary participation of women in reaching the overall goal. Additional detail about the Results Frameworks of the three IPs is presented in Annex I.
EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following are the principal evaluation questions (EQs).

- **EQ 1.** To what extent have the activities of the three projects met their goals, purposes, and desired outcomes; and what factors promoted or inhibited their achievement?

- **EQ 2.** In each technical sector addressed by the projects (maternal and child health and nutrition; agriculture/livelihoods; early warning systems/disaster risk/resilience), what were the most effective and most efficient implementation methods and approaches among those selected by implementing partners (IPs)?

- **EQ 3.** Based on the evidence, what project activities and outcomes are likely to be sustained, and why?

- **EQ 4.** What are the positive or negative unintended consequences of each of the projects, if any, and how were these consequences identified and taken into account by the IPs?

- **EQ 5.** What key lessons learned and best practices should inform future projects in the country?

EVALUATION DESIGN AND LIMITATIONS

The performance evaluation was conducted by a team assembled by ME&A under the Evaluation and Learning (EVELYN) project, utilizing a mixed-methods design. It relied on a very robust database of information derived from two population-based surveys (PBSs) of households in areas supported by the three projects—a total of 7,200 households were surveyed at baseline (2013), and 5,460 households at endline (2017), distributed evenly across the three project areas— as well as extensive key informant interviews (KII s) and group discussions (GDs) conducted by the evaluation team (ET). The PBS data were utilized to derive and compare standard FFP indicators across multiple sectors from baseline to endline. The PBS data were supplemented in 2017 by GDs with 673 participants (315 men and 358 women) across 28 villages, as well as 84 KII s, conducted at the national, district, and commune levels. The ET also drew on key IP documents, monitoring information, midterm evaluations and other information from secondary sources to help interpret findings and provide support for recommendations. The mixed-methods design allowed the ET to triangulate findings from several different sources, providing strong evidence-based confirmation of findings and conclusions, while helping to mitigate the limitations of each source of data considered in isolation. Additional detail on the evaluation design is presented in Annex III.

The performance evaluation was to address the efficiency of project interventions under EQ 2—Effectiveness and Efficiency of Interventions. This analysis requires line item budget cost data per activity which was not available from the IPs. Therefore, efficiency is not addressed in this report.

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

**Overall Project Achievements:** Analysis of PBS results and supporting qualitative data from beneficiaries and key stakeholders and review of IP documentation indicates that each of the several overarching goals and outcomes across most of the associated technical sectors were met. There were some notable exceptions on the: poverty indicators; water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) indicators; and prevalence of underweight women. Across the three DFAPs, greater challenges were experienced for activities related to value chain development and other livelihoods/income-generating activities (IGAs), water infrastructure, and latrine building which were also reflected in the midterm evaluations for the projects. The water and latrine issues may contribute to the smaller or negligible gains on WASH indicators that were generally observed. The use of financial services increased during the

---

1 The difference in sample size derived from a reduction in the number of villages where implementation actually occurred, relative to what was anticipated at baseline.
project timeframe, but gains were smaller and the overall use of financial services among the populations within the project area was still relatively small at endline. Promotion of value chain activities and broader IGAs remains a challenge in all three project areas.

Substantial adoption by beneficiaries was noted in GDs and KIIs for many of the behavior changes or improved technologies that the projects sought to introduce. This included significant adoption of improved agricultural practices, use of improved seed varieties and fertilizers, and use of improved crop storage practices that were promoted through the DFAPs, and which led to a substantial increase in crop yields for many households. Together with the use of improved food storage practices, this appears to have led to greater availability of food for a longer period of time during the year for households, contributing to improved household food security. However, despite clear food security gains to project households, the baseline food security situation appears to have been sufficiently tenuous that these production and storage gains were still not sufficient by endline to carry many households through an entire year. There is fairly strong evidence of positive spillovers in agricultural practices, crop yields, and crop storage, both from direct and indirect beneficiaries within project villages, and also evidence of uptake by individuals in nearby non-project villages. As further evidence for positive spillovers, PBS analyses found improvements for both direct and indirect beneficiaries on most of the indicators, across sectors.

Analyses of outcomes for the poorest households (below the daily per capita poverty threshold of $1.25 per day) relative to the rest showed that, while the poorest households did have lower values compared to other households on several indicators at endline, they experienced significant improvements on most indicators between baseline and endline, particularly on food security, agriculture, women’s dietary diversity score (WDDS), and children’s malnutrition indicators. Project beneficiaries generally felt that the poorest households did receive project benefits. However, inequitable selection of households for different project activities was also reported, often tied to village governance dynamics and beneficiary selection processes.

**Effectiveness of Interventions:** Several strengths were identified in GDs and KIIs in terms of overall implementation approaches, and effective approaches to project management, communications, and collaboration taken by each of the three DFAPs. These included the social behavior change communication approaches used by the projects, in addition to the gendered peer educator group models used to elicit peer-to-peer learning. Projects were also found to have effective communications, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, and collaboration with the Government of Niger (GON) at the national level and with designated focal points within each technical sector at regional and department levels.

Several effective implementation approaches were identified across the three DFAPs. Improved seeds and conservation agriculture (CA) were both widely adopted across the three DFAPs and were associated with significant yield increases of rainfed crops. Project examples of public-private partnership (PPP) approaches to scale up and improve seed distribution proved highly effective as promising models for improved seed varietal multiplication and distribution, with potential for scale up and replication beyond the DFAP target zones. In addition, dry season gardens were promoted by all three DFAPs; however, evidence suggests that this activity tends to have a positive impact on income and seasonal migration only when combined with adequate capital investments in water supply and inputs and effective market linkages. Key challenges to implementation approaches included personnel management, especially related to recruitment and retention of female project staff and community volunteers, and staff turnover in general. Issues of effective communication and coordination of technical staff across technical sectors were also noted.

In general, beneficiaries reported being satisfied with the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and suitability of the services introduced by the three DFAPs. Respondents felt that they had received sufficient training and know-how in all project activities. There were some beneficiaries, however, who expressed
some specific concerns were expressed about the quality of service across all three DFAPs, including: mismatch between community needs and priorities and project services; inadequate project approaches and support to link producers to markets; and problems with credit provision in savings and loan groups, particularly during periods of acute need for cash such as the hunger season. In a few cases, beneficiaries also questioned the suitability of certain WASH activities planned by the IP.

Activities that were reported to have had more varying effectiveness included: bio-reclamation of degraded lands (BDL); latrine construction; and implementation of Village Savings and Loan Activities (VSLAs)/IGAs. Beneficiaries’ perceptions of the targeting approaches used by the three DFAPs were generally positive. They generally reported that benefits were either equitably and fairly distributed among community members, including the poor, or unequally distributed for certain activities, in the sense that special selection criteria—including need, capacity, and commitment—were used in many instances according to the type of activity being implemented.

**Sustainability of Outcomes:** GD and KII results strongly suggested that many of the activities and new practices promoted by the projects have been widely adopted by participants across most of the technical sectors. Several positive spillover effects on indirect beneficiaries were observed through both the PBS and the qualitative data, providing additional evidence for sustainability of several project activities beyond the project lifetime. Examples include adoption of maternal and child health and nutrition (MCHN) and WASH behavioral practices such as exclusive breastfeeding, supplemental feeding with nutritious local food sources, particularly infant porridges, and handwashing. On the other hand, KIIIs with commune-level government and technical staff within the project-related sectors indicated that linkages among their offices had been limited.

In the MCHN and WASH technical areas, it appeared from GDs and KIIIs that beneficiaries were likely to continue practices related to hygiene, sanitation, and health, such as exclusive breastfeeding and regular health center consultations for pregnant women. Construction of latrines appeared to have low post-project sustainability, due to high cost and technical challenges for beneficiaries. Water infrastructure updates also presented challenges beyond the projects’ expected end dates, due to costs of setup and maintenance. In agriculture and livelihood technical areas, beneficiaries appeared highly likely to continue the improved agricultural practices and crop storage techniques they learned through the DFAPs. Some of the beneficial practices promoted by the projects appeared most likely to be sustained after project lifetime by those who could afford to pay for them. This included some of the most important services provided by the projects and those for which participants expressed the greatest motivation and hope to pursue.

Practices that yielded noticeable positive results quickly were the ones that beneficiaries most commonly cited as ones they will continue to perform beyond the lifetime of the project. PBS and qualitative results both suggest high variability in the success of IGAs and livelihood changes, and indicate that widespread economic improvements have not yet been achieved. This may constitute a key unrealized piece of the theory of change that is likely to affect sustainability of certain outcomes after project end.

**Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned:** Positive and negative unintended and unanticipated consequences were identified across all three projects. Key positive unanticipated consequences are crop productivity beyond beneficiary and IP staff expectations, and the unanticipated positive effect of some group activities on social capital, including through women’s market gardens, early childhood development centers, VSLA/Savings and Internal Lending Committee (SILC) activities, and cooking demonstrations in strengthening group and community bonds within as well as among neighboring communities. A notable positive spillover effect suggested by GD results was the adoption of some project activities by individuals and households from surrounding non-project villages. Examples of these included adoption of MCHN and WASH behavioral practices such as exclusive breastfeeding, supplemental feeding with nutritious local food sources, particularly in infant porridges, and
handwashing. While farming methods are more difficult to master, some GD respondents mentioned neighboring farmers from non-project villages coming to visit some group trainings or individual lead farmer fields to observe conservation agricultural practices, which they then adopted in their own fields.

Key negative unanticipated consequences included the low uptake of Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS)/latrine activities, lower than anticipated effectiveness on value chain and market linkages, and perceived inequities and dislike of food for work (FFW) activities.

**KEY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The table on the following pages summarizes some of the evaluation’s key conclusions and the actionable recommendations deriving from them.
### Overall Program Design

**Program Coverage**

The current FFP implementation model in Niger emphasizes breadth over depth in terms of project coverage and benefits received by households within a given project village. This approach may spread benefits too thinly across households within a village to elicit significant progress on longer-term outcomes, including income generation and livelihoods change. Future project design may consider the potential gains associated with an implementation model that aims for fewer activities and more direct beneficiaries per activity within a given community, which may in turn increase the marginal impact per household and likelihood for sustained gains across all households in a community.

**Training/Capacity Building**

GD and KII respondents cited a need for refresher trainings during project implementation and ongoing support in building knowledge and technical capacities, particularly for new activities or activities that require more frequent immersion and practice to master well. Future efforts in project training and capacity building should introduce periodic refresher courses or advanced technical sessions so that beneficiaries and staff can achieve full mastery of specific skill sets and remain motivated and engaged in progressively assuming ownership of project objectives, results, and outcomes.

### Sector-Specific: MCHN and WASH

**MCHN – Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC)**

There has been widespread knowledge-sharing and uptake among direct beneficiaries of improved MCHN practices (e.g., infant feeding, exclusive breastfeeding, preparation of nutritious foods, pre-natal healthcare visits) as a result of effective community mobilization by peer educator/caregiver groups (lead mother and husband groups). GD beneficiaries reported they are likely to continue practices related to health such as exclusive breastfeeding and regular health center consultations for pregnant women. This finding supports the conclusion that the SBCC approach to improving health and nutrition outcomes for children and pregnant and lactating women (PLW) is effective. FFP should consider replicating and expanding the SBCC model on MCHN interventions that emphasizes gender segregated caregiver/peer educator groups promoting positive health, nutrition, and hygiene outcomes in future DFAPs in Niger. The approach using volunteer lead mothers and husbands should be carefully reviewed to ensure that incentives such as quarterly or semi-annual, updated technical training modules are built into the design of MCHN messaging strategies. Furthermore, key MCHN indicators should be rigorously monitored to better understand the impact on mother and child health and nutrition. For example, the Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) should be closely monitored for measurement of impact of food rations as well as nutritious crops (vegetables) being grown to improve MCHN.

**Water User Groups and Cost Recovery**

Findings highlight that the user group model for WASH investments in communities (such as community wells) involving fee-for-service water use appears to be working and should be continued as qualitative data suggest that household access to and availability of water has generally improved in the project villages. The private sector model of cost recovery of water user fees for WASH investments, in particular, appears to have been successful. FFP should consider further exploration and expansion of the private-sector model of cost recovery of water user fees for WASH investments in infrastructure management, repair, and maintenance to ensure the longevity and sustainability of water resource investments over time.
### Community Led Total Sanitation

Barriers to uptake of improved latrines involve multiple factors, the most important of which are the high cost of materials or wage labor required to build latrines, such that only the wealthiest households have the means to afford this, as well as engineering challenges with latrine pit stability. The current one-size-fits all, top down service model is lacking in creativity and based upon a supply- rather than demand-oriented model. Despite some modest gains in raising awareness about the connection between health and adoption of the CLTS approach, significant progress in the uptake of latrines has not been achieved.

FFP should explore innovative approaches to sanitation markets with a focus on demand-driven solutions that allow for client choice among a range of latrine models that best fit the financial and personal preferences of the household. This may require more creative financing models that directly link VSLA/SILC IGA groups to demand-driven sanitation markets in which customer preferences and other household features are factored into product design and service delivery.

### Sector-Specific: Agriculture and Livelihoods

#### Agricultural Practices, Crop Productivity, and Crop Storage

Findings demonstrate strong uptake and spillover of improved conservation agricultural practices, crop productivity, and crop storage, with positive impacts on food security.

The package of CA techniques, improved seed varieties, and effective service delivery models (Farmer Field School, Participatory Varietal Selection) should be closely reviewed for potential scale up in future DFSA design. To better understand how crop production and consumption are affecting targeted outcomes, FFP may also consider measuring the proportion of household food production consumed at home as part of the PBS survey protocol.

#### Warrantage/Cereal Banks

LAHIA demonstrated the capacity of farmers to use crops as collateral to obtain loans and store crops for later market sale when prices are high at the peak of the dry hunger season. As a result, some farmers had extended household food provisioning during the lean season.

Future DFSA design should entail an in-depth examination and constraints analysis to identify barriers to implementation and actionable strategies for broader application of the warrantage model throughout new DFAP target zones.

#### Value Chain Market Linkages

Findings document the need to improve value chain linkages of market garden groups by enhancing their capacity to boost farm income through access to more high value markets locally and regionally. While beneficiaries presently receive market pricing data through project-supported mobile phones using market information system technology, there is need for more targeted support of farm producer groups such as the VSLA/SILC and market garden groups.

Further research is needed to understand the nature of market systems in Niger and identify better opportunities to integrate smallholder producers into more high value commodity value chains. Research is also needed to better understand how producer groups can be more effectively organized in production and marketing clusters to more efficiently consolidate production for collection and transport to more high value regional markets. In addition, production and marketing clusters might be organized at a commune level, to more effectively consolidate crop harvests for collection, transport, and sale in local and regional markets.

#### Subsistence to Market Graduation

While targeting of the poorest and most vulnerable households has been successful in terms of achieving increased food security, as well as for MCHN and WASH objectives, successful participation into value chain activities, and integration into local and regional markets, remains limited.

For future DFSA designs, FFP should consider a phased model of beneficiary food security activities that moves households from subsistence to market integration. The approach would first ensure that households are able to meet annual subsistence needs, then graduate them into participation in targeted value chains and integration into local and regional markets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-Private Partnerships</th>
<th>Evaluation findings suggest that the AMATE and HALAL PPP approaches to seed multiplication and distribution holds promise for scale up within and beyond the DFAP target zones.</th>
<th>Future DFSA design in Niger should leverage these highly effective models to pilot expansion of the PPP approach by facilitating horizontal market linkages and synergies among other relevant private sector actors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Access to Land</td>
<td>Evaluation findings underscore the structural barrier of women’s lack of access to land for cultivation of rainfed and garden crops. Efforts to obtain degraded parcels of land for restoration and crop/fodder production have made some modest gains but several challenges place in question the long-term sustainability of these initiatives. In addition, there are impediments to titling and access to legal contracts which are undermined by the corruption of local officials.</td>
<td>For future DFSA activities, FFP should conduct a detailed review of the key factors (sociocultural, religious, economic, environmental, institutional) constraining women’s access to land in Niger and introduce targeted interventions to remove key barriers identified. Actionable strategies are needed to make land more accessible in local settings that minimize distance and address key agricultural input impediments. Project funds may be needed for investment in land titling in more fertile areas with greater production potential such as in bottom lands for market gardening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector-Specific: Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Warning Systems and Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>Early warning systems response units [e.g., Systèmes Communautaires d’Alerte Précoce et de Réponse aux Urgences (SCAP-RU)] tasked to strengthen community resilience capacity were found to be hobbled by challenges including limited responsiveness and support from the Vulnerability Monitoring Centers (OSVs) at the commune level, a lack of budgetary commitment, or resources emanating from the national ministry level. To mitigate these issues, the IPs reported more focused training in areas such as organizational development, community development, and risk management.</td>
<td>A strategic review of the structural factors impeding progress of the SCAP-RU to work more effectively with commune and regional government authorities should be undertaken by FFP. The most effective strategy may be to introduce program advocacy efforts to support greater awareness and investment in community resiliency among government officials at national, regional, and commune levels. This may include support for improved coordination and communication between the SCAP-RU and OSV, budgetary support, and ensuring resource transfer from the national to regional and commune levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

1.1 EVALUATION BACKGROUND

In 2012, the United States Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Office of Food for Peace (FFP) awarded to a consortium of U.S. private voluntary organizations (PVOs) three five-year development food assistance programs (DFAP) in Niger. These projects include:

1. The Livelihoods, Agriculture, and Health Interventions in Action (LAHIA) project in the Maradi region, implemented by Save the Children (SC), in partnership with World Vision (WV);
2. The Programme d'Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire des Ménages (PASAM-TAI) in the Maradi and Zinder regions, implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS), in partnership with the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT); and
3. The Sawki project in the Maradi and Zinder regions, implemented by Mercy Corps (MC), in partnership with Helen Keller International (HKI) and Africare.

This report details the findings and recommendations of a performance evaluation (PE) of the three DFAPs, funded by USAID/FFP. Given that these three projects were originally projected to close out in 2017, USAID/FFP requested that a PE be undertaken in that year. The purpose of the PE was to:

- measure the performance and development outcomes of the PASAM-TAI, LAHIA, and Sawki projects; provide an evidence base for Niger DFAP effects on key objectives; and provide recommendations to FFP for the future design of Development Food Security Activities2 (DFSAs). The evaluation was conducted from March 2017 – January 2018 by Mendez England & Associates (ME&A) and its subcontractors, NORC at the University of Chicago (NORC) and ICF International (ICF) under the Evaluation and Learning Mechanism (EVELYN) project. Three field teams were assembled for the qualitative component of this work. They were led by Dr. Mamadou Baro (LAHIA evaluation lead, NORC), Dr. John Magistro (PASAM-TAI evaluation lead, NORC), and Dr. Lauren Persha (Sawki evaluation lead, NORC). The analysis of the quantitative population-based survey (PBS) data to inform the evaluation was led by Dr. Gheda Temsah (ICF International). ME&A provided logistic and quality control support.

The evaluation’s results are aimed at multiple audiences. The findings are expected to have primary accountability and learning value to USAID (FFP/Washington, USAID/Niger, FFP West Africa Regional Office, and the FFP learning network) and CRS, SC, and MC and their sub partners. Additional stakeholders include the Nigerien government officials from key collaborating ministry offices, USAID West Africa Sahel Regional Office, and the Resilience in the Sahel Enhanced (RISE) program partners. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation will be used by USAID/FFP to extract lessons learned and generate insights to inform the design of follow-on FFP activities in Niger. Evaluation recommendations and findings may also be used by FFP internally to refine DFAP proposal guidelines and project policy.

1.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The summative performance evaluation provides a substantive analysis of four key topical areas, according to the evaluation Statement of Work (Annex II).

---

2 Note that FFP changed the name of DFAPs to DFSAs.
1. Overall Project Achievements

Evaluation Question (EQ) 1. To what extent have the activities of the three projects met their goals, purposes, and desired outcomes; and what factors promoted or inhibited their achievement?

EQ 1.1 Did interventions reach the poorest individuals within the target population areas (e.g., landless, land poor, divorced, and widowed older females in female-headed households)?

EQ 1.2 Based on available evidence, what are plausible/potential pathways to achieving outcomes across a priority set of project activities selected by USAID for additional learning?

2. Effectiveness and Efficiency of Interventions

EQ 2. In each technical sector addressed by the projects [maternal and child health and nutrition (MCHN), agriculture/livelihoods, early warning systems/disaster risk/resilience], what were the most effective and most efficient implementation methods and approaches among those selected by implementing partners (IPs)?

EQ 2.1 What are the strengths of and challenges to the projects’ overall implementation approach, management, communication, and collaboration? What steps were taken by the IPs to address challenges?

EQ 2.2 Who was targeted by and benefited from each project’s intervention activities, and how effective was/were the selected targeting approach(es) in achieving its respective goals?

EQ 2.3 How are the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and suitability of the services provided by the project perceived by the beneficiaries and their communities? Are there major differences in these perceptions of service delivery across key beneficiary sub-groups, and what are reasons why?

3. Sustainability of Outcomes

EQ 3. Based on the evidence, what project activities and outcomes are likely to be sustained, and why?

EQ 3.1 What processes, systems, and institutional arrangements [especially linkages and coordination with other U.S. Government (USG) and non-USG investments] were made by the IPs or members of the target population to sustain the necessary and critical services required to achieve and sustain projects outcomes?

EQ 3.2 What is the level of motivation of the service providers to continue providing services after the project ends, and of the beneficiaries to receive and pay (or invest time) for these services?

4. Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned

EQ 4. What are the positive or negative unintended consequences of each of the projects, if any, and how were these consequences identified and taken into account by the IPs?

EQ 5. What key lessons learned and best practices should inform future projects in the country?
2. PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 COUNTRY CONTEXT

Niger is a landlocked nation of nearly 20 million inhabitants in the West African Sahel. With a land area of approximately 1,270,000 square kilometers, it is the largest West African nation. The country is one of the least developed nations in the world with a poverty rate of nearly 50 percent and an annual per capita income of $420.\(^3\) In 2016, Niger’s development status ranked next to last among 188 nations, globally.\(^4\) The country faces many development challenges characteristic of the Sahel region, one of the poorest regions in the world: environmental decline; rapid population growth; water scarcity; ineffective governance structures; high exposure to infectious diseases; poor health and nutritional status; weak market infrastructure; and low agricultural productivity and livelihood capacity. Niger’s limited development capacity is exacerbated by the vagaries of climate variability in the form of increasingly unpredictable patterns of rainfall and flooding in a region recurrently exposed to drought. Chronic water scarcity and low agricultural productivity have prompted a historical pattern of extensive labor migration of young men to Nigeria and the coastal areas of West Africa to the south, as well as to Algeria and Libya to the north.

The chronic nature of structural poverty in Niger is mirrored by a state of political instability in the country over an extended period of time. Niger has endured recurrent political crises for well over a decade, including four different regimes (two military), three coups d’etat, and recent armed rebellion movements by the Tuareg. This political instability, along with growing security challenges in the north and at the border regions in recent years, have further eroded development gains. Niger’s economic growth has been highly variable over the last decade (Figure 1), and is considered to be highly sensitive to agro-climatic, extractive industries investment, and security conditions. Agriculture and livestock account for nearly half of Niger’s gross domestic product (GDP), while total export earnings are dominated by the mining sector. Still, Niger’s economy is dominated by the informal sector, which is estimated to account for nearly 75 percent of the country’s GDP.\(^5\)

These myriad development challenges have adversely affected the food security status of Nigeriens, particularly those living in the rural areas across the vast Sahelian desert landscape. The country has experienced recurrent food crises dating back to protracted periods of drought in the 1970s and 1980s. More recently, Niger experienced extreme food shortages from 2001-2005 and in 2010-2011,\(^6\) and is considered a hotspot of food insecurity in the Sahel region.\(^7\)

Nigeriens live within a challenging Sahelian environment that is characterized by water scarcity and low annual precipitation. Communities rely heavily on rainfed agriculture and livestock rearing as their primary livelihoods. Transhumant pastoralism becomes more prominent, with less reliance on dryland farming as one moves north in the Maradi and Zinder regions. Millet and sorghum are the two primary subsistence food crops in Niger, constituting 76 and 22 percent of cereal crop production, respectively.\(^8\) Dry season irrigated vegetable production is also practiced in some communities, and sorghum and millet may be intercropped with cowpeas, groundnuts, sorrel, and okra. Horticultural crops

---


\(^5\) International Labor Organization (ILO) and Government of Nigeria (GON) 2012.
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provide both subsistence and income earnings for men's and women’s garden groups. The most common crops grown are onions, cabbages, lettuce, tomatoes, squash, sweet potatoes, and peppers.

Figure 1: GDP Growth and Inflation Rates in Niger, 2008-2015

Two key indicators of food security, the Global Food Security Index (GFSI) and the Global Hunger Index (GHI), are reflective of the food security status of Niger relative to the rest of the world. Niger’s GFSI score of 29 (0-100, 100 = best environment) is below the average of 37.4 for the Sahel region and nearly half that of the global average of 57.3. The GHI score of 33.7 (0-100, lower is better) for Niger is slightly above the regional average of 27 and nearly twice that of the global average of 17.2. USAID’s FFP Office notes that Niger has one of the highest malnutrition and mortality rates in the world. United Nations (UN) population estimates for 2010-2015 place the infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births at 66, nearly double the world average of 35. A key driver of food insecurity in Niger is its rapid population growth. At 3.8 percent, it is one of the highest worldwide, while its fertility rate is the highest in the world at 7.4 births per woman. This rapid demographic growth is characterized by a very young population, with 68.2 percent of Nigeriens under 25 years of age, and one-half of the population under 15.

Health and nutrition indicators underscore the fragile health and nutritional status of children and poor access to potable water supply. In Niger, the percentage of children under age 5 who are underweight (weight for age) is 37.9 percent, significantly higher than the regional average of 19.6 percent, and well above the global average of just under 10 percent. The percentage of children severely underweight is 13.3 percent, more than double the regional average of 5.3 percent, and nearly three times the global

---

9 The Global Food Security Index considers the core issues of affordability, availability, and quality across a set of 133 countries. The index is a dynamic quantitative and qualitative scoring model, constructed from 28 unique indicators, that measures these drivers of food security across both developing and developed countries. Additional definition information is available at: http://foodsecurityindex.eu.int/Methodology
10 The Global Hunger Index is designed to capture the multidimensional nature of hunger. Scores are based on four indicators: undernourishment, child wasting, child stunting and child mortality. Additional information on the GHI, including how it is calculated, is available at: http://www.globalhungerindex.org/about/ http://www.globalhungerindex.org/
13 USAID Fact Sheet: Agriculture and Food Security in Niger. 2015.
average of 4.5 percent. Stunting (height for age) among children under 5 is 43.9 percent, above the regional average of 34.3 percent, and slightly over twice the global average of 21.3 percent. As per a recent assessment of vulnerability and resilience in Niger, carried out by MC and using data on chronic malnutrition rates as a proxy for geographical vulnerability and food insecurity, the highest rates of stunting nationally among children under 5 are found in the DFAP target zones of Maradi and Zinder (>50 percent). The prevalence of wasting among children under 5 is 18.7 percent, more than twice the regional average of 8.5 percent, and three times the global average of 6 percent.

Levels of education and gender inequities often have some bearing on one’s knowledge, awareness, decision-making, and control over critical production factors necessary to secure food in Niger. Many of Niger’s education indicators are among the lowest in Sub-Saharan Africa. The country has one of the lowest adult literacy rates (age 15+) in the world at just over 19 percent, more than three times below the regional average of 66.6 percent and four times below the global average of 83.7 percent. Youth literacy (ages 15-24) is also extremely low, at 26.6 percent. Gains in education have changed little over more than two decades, with mean years of schooling in Niger having increased by only one year from 1990 to 2015. Women’s ability to make decisions in accessing and controlling food resources, such as land, labor, and capital, are reflected in measures of gender inequality. The Gender Development Index (GDI) ranks women in Niger as among the most discriminated against in the world. The country ranked 157th out of 159 countries in the Gender Inequality Index (GII) in the 2016 United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Human Development Report. Gender inequality, when coupled with a lack of educational opportunity for women and early marriage and childbirth of adolescent girls, contributes to high population growth. These factors, which are particularly acute among young women and adolescent girls in Niger, place a heavy burden on young women to fulfill both domestic and agricultural tasks in feeding a rapidly growing population that is expected to triple by 2050.

2.2 PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The three five-year projects—LAHIA, PASAM-TAI, and Sawki—were designed to address critical problems of food insecurity, poverty, and malnutrition, as well as to increase the resiliency of communities and households in targeted areas within the Maradi and Zinder regions (Figure 2). The approach for each DFAP is quite similar, as indicated by their respective strategic objectives (Table 1), and based on the FFP strategy and Theory of Change (TOC).

Key interventions include: 1) the promotion of positive behavior in nutrition, health, hygiene, sanitation, and agriculture; 2) the involvement of women in project activities as participants and beneficiaries of anticipated outcomes; and 3) interventions to diversify livelihoods through livestock, savings and lending, and literacy activities. The resilience dimensions of the three DFAPs in Niger were designed to intersect

---

19 For wasting, a rate above 15 percent constitutes a “critical” status that should trigger a national response. WHO Crisis Classification using rates of Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) Severity Prevalence of GAM are as follows: Acceptable < 5 percent; Poor 5 – 9 percent; Serious 10 – 14 percent; Critical ≥ 15 percent. (WHO, 2003, “The Management of Nutrition in Major Emergencies”).
24 Ibid.
with and complement a larger USAID regional initiative, RISE.\textsuperscript{25} The target zones of coverage by government administrative level (region, district, commune), and number of villages and individual beneficiaries for each project are listed in Table 2.\textsuperscript{26}

**Table 1. Strategic Objectives by DFAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives by Project</th>
<th>LAHIA (SC)</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI (CRS)</th>
<th>Sawki (MC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Objective (SO) 1: Nutritional status of children under 5 years of age and pregnant and lactating women (PLW) improved</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1: Households with PLW and children under 5 have reduced chronic malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1: Reduce chronic malnutrition among PLW and children under 5 with an emphasis on children under 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2: Access to food by vulnerable households increased</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2: Vulnerable households have increased the production and consumption of food for nutrition and income</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2: Increase the local availability and households’ access to nutritious food by diversifying agricultural productivity, rural households’ income, and increasing resilience to shocks</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3: Vulnerability to food security shocks reduced</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3: Targeted communities have enhanced and protected food security</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 4: Cross-cutting: Status of women within target households and communities improved</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting Gender Objective: Gender roles expanded to enhance sustainable results</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting Intermediate Result (IR): Local government and community structures support households’ resilience to drought</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Implementing Partner Zones of Coverage, and Number of Villages and Beneficiaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Number of Villages</th>
<th>Number of Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA (SC)</td>
<td>Maradi</td>
<td>Aguie</td>
<td>Aguie, Tchadoua, Gangara</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidan Roumdji</td>
<td>Guidan Sori, Sae Saboua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASAM-TAI (CRS)</td>
<td>Maradi</td>
<td>Mayahi</td>
<td>Serkin Haoussa, Kanembakache, Mayahi</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>446,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinder</td>
<td>Kantche</td>
<td>Dan Barto, Ichirnawa, Kourni, Doungou, Yaouri, Daouche, Matameye Tsaouni, Kantche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{25} Managed by USAID’s Regional Sahel Office, RISE covers the most fragile and food insecure regions of Burkina Faso and Niger and incorporates multiple implementing mechanisms, including the FFP activities, to address the root causes of recurrent food insecurity and fragility through program interventions to increase the resilience of communities and households.

\textsuperscript{26} The three awards were scheduled to end in September 2017. FFP extended the projects until September 2018 to align them with the RISE timeline. The total awards for each DFAP, including monetization are: 1) PASAM-TAI - $39,929,100 + cost extension $4,990,000 = $44,919,100; 2) Sawki - $24,114,803 (no cost extension); and 3) LAHIA – $29,844,500 + cost extension $2,632,100 = $32,476,600. While PASAM-TAI community coverage was roughly ten times larger than that of Sawki and LAHIA, the budget was not of equivalent scale. The project was able to deploy a cluster management model with each field agent covering 10 villages, thus enabling easier access to logistics and management support through sub-regional offices at the district level with guest houses in two district headquarters. This localized management structure was very effective to manage field workers close to their cluster communities, thereby achieving results through efficiencies and economy of scale. Other cost efficiency factors included several service department positions in finance, procurement, and logistics that were cost shared with other projects. Finally, the project exercised very strict budget control measures including the use of fuel cards to manage fuel consumption and annual work plans with budgets developed by project Team Leaders who had control of their own budgeted activities, ensuring close field-level monitoring of project expenditures.

---
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2.3 DEVELOPMENT HYPOTHESES AND THEORY OF CHANGE

In FY 2014, FFP began to institute a more robust evidence-based process of program design, by requiring that IPs develop a comprehensive TOC for programming of their activities.27 While the three DFAP awards granted in 2012 preceded FFP’s new strategic framework on food security, the comparability of Results Frameworks among the three private voluntary organizations (PVOs) enables one to posit a comprehensive development hypothesis, or TOC, that reflects the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved for each implementing organization.

The common goal across the three DFAPs is that food insecurity and malnutrition will be reduced among poor, vulnerable households in rural Niger. The working hypothesis is that if the nutritional status of pregnant and lactating women and children under 5 is improved (SO 1), access to food by vulnerable households is increased (SO 2), vulnerability to food security shocks is decreased and community resilience is increased (SO 3), and the status of women is improved (SO 4), then decreases in food insecurity and malnutrition among poor households should be achieved. The hypothesis stresses

the close interrelationship between malnutrition and food insecurity, and the important and necessary participation of women in reaching the overall goal.

While the goals and strategic objectives among the three DFAPs are comparable overall, variations in approaches with respect to intermediate results and supporting activities are found in the Results Frameworks for each IP (Annex I).

2.4 BASELINE AND MIDTERM CONTEXT

A baseline study of the three DFAPs conducted between February and April 2013 highlighted the critical baseline status of households in the project areas with respect to household hunger, maternal and children’s health, nutrition, and poverty, and also provided useful data on household characteristics. The average household size across the three DFAPs was 7.2 individuals and 90 percent of households comprise a male and a female adult. Nearly 80 percent of households had at least one child between 0 and 59 months, confirming a very high population growth, and nearly 90 percent of heads-of-households had no formal education.

With regard to household hunger and food diversity, the baseline study found important variations across the three DFAPs (Table 3). Households in the regions targeted by Sawki had a lower prevalence of moderate to severe hunger and a higher dietary diversity score than in the LAHIA project area. Households in the regions targeted by LAHIA had a prevalence of moderate to severe hunger twice as high as those in the regions targeted by Sawki and a slightly lower dietary diversity score. Agricultural employment and remittances are the two key livelihoods strategies in Niger’s agro-pastoralist zone, including Maradi and Zinder, where 40 percent of the country’s food is produced. Yet, most households in Maradi, where LAHIA operates exclusively, were unable to access enough land to feed their own families; half the population was estimated to be unable to afford a balanced diet, even though sufficient food was locally available.28 The difference between DFAPs with regard to the stunting and underweight rates among children under 5 was smaller, and children in the PASAM-TAI project area had the highest baseline rates on these indicators. In general, the stunting and underweight rates measured across all three DFAPs at baseline are among the highest in West Africa and indicate widespread and extensive chronic malnutrition.

Table 3. Key Baseline Household Characteristics and Children’s Nutritional Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Household Characteristics</th>
<th>LAHIA (SC)</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI (CRS)</th>
<th>Sawki (MC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered household type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult males</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult females</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Hunger and Food Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of moderate to severe hunger</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Save the Children. 2009. Understanding Household Economy in Rural Niger. London. Note that the study, conducted in Maradi Region, considers a balanced diet to be composed of cereals, leguminous/oleaginous plants (containing oils or lipids), an animal food source, and wild fruits/leaves, and found that a balanced diet was possible through locally available food.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAHIA (SC)</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI (CRS)</th>
<th>Sawki (MC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of severe hunger</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Dietary Diversity Score</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Poverty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living on &lt;$1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Depth of Poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily per capita expenditures</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s Nutritional Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underweight prevalence (0-59 months)</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunted prevalence (0-59 months)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of minimum acceptable diet (6-23 months)</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household poverty—based on measures including the percentage of individuals living on less than $1.25/day, mean depth of poverty, and daily per capita expenditures—was high across all three DFAPs, but was especially dire for households in the regions targeted by LAHIA, whereas it was least dire among households in the regions targeted by Sawki. Reliance on cash-for-food purchases forces males to migrate for work, leaving behind women who resort to negative coping strategies to feed their children. Gender inequities and decades of political instability add to the challenge: girls and women are the most marginalized. Norms linked to land tenure, asset ownership and accumulation, early marriage and household decision-making leave women with no safety nets, skills, or economic opportunities.

Midterm evaluations of all three DFAPs were performed in late 2015 to early 2016 by three different evaluation teams (ETs). Principal findings and recommendations from those earlier reports are summarized below for each DFAP:

### 2.4.1 PASAM-TAI

#### 2.4.1.1 Key Findings

- Villagers had grasped key messages from the program and were implementing key concepts, including: the importance of handwashing; household and village hygiene; the importance of perinatal clinic consultations; and using latrines and mosquito nets.
- In contrast, villagers did not generally retain or mention simple messages nor cite obvious changes in practice in the areas of agriculture, livelihoods, and disaster management.
- While project data suggest that almost 75 percent of targeted participants can cite some of the components of the 1,000 days approach, villagers interviewed did not express an understanding that this window is critical for infant development that would mark them for life.

#### 2.4.1.2 Recommendations

- Beyond promoting behavior adoption, seek to increase villagers’ understanding of the 1,000 days approach and how critical that period is for children’s development.
- Review the registration system for food beneficiaries and develop and propagate clear guidelines at all levels after determining the extent of non-inclusion of valid beneficiaries.
- Review training materials and approaches and make more explicit the expected behaviors that will show that participants have internalized the training.

---

29 The World Bank announced a new international poverty line of $1.90 per capita per day (using 2011 purchasing power parity [PPP]) in October 2015. To facilitate comparison with the baseline poverty estimates that were produced in 2013, endline poverty estimates were calculated using the $1.25 per capita per day (using 2005 PPP).
• Ensure that the program avoids overtaxing volunteers, particularly women, due to time spent on project activities. Also, promote opportunities for communities to provide financial support to key volunteers.
• Certain program areas such as literacy or early childhood development may represent valuable innovations to a Title II program, but PASAM-TAI needs to identify which area to emphasize to have major breakthroughs due to limited resources.
• Renew efforts to strengthen partnerships with government agencies at departmental and communal level and thereby build the capacity of government and community organizations.

2.4.2 LAHIA

2.4.2.1 Key Findings
• Well-organized activities with discrete start and end points and clear participant targeting were also the most successful from the beneficiary point-of-view. These activities included: drilling wells; handing out rations; and educating people on health, nutrition, and hygiene.
• Some activities (e.g., behavior change around gender norms, cereal banks) required beneficiaries to adopt a longer-term vision, suspend their disbelief, and invest time and their meager resources to achieve the sought-after gains. However, beneficiary expectations were not effectively managed and attempts at implementing these activities were met with limited success.

2.4.2.2 Recommendations
• Invest in relationships with government and community-based organizations to foster sustainability. This includes clarifying procedures, expectations, and responsibilities with all partners and effectively propagating information through workshops and information sessions.
• Subcontract activities that fall outside of the project’s and IPs’ institutional strengths, for example, finding experienced partners to implement support activities for selected types of businesses and subcontracting agricultural extension to an organization experienced in providing practical skills to Sahelian farmers.

2.4.3 Sawki

2.4.3.1 Key Findings
• Activities noted as generating the strongest impact were: caregiver groups; irrigated community vegetable gardens; distribution of improved seed varieties and animal breeds; and bio-reclamation of degraded lands (BDL).
• Areas where results were not maximized included access to water, infrastructure, and governance. The program also initiated some activities late and had some gaps in its initial context analysis.
• Sawki was praised for developing a sense of solidarity and mutual assistance within communities.

2.4.3.2 Recommendations
• To ensure that participants in nutrition and health activities internalize messages and apply new practices, the teaching methods used should become more interactive and reflective.
• In agriculture and livelihoods, a focus on increased quality and excellence of activities must occur.
• Overall recommendations include: strengthening capacities and partnerships; continuing to focus on women; enhancing the focus on youth; and supporting good governance processes at the local level to enhance sustainability.
2.5 ENDLINE INDICATORS RELATIVE TO IP TARGET LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

To provide context for evaluation results and explanatory factors presented in ensuring chapters, key differences between endline PBS values and the endline targets set by IPs are briefly summarized here.30

2.5.1 PASAM-TAI

At endline, several indicators for the PASAM-TAI project area were in close range to the targets set by the project. However, as was the case for LAHIA and Sawki as well, the endline PBS values for some key poverty and health indicators were substantially lower than IP targets set for the PASAM-TAI project area. For example, the percentage of people living on less than $1.25 a day at endline was 13 percentage points higher than the endline target, at 58 percent. FFP health indicators that did not reach their target by endline include the percentage of households commonly using soap and water, for which the endline value is 23.1 percentage points lower than the target value of 40 percent, and the percentage of children under 5 who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks, for which the endline value is 22.2 percentage points higher than the target value of 5 percent. Targets associated with underweight children 0-59 months old and with the prevalence of underweight women of reproductive age were also not met and were off by 7.3 and 10 percentage points, respectively. Other key indicators for which the endline PBS value for PASAM-TAI diverged substantially from the IP target were:

- Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with oral rehydration therapy (ORT): the PBS value at endline was 18.1 percentage points lower than the target of 94.2 percent.
- Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD): PBS value at endline was 15.4 percentage points lower than the target.
- Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding (EBF): PBS value at endline was 21.2 percentage points lower than the target.

2.5.2 LAHIA

LAHIA met or came very close to meeting several of the target values it set for FFP poverty indicators, including the percentage of people living on less than $1.25 a day, depth of poverty, and the daily per capital expenditure. Endline PBS results showed that the project did not meet the targets set for the percentage of households with children 0-23 months using soap and water at the handwashing station (12.4 percent versus a target of 30 percent), or the percentage of children under 5 who had diarrhea (18.1 percent versus a target of 11 percent). However, endline PBS values exceeded the target for the percentage of households with moderate to severe hunger by 11.8 percentage points and met the target for the percentage of stunted children 0-59 months old. Similar to the other two projects, the endline values substantially exceeded IP targets for the percentage of: farmers who used financial services (25.3 percent versus a target of 15 percent); farmers who used three or more sustainable agriculture practices or technologies; farmers accessing inputs and services promoted by the program; and farmers using at least two improved storage techniques.

2.5.3 Sawki

Similarly, Sawki exceeded a few of the target values for FFP indicators, such as the percentage of households commonly using soap and water at a handwashing station (35.9 percent versus a target of 29.6 percent), but did not meet several others, especially those related to poverty, water, and diarrhea prevalence. For example, the percentage of people living on less than $1.25 per day was 12.2 percentage points higher at endline than the target of 40.3 percent. Similarly, the percentage of children under 5 who had diarrhea at endline was 14.2 percentage points higher than the 7.8 percent target. However,

---

30 This section highlights key differences between IP targets and endline values, where differences are sufficiently large. Statistical tests of differences are not conducted.
the project exceeded by nearly 12 percentage points its targets for the percentage of births receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy, and met its targets for the prevalence of underweight and stunted children under 5, the prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet, the prevalence of EBF, and the prevalence of underweight women of reproductive age. The project exceeded its target for the percentage of farmers who used at least two sustainable agricultural practices or technologies. The percentage of farmers practicing value chain activities promoted by the project was 9.7 percentage points lower than target.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The summative PE of the Niger DFAPs utilized a mixed-methods design that integrated data from multiple sources. The evaluation drew on data collected via a PBS to measure current status and change over time for 20 key FFP indicators and a companion qualitative data collection effort conducted at endline to provide: additional context and understanding of beneficiary perceptions of project achievements; changes in key outcomes and reasons why; and additional information from project IPs and related stakeholders on issues of project effectiveness, sustainability, unintended consequences, and lessons learned. In addition to the quantitative PBS data and primary qualitative data collected from DFAP beneficiaries and other key stakeholders, the final PE also drew on secondary data from IP performance monitoring data, key IP documents, and the midterm evaluations conducted for each of the DFAPs. The availability of pre/post quantitative data on FFP indicators substantially increased the ability for the ET to derive evidence-based findings, conclusions, and recommendations for this evaluation. The mixed-methods design also utilized qualitative data collection protocols to collect primary qualitative data from DFAP beneficiaries and other key stakeholders, and additionally drew on key IP documents, monitoring information, and midterm evaluations to help interpret findings and provide support for recommendations.

3.1 QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS: PBS

The PBS was designed to obtain measures for 20 FFP indicators related to: food access; children’s nutritional status and feeding practices; women’s nutritional status and dietary diversity (WDDS); water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH); agricultural practices; and measurements of poverty. In addition to the required FFP indicators, the PBS also included four program-specific custom indicators identified by the IPs as key measures for their individual programs. Custom indicators were added by the projects to assess: handwashing practices; use of improved varieties of macronutrient-dense foods; knowledge of importance of access to health services; and frequency of ANC visits. Custom indicators are defined in the 2013 Title II Surveys Data Treatment and Analysis Plan (DTAP). FFP indicators are defined and described in the 2015 FFP Indicator Handbook.31

The PBS at endline used the same data collection instruments,32 level of statistical precision, and the same statistical power as at baseline, and collected data on the same population-level impact and outcome indicators. Analysis of change rests on statistical tests of differences between the baseline and endline measurements. The baseline data collection for the PBS33 took place in February-March 2013, and the endline data collection was conducted in May-June 2017. The pre/post design of the quantitative component of the evaluation enables measurement of change in indicators between the baseline and

---

32 Minor updates to the household survey were made at endline to enable identification direct and indirect beneficiaries overall and by key project activities, and to provide additional information at request of FFP and partners (e.g., on cell phone use).
33 For full details of the baseline study, including PBS and qualitative results, see “Baseline Study for the Title II Development Food Assistance Projects in Niger” report. Available at: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnaed237.pdf
endline, but it does not allow inferences to be made about whether any of the observed changes were caused by the projects. In other words, attribution of changes in outcomes to the projects is not possible under this design.

The household sample at baseline and endline was based on a multi-stage clustered sample design, and the sample size was calculated to detect a 6 percentage-point change in the prevalence of stunting within each of the three DFAP projects. The baseline PBS sample, conducted across 240 villages in total, consisted of 7,200 households, with 80 villages and 2,400 households sampled in each of the three DFAP program areas. The endline sample consisted of 5,460 households surveyed across 182 villages. In total, 61 villages were sampled per project at endline (60 villages were sampled for LAHIA, the total number of villages covered by the program), and 30 households were surveyed per village. The difference in total sampled villages across baseline and endline was due to a reduction in the number of villages where implementation actually occurred, relative to what was anticipated at baseline.

Analysis of the PBS data consisted of: calculation of baseline and endline indicators (point estimates and 95 percent confidence intervals); assessments of statistically significant differences in indicators across baseline and endline values; and disaggregated analyses of differences in endline indicator estimates (and change across baseline and endline, where possible) by direct/indirect beneficiary status. Relevant sampling weights were used to represent the full target populations for all analyses, and calculated for the combined program areas and for each DFAP implementation area separately. Point estimates and variance estimations took into account the design effect associated with the sampling design. In addition, supplemental analyses were conducted to examine if and how outcomes vary by household wealth status, and to identify key individual, household, and village-level characteristics associated with a change in the prevalence of underweight women and the prevalence of moderate to severe hunger in households, two of the key outcomes of interest for this evaluation (see Annex VI, including Sub-Annexes 6A-6F, for full methods and results).

Indicator estimates from the baseline and endline surveys were compared to assess change over time. This pre/post design allowed for the measurement of change in indicators between the baseline and endline surveys; however, the design does not allow statements to be made about attribution or causation relating to project impact. To rule out whether changes in the indicators are a result of shifts in the underlying characteristics of households that are correlated with the indicators—such as the age, sex, or level of education of the household head—analyses were conducted to compare household characteristics between the baseline and endline. The objective of these analyses was to document whether there are significant differences between baseline and endline household characteristics which can be taken into consideration when interpreting indicator results.

Because the DFAPs scaled back their project areas after the baseline survey, some of the villages sampled at baseline did not receive the DFAP interventions. Therefore, baseline household characteristics and indicator estimates were compared between villages that received the DFAP interventions and those that did not to identify whether significant differences exist. If no differences were found, then the baseline sample, which included villages that eventually did not receive the DFAPs, were considered representative of the target DFAP populations at baseline.

For each project, indicator results and tests of differences in indicators between baseline and endline were examined separately for direct and indirect beneficiaries to evaluate if the effects of the project interventions “spilled over” from direct to indirect beneficiaries—as is desired. The designation of respondents and households as direct versus indirect beneficiaries was based on household respondents' answers to a set of questions about exposure to the project interventions. One respondent per household was asked, “Have you or someone from your household participated in LAHIA/PASAM-TAI/Sawki project activities?” Respondents who answered “Yes” were considered to be direct beneficiaries. Respondents who answered “No” were considered to be indirect beneficiaries. Respondents who reported they or someone in their household participated in the project were asked
about the type of assistance. Program assistance includes food rations, nutrition training or meetings, agriculture-related training or meetings, or other types of assistance. The responses were not validated by the projects so it was not possible to determine definitively that the respondents know the source of the program assistance. For this reason, among other factors, causality cannot be attributed to any of the projects. Additionally, respondents or households were likely to be recipients of more than one type of assistance so it was not possible to disentangle the effects of different types of program interventions.

Additional analyses of the PBS data were conducted to explore the effectiveness of the projects in reaching target populations – namely, the “poorest of the poor,” children under 2, and pregnant and lactating women (PLW). The baseline and endline estimates of the indicators were compared for the poor and non-poor separately to empirically test whether the two groups experienced improvement over time. Additionally, the indicator estimates at baseline and endline were compared between the poor and non-poor to explore differences between the two groups. The prevalence of underweight and wasting for children under 2 was compared between the baseline and endline. Because stunting is a measure of chronic malnutrition, the baseline and endline estimates of the prevalence of stunting were compared for children over 2, since children over 2 in the endline sample will have had longer exposure to the project interventions and changes to the prevalence of stunting for these older cohorts are more likely to be detected. WDSS was compared at baseline and endline for PLW and non-PLW separately to explore whether the two groups of women experienced change since the baseline. Comparisons of WDSS between PLW and non-PLW at baseline and endline were also conducted to determine if the two groups of women differ.

3.2 QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The qualitative component of the PE drew on three data collection methods:

- Desk review of IP quarterly and annual performance reports, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data, and relevant secondary information;
- Group discussions (GDs) conducted at endline with project beneficiaries in 8-12 villages per DFAP; and
- Key informant interviews (KIIs) conducted at village, commune, prefect, and national levels, also conducted at endline.

Qualitative data collection utilized purposive sampling and semi-structured GD and KII protocols. The qualitative fieldwork for the endline PE was conducted between June and July 2017. Full quantitative results were not available in time to fully inform the design of the qualitative instruments (such as for the poverty indicators), which limits the ability for the qualitative data collection to explain some of the quantitative results. However, some preliminary results from the PBS were available during qualitative data collection (for example with respect to the diarrhea indicators), and those findings were used to help direct follow-up probing on those issues.

3.2.1 Group Discussions

The ETs conducted 56 GDs at endline, consisting of two gender-segregated GDs per sampled village across 28 villages (8 villages each for Sawki and LAHIA, and 12 villages for PASAM-TAI). GDs comprised 673 participants in total (315 men and 358 women). GDs were organized with the assistance of community leaders and DFAP field agents, and were comprised of a maximum of 12 participants. An English-French-Hausa speaking moderator from each ET conducted the GDs in the local language predominantly spoken in each of the DFAP implementation areas. GDs were generally held outside at common gathering areas in the respective villages. Semi-structured instruments with questions organized by evaluation theme were used to guide the discussion (see Annex V).
3.2.2 Key Informant Interviews

At endline, a total of 84 KIIs were conducted by the DFAP ETs. This includes four at the national level, 23 at the district and commune levels, and 57 at the village level. The interviews followed a semi-structured format to allow for follow-up questions and flexibility in the discussion. The KII protocol was structured to gather information on: the extent to which activities have been achieved, and on what factors promoted or inhibited project activities and outcomes; perspectives on the effectiveness of project interventions and targeted groups; quality of services provided; motivations and capacity to demand and sustain services; and the sustainability of project interventions and outcomes (see Annex V for KII protocols).

3.2.3 Village Selection for Qualitative Data Collection

Village selection for qualitative data collection was based on maximizing coverage on a range of different project activities, drawn from IP data on activity implementation by village, and maximizing variation on village distance to a regional town (within a two-hour travel time, for logistical feasibility). Village selection was stratified by commune (one village was selected from each commune to capture potential variability across different communes) and, for PASAM-TAI, the selection process also aimed to exclude villages sampled for the PBS in order to minimize respondent burden (this was not possible for LAHIA and Sawki, since the endline PBS sampled nearly all implementation villages for each of the two projects).

3.2.4 Desk Review of IP and Secondary Documentation

The purpose of the desk review of IP and available secondary documentation was to identify key findings and explanatory factors from IP reports and internal M&E data pertaining to each of the outlined EQs. Examination of key documents was also used as a source of triangulation for qualitative data provided by project beneficiaries and KIIs or to help interpret or provide explanatory context for both PBS and qualitative results.

3.2.5 Qualitative Data Analysis

GDs were recorded, with consent from participants, and transcribed from Hausa to French. Transcribed GD data and detailed GD notes were then coded in NVivo according to a pre-defined codebook coding text segments according to key themes of interest for the EQs. KII notes were summarized using standard content analysis techniques. For both KIIs and GD data, analyses summarized common trends and patterns to highlight project-, sector-, and gender-differentiated trends, and to identify examples of positive deviance and most significant change.

3.3 EVALUATION LIMITATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

3.3.1 Lack of Valid Counterfactual for Quantitative PBSs

The pre/post quantitative design without a valid counterfactual at both time points cannot definitively attribute changes in program indicators to the DFAPs. However, companion qualitative data collection at endline aims to: help corroborate the PBS-based results; capture information on potential confounders; and understand beneficiary perceptions on if and how project activities helped to elicit change in key outcomes. As one example of potential confounders, it is noted that other donors that are active in the livelihoods, WASH, and/or the MCHN space were present in each of the project areas prior to DFAP award initiation, which could have had varying contributions to baseline levels of FFP indicators and also influenced trajectories on such indicators during the DFAP lifetime.

3.3.2 Reduction in Total Number of Implementation Villages Between Baseline and Endline PBSs

Because the DFAPs scaled back their project areas after the baseline survey, some of the villages sampled at baseline did not receive the DFAP interventions. This resulted in a smaller number of villages...
sampled for the PBS at endline. The reduction in implementation villages resulted from resource constraints, although clear criteria for the de-selection of villages for implementation were not available to the ETs. The change in the endline household and village sample could have an effect on the analysis of change in indicators from baseline to endline if there are systematic differences in factors related to the impact and outcome measures between the sampled villages where the program was implemented and those where program implementation did not occur. To address this concern, the endline PBS analyses tested for differences in key individual and household demographic characteristics across the baseline and endline village samples, and found no substantial differences (see Annex VI, Sub-Annex B, Tables 6.2-6.4). This means that the baseline sample, which includes villages that eventually did not receive the DFAPs, can be considered representative of the target DFAP populations at baseline. In general, households in villages that eventually received the DFAP and those that did not receive the DFAP are similar with respect to household characteristics at baseline (average household size, average age of household head, average age of primary caretakers for children under 5, percentage of households with women 15-49 years, percentage of households with currently married women 15-49 years, percentage of households with children 0-59 months, percentage of households with children 6-23 months, percentage of households with children 0-5 months). A few differences were observed, in the PASAM-TAI project area only, on highest level of education by female household members (lower in villages that received the DFAP), average household size (lower in villages that received the DFAP), and average age of household head. No differences were noted in the LAHIA or Sawki project areas (see Annex VI, Sub-Annex B, for additional results).

3.3.3 Difference in Seasonal Timing of Data Collection between Baseline and Endline PBSs

The baseline data collection for the PBS took place in March, while the endline household survey was conducted in May. It is possible that this difference in seasonality across the two rounds of data collection could contribute to differences in some of the indicator estimates. In terms of a typical seasonal calendar, March is generally a post-harvest month in which it is not uncommon for seasonal migrants to have migrated out of villages to seek wage work. In May, farmers begin land preparation in anticipation of the rainy season and planting and this is typically a lean season for pastoralists (note, however, that the lean season for farmers generally occurs somewhat later in the year, starting in mid-June; see Figure 3). In particular, dietary diversity, prevalence of household hunger, and prevalence of diarrhea indicators may be more sensitive to this difference. Note that the rainy season in Niger typically occurs between the months of June and September, and this may partially explain the increase in diarrhea between the baseline and endline survey.

3.3.4 Recall Bias in Qualitative Data Collection

Some evaluation topics, such as perceptions about the beneficiary selection processes that occurred early in program implementation, may be difficult for respondents to remember accurately as time passes. Careful construction of question wording on interview guides, probing for clarification, and triangulation across GDs and KIIIs were used to mitigate the potential for recall bias to influence results. PE teams had little indication of serious issues related to this during the qualitative data collection.

3.3.5 Selection Bias for Qualitative Data Collection

For the qualitative component of the PE, village selection was purposive, stratified by commune, and aimed to maximize coverage on the breadth of project activities in selected villages while including
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34 The fieldwork for the baseline survey took place between February 26 and March 30 and revisits for incomplete surveys occurred April 14-17. The data collection for the endline survey started on April 30 and ended on May 29.
35 Non-nutrition indicators that may be affected are HHS, HDDS, WDDS, MAD, and children’s diarrhea. For agricultural indicators, because the main harvest season preceded both surveys, there is unlikely to be a seasonal influence.
villages across a range of accessibility from either Maradi or Zinder regional towns (based on distance from regional town in kilometers and total travel time). Village selection for the qualitative data collection aimed for representativeness to the extent possible, but it is noted that purposive qualitative data collection is inherently non-representative. Moreover, respondents who participated in GDs and were willing to share their views may not be representative of all project participants, or may be different in key observable or unobservable ways. The ET sought to mitigate the potential for biased results by recruiting respondents with a range of experiences and beneficiary roles for the qualitative data collection, and also by triangulating information across different types of project beneficiaries and stakeholders.

Figure 3. Niger Seasonal Calendar (Typical Year)

(Source: Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), accessed at: [http://www.fews.net/west-africa/niger](http://www.fews.net/west-africa/niger))

4. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 EQ 1: OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS: TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE THREE PROJECTS MET THEIR GOALS, PURPOSES, AND DESIRED OUTCOMES; AND WHAT FACTORS PROMOTED OR INHIBITED THEIR ACHIEVEMENT?

FINDINGS

4.1.1 Integrated Quantitative and Qualitative Findings by Sector: Project Achievements and Key Factors, Overall and by Subgroups

Statistical tests of differences between the PBS endline and baseline results suggest substantial improvements in intermediate steps in the TOC pathway in all three DFAP areas. These include positive improvements on all agricultural indicators, the household dietary diversity score (HDDS), and WDDS. PBS results also show positive change in impact-level indicators, including improvement in the nutritional status of children under 5 years of age across all three project areas. The percentage of children 6-23 months of age who receive a MAD also improved. However, the percentage of underweight, stunted, and wasted children in the project areas still remains high at endline.

---

36 See Annex VI, including Sub-Annexes 6A-6F, for baseline and endline PBS estimates, raw differences, and statistical tests of difference.
The PBS results demonstrate little to no change in the project areas on some key indicators or variable improvements across the projects. This is most notable for the poverty and WASH indicators and the prevalence of underweight women, EBF, and diarrhea for children under the age of 5. For example, improvements were seen for LAHIA project areas on poverty indicators, use of sanitation facilities, and EBF while little change was observed in the other project areas. Improvements were seen for Sawki project areas on households with soap and water at handwashing stations and on prevalence of underweight women.

Analysis of differences in outcomes for direct and indirect project beneficiaries suggests that both types of beneficiaries experienced improvements during the project time frame. For some indicators, the improvement for direct beneficiaries was greater than for indirect beneficiaries in all three project areas. This was the case for the use of financial services, WDDS, and knowledge of the importance of access to health services. In the PASAM-TAI and Sawki project areas, direct beneficiaries also had greater gains than indirect beneficiaries on HDDS and the use of sustainable agricultural practices. Overall, the results provide evidence for positive project spillover effects to indirect beneficiaries within project villages.

Analyses of differences for the poorest households relative to other households indicate that although the non-poor were better off at endline than the poorest households on several indicators, the poor did experience significant improvements since baseline, particularly for the food security, WDDS, and children’s malnutrition indicators.

The combined quantitative and qualitative results by broad technical sector are elaborated below. Each section by technical sector includes a summary of the qualitative evidence base to help interpret the PBS findings and summarizes findings for the overarching EQ and two sub-questions on population sub-groups (poorest households related to others) and plausible factors to help explain pathways to outcomes. Where possible, project- or gender-differentiated results are also highlighted, as are any notable external factors that could also be associated with the observed changes. The report begins with the agricultural and WASH results, which are primarily outcome-level indicators, followed by the impact-level food security results. It then moves to women and children’s health and nutrition impacts, and overarching poverty impacts.

Agriculture

The PBS results suggest substantial improvements on all agricultural indicators during the project lifetime, in each of the DFAP areas (Figure 4). The percentage of farmers utilizing the given practice or service more than doubled for several of these indicators—including for the percentage of farmers who used financial services, improved storage practices, or at least three sustainable agricultural practices in the 12 months prior to survey and the percentage of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient dense foods. Direct and indirect beneficiaries both experienced substantial improvements. As one would expect given program targeting, gains were generally greater for direct beneficiaries (Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6A, including Tables 6.5-6.7). Positive gains were also generally observed for both male and female farmers. However, despite the substantial increase in the percentage of farmers who used financial services during the project timeframe, the overall percentage of the

37 The designation of respondents and households as direct versus indirect beneficiaries is based on household respondents' answers to a set of questions about exposure to the project interventions on the PBS household survey. One respondent per household was asked “Have you or someone from your household participated in LAHIA/PASAM-TAI/Sawki project activities?” Those who answered “No” are considered to be indirect beneficiaries. See Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6A for raw differences and statistical tests of endline differences between direct and indirect beneficiaries.

38 See section 3.1 for a description of how respondents were categorized as direct or indirect beneficiaries, and note this is a proxy measure.

39 Poorest households are defined as living below the US$ 1.25 daily per capita threshold in constant 2010 USD.

40 Defined as living above the $1.25 daily per capita threshold in constant 2010 USD.

41 See full results in Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6C.
sample who use financial services at endline still remains fairly low (25 percent for LAHIA, 17 percent for PASAM-TAI, and 17 percent for Sawki project areas).

**Figure 4. Endline to Baseline Change on Agricultural Indicators, by Project**

![Graph showing endline to baseline change on agricultural indicators by project group.](image)

(Data Source: Niger Baseline and Endline PBS; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001)

Group discussions with project beneficiaries across the three DFAPs corroborated the positive changes in agricultural practices observed in the PBS results and illustrated how uptake of these practices has led to increased production and food availability for beneficiary households. GD participants strongly emphasized the importance of the agricultural and livestock knowledge and trainings they received, as well as the benefits they experienced from increased access to key agricultural inputs, primarily the improved seed varieties\(^{42}\) and chemical fertilizers that were provided by each of the three projects.

There was widespread agreement from project beneficiaries across the DFAPs that the combined agricultural knowledge they learned directly through farmer field schools, via observation of demonstration plots or through interactions with lead farmers, together with the use of improved seed varieties and chemical fertilizers had enabled them to double or triple their yields of millet and other staple crops. GD respondents also pointed to the improvements in crop storage practices they learned through the projects, such as the use of Purdue Improved Crop Storage (PICS) sacks, which they said had enabled staple grains and cowpeas to remain edible for several more months per year. Increased crop production was highlighted in 15 of 28 associated GDs held across the DFAPs while increased duration of food availability was noted in 11 of 28 GDs. As a knock-on effect, beneficiaries in some GDs noted that their improved crop storage abilities allowed them to store and strategically sell some of their stock when market prices rose, rather than selling at low prices as they had in the past.

GDs also provided additional insights, from the perspectives of beneficiaries, on how project activities helped them to achieve agricultural, food, and livelihoods improvements. For men, an increase in agricultural production was the most commonly noted major achievement that beneficiaries mentioned

---

\(^{42}\) For example, the projects introduced an improved variety of millet that matures in 70 rather than 120 days.
as a result of the project. Men also commonly mentioned an increase in the duration of food stocks, benefits received from improved seeds, and improved diet or nutritional diversity. Women highlighted a similar set of important changes as a result of project activities, but they also emphasized improved income or livelihoods more than men did. Overall, there were few differences in male and female beneficiary responses and response trends were similar across the three DFAPs.

Despite these achievements, GD participants across the DFAPs also reported several remaining challenges on agriculture, food, and livelihoods issues. Respondents in 7 of 28 GDs across the DFAPs highlighted that, even with substantial yield improvements, the amount of food produced by many households was still not sufficient to feed the household throughout the entire year. Insufficient financial resources were noted as a challenge to achieving greater improvements in 11 of 28 associated GDs. Women particularly highlighted insufficient financial resources to purchase improved seed varieties or chemical fertilizers. Persisting challenges were also noted for access to sufficient water and land, and for maintenance of water infrastructure and milling or other processing machines provided to villages. Respondents across the DFAPs mentioned concerns about continued access to improved seeds and fertilizers, water and farming inputs required for off-season market gardening, challenges with pest control, and varying availability of vegetables throughout the entire year.

“Before we learned these techniques, we did not exceed 25-30 bundles of millet harvested with one hectare. But today, if we practice these new methods of production, you can have at least 70-80 bundles from one hectare.” – LAHIA male beneficiary.

With respect to water constraints, beneficiaries in 9 of 28 associated GDs commented on the difficulties of off-season farming due to water scarcity and long wait times at wells. Beneficiaries across the DFAPs expressed desire for additional boreholes, foot operated pumps, rehabilitation of wells that had fallen into disrepair, or a water tower in their village.

With respect to challenges on credit access and continuing financial constraints, a LAHIA women’s GD noted that access to credit through the DFAP was an important tool for those with financial needs. However, the women also noted that while yield increases obtained through the project had motivated households to buy improved seeds, this purchase often must be made on credit and many households were still unfamiliar with how to obtain this. Warrantage practices were also viewed as beneficial, but women expressed concerns over sustained participation due to the terms of the microfinance institution. In contrast, participants in the Sawki GDs made multiple reference to the lack of access to any credit. Barriers to access included: inability to obtain the required deposit amount; difficulties making credit repayments that discouraged households from seeking credit; and other perceived risks associated with borrowing. In PASAM-TAI, women beneficiaries mentioned that revenue generated by their agricultural activities was often not enough for their daily needs. Women also said they did not feel

---

43 In one Sawki village, men estimated that 60 percent of households cannot afford to buy improved seeds or fertilizers. In another Sawki village, men estimated that 20 percent of households are able to conserve enough improved seed stock after harvest for the subsequent agricultural season. Other households still must consume all of their seed stock before the next planting season, due to food shortages, and require subsidized distributions or credit to buy improved seeds for the next year.

44 For example, Sawki men’s and women’s GDs mentioned machines to grind millet and process poultry feed could not be repaired in the village when they broke down.

45 Most notably in LAHIA women’s GDs.

46 Warrantage describes the inventory credit system (normally called the warehouse receipt system). This means granting credit with grain as collateral in secure warehouses where a third independent party holds the collateral on behalf of both the creditor and the debtor.

47 In LAHIA GDs, there were multiple mentions of long delays in receiving payment through the warrantage system.

48 In Sawki, this was mentioned in 6 of the 8 associated GDs, while highlighted in only 2 of 8 LAHIA GDs by comparison.
they were sufficiently organized to profit substantially from the sale of their market garden harvest, and felt that credit repayment terms contributed to lower profits.

**WASH**

PBS results show an increase in the use of improved sanitation facilities in the LAHIA project area, and no change on this indicator in the other two project areas (see Figure 5). With respect to the percentage of households with a handwashing station with water and soap, improvements were observed in the Sawki project area (see Figure 6) for both direct and indirect beneficiaries. Improvements in knowledge of three of the five critical moments for handwashing were also observed for both direct and indirect beneficiaries for two of the project areas. This knowledge increased from 8.2 percent to 14.9 percent (p<0.01) of households for the LAHIA project areas, and from 6.6 percent to 12.1 percent (p<0.01) of households in the Sawki project area. For PASAM-TAI, no change was observed across baseline and endline at 8.6 percent and 6.8 percent of households, respectively.

Qualitative data on WASH from project beneficiaries across the DFAPs corroborated a moderate increase in improved sanitation facilities in villages due to project latrine building activities and also provided insights into the substantial financial and engineering difficulties associated with latrine construction that served as barriers to wider uptake.

**Figure 5. Percentage of Households Using Improved Sanitation Facilities**

GDs with beneficiaries also indicated that project sensitization had been effective for increasing knowledge about the linkages between increased use of latrines rather than open defecation, handwashing prior to food preparation and after defecation, and reduced diarrhea among children and within households. In 10 of 28 associated GDs participants noted there was less open defecation in their village due to projects’ efforts on this.

---

49 WHO and UNICEF define an improved sanitation facility as one that hygienically separate human excreta from human contact. This includes pit latrines not shared with other households that have a slab or lid cover and open pit. Source: Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA III). 2015. FFP Indicators Handbook Part I: Indicators for Baseline and Final Evaluation Surveys. April 2015. Washington, DC. In the three DFAPs evaluated, this includes both cement and earthen (traditional) forms of pit latrines.

50 The stronger uptake of latrines in LAHIA is not entirely clear, and the approaches of the three IPs in addressing CLTS and ODF certification were similar. The more positive result may be due to a number of factors including the close monitoring proximity of LAHIA facilitators with strong involvement of the local government technical services, and the key role of canton chiefs from the five communes in supporting the activity. In addition, LAHIA did not promote a prescribed or imposed latrine model, allowing each household to build their latrines according to their own preferences and economic means, in compliance with CLTS standards. Source: Personal communication with LAHIA MEAL Manager, January 9, 2018.

51 For all charts in this chapter: Results shows the statistical test of differences between endline and baseline values. Data Source is Niger Baseline and Endline PBS; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. Results marked with *** are considered highly statistically significant.
For example, in PASAM-TAI project areas, women noted there was greater understanding of the role of handwashing in reducing diseases and this behavior was also now promoted among children. Similar comments were made across the GDs for all three DFAPs. In this sense, the reasons for the lack of movement on handwashing indicators observed in the PBS results are unclear and there was little indication from IP data to explain greater improvement in Sawki project areas relative to the other two.

In contrast, GDs with beneficiaries provided a much clearer understanding of barriers that contributed to only moderate improvements on the use and availability of improved sanitation facilities. Two key factors were repeatedly mentioned by beneficiaries: the high cost of materials or wage labor required to build latrines, such that only the wealthiest households have the means to afford this; and engineering challenges with latrine pit stability. With respect to the cost to build latrines, women in Sawki GDs noted that the project did not provide materials. Across all three project areas, beneficiaries mentioned that inability to afford building materials for latrines was a key factor prohibiting additional construction of latrines in the village. However, villagers said they had been effectively sensitized on the importance of eliminating open defecation and keeping latrines clean. In multiple Sawki GDs, women mentioned that keeping latrines clean had indeed resulted in their greater use.

In Sawki, male beneficiaries estimated that latrine construction costs a total of 10,000-15,000 CFA ($18-27) for each household, after receiving the starter materials from Sawki. With these fairly high costs in mind, they said that in the future an increased subsidy from Sawki would likely result in more latrines built in the community. Male beneficiaries in another Sawki village reported that at least two thirds of the houses had constructed latrines, but that the high cost and shortage of materials was the key barrier to construction for the remaining one third of households. In LAHIA, male beneficiaries generally reported a sufficient number of latrines in their villages, but noted limited access to cement and without its use to line the pits, the latrines collapse. In PASAM-TAI, male beneficiaries in one village estimated that only 20 percent of houses in the village have latrines. It was also related that in some cases further expansion did not occur because project staff had reduced the cement allocation or subsidy for latrine construction.

52 This appears to be due to unstable soils that cause latrine pits to collapse during rains unless they are sufficiently lined.
53 Note this is in keeping with the community-led total sanitation (CLTS) design, and corroborated by IP program literature.
Food Security

PBS results demonstrate improvements in HDDS in all three project areas (Figure 7), and for both direct and indirect beneficiaries (Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6A). Improvements are also observed in the prevalence of hunger in the LAHIA project area, also for both direct and indirect beneficiaries. However, no change was observed on this in the PASAM-TAI or Sawki project areas (Figure 8).

Figure 7. Household Dietary Diversity Score
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Figure 8. Prevalence of Moderate or Severe Hunger

![Figure 8. Prevalence of Moderate or Severe Hunger](image)

Qualitative data from project beneficiaries largely corroborated the HDDS results. Across the DFAPs, GD participants conveyed that they had learned the importance of eating a variety of more nutritious foods through project trainings and had also received greater access to such food—either through direct food rations provided by the project or through the new types of vegetables they had learned to grow in market gardens established through the DFAPs. However, beneficiaries also noted they do not always have the means to access such foods throughout the entire year due to financial constraints. While vegetables are generally available during the harvest season, in the off-season they typically must be purchased in markets within or outside of villages. During such periods, only households with greater financial means are able to use scarce household resources to purchase vegetables.

With respect to PBS findings of a large decline in the prevalence of moderate or severe hunger among LAHIA households and no significant change on this in PASAM-TAI and Sawki areas, GD and KII data provided insights which corroborate that most households in the project areas still experience some lean or hunger period during the year. At the same time, there is also some indication from the GDs that this period has shortened for many households relative to the pre-project period because they: 1) experienced a substantial increase in agricultural production (see earlier discussion); and 2) learned more effective staple crop storage practices that enabled their food stocks to last for several more months each year than in the past (see previous discussion). In addition, GD participants across the project areas also noted that such storage practices, in some cases combined with the introduction of a functional warrantage system, also enabled households to hold some of their grain, beans, or onion stocks in reserve until they could take advantage of higher market prices, thus gaining additional income which they could use to purchase food when reserves run low.

Despite these clear gains to project households, in all project areas the resounding theme from beneficiaries was that, even with the large improvements in food security as a result of project activities and trainings, many households still experience food shortages for some length of time each year. In

---

54 Note that HDDS is reported on under Food Security indicators, per USAID specifications, and can also be viewed as an indicator of household socio-economic status. It is noted that HDDS is not a nutrition indicator.
other words, their highly marginal baseline food security situation was sufficiently tenuous that even a doubling or tripling of yields and 2-3+ month increase in annual food stock availability was still insufficient to carry their household through the entire year on what they produced.

**Women’s Health and Nutrition**

PBS results demonstrate an improvement in WDDS in all three project areas (Figure 9), and for both direct and indirect beneficiaries. Of the nine nutrient-rich food groups included in the WDDS, on average, women’s WDDS scores increased by one food group, moving from three food groups at baseline to four food groups at endline. An improvement in the prevalence of underweight women was observed in the Sawki project area, but there was no change in the other two project areas (Figure 10).

![Figure 9. Women’s Dietary Diversity Score](image)

![Figure 10. Prevalence of Underweight Women](image)

However, a decline in the prevalence of underweight women was also observed for direct beneficiaries of each DFAP. With respect to the percentage of births that received at least four ANC visits, improvements were observed in the PASAM-TAI (47.9 percent at baseline, and 62.1 percent at endline, *p*<0.05) and Sawki (40.9 percent at baseline, and 65.1 percent at endline, *p*<0.01) project areas, and this trend was observed for both direct and indirect beneficiaries. In LAHIA, there was no statistically significant change, with 65.9 percent of births receiving at least four ANC visits at baseline and 71.5 percent at endline. Qualitative results highlighted the importance to beneficiaries of increased MCHN knowledge due to the projects, and several resulting benefits (Figure 11). In men’s and women’s GDs across the project areas, participants emphasized that they perceived positive changes in women’s health and nutrition as a result of the project, including: increased use of health clinics for childbirth; broader benefits to women, children, and families overall due to increased birth spacing for women through the use of family planning and contraceptives; and decreased illness and improved nutrition for children. In PASAM-TAI project areas, women linked visits to the health center to easier births, and also said that such childbirth at the health center resulted in immediate breastfeeding. Across the DFAPs, there was evidence that men are beginning to see maternal and child health as a more collaborative process. Men understood that their adherence to birth spacing practices, EBF, and child nutrition are equally their responsibilities. Further, men are doing their part by supporting women in going to health centers for delivery, consultations, and pregnancy monitoring.

“By the way, we have had the same trainings and sensitizations about managing families, family planning, and plenty of other things. Thus, it can be said that the mentalities of the men and those of women too have changed. The men have understood that it is necessary to sustain a pregnant woman by giving her a rich and balanced diet. They also accompany their wives for births at the health center.” – Female PASAM-TAI beneficiary.
Across the three DFAPs, beneficiaries also noted similar persistent challenges to greater improvements in women’s health and nutrition. Key issues were insufficient financial resources to afford pay-for-service activities or benefits (such as some health center costs), a need for more refresher trainings that are accessible to a wide range of villagers in order to more strongly reinforce MCHN knowledge or practices and challenges with respect to health center staffing (Figure 12). Women highlighted that cultural norms around health center visits and family planning are generally changing, but slowly. Male GD participants noted that villages could benefit from additional sensitization on women and children’s health issues, including family planning, to help bring more reluctant households on board. In LAHIA GDs, distance to the health center was noted as a barrier to access, in some cases requiring travel of 10 kilometers.

Discussions with beneficiaries provided little additional information to corroborate or interpret the lack of change on the prevalence of underweight women in the project areas, which is somewhat counterintuitive given improvements in WDDS. However, it is also noted that while WDDS provides insights into the diversity of food consumed by women, it does not provide information on the frequency or composition of those different food groups, which can also affect a woman’s weight.

Children’s Health and Nutrition

PBS results point to significant improvement in children’s health and nutrition outcomes over the project lifetime. Notably, the prevalence of stunting was reduced by 7 percentage points in the LAHIA project area and 5 percentage points in the PASAM-TAI project area and these differences are

---

55 Specifically, beneficiaries noted that some men and women are reluctant for women to be treated by male health workers at clinics and that some health centers are only staffed for a small number of days each week. In all three areas, both men and women discussed the continued reluctance of some women to use health center services or family planning methods offered by the health center due to cultural norms and religious beliefs.
statistically significant. Stunting was not reduced in the Sawki project area\textsuperscript{56} (Figure 13). The reduction in the prevalence of underweight and wasting was statistically significant in all three project areas.\textsuperscript{57} In general, the prevalence of underweight and stunted children remains high in all three project areas despite these notable gains (endline stunting levels were at 50, 55, and 51 percent of children under 5 for LAHIA, PASAM-TAI, and Sawki areas, respectively). Improvements were observed for both boys and girls, with some exceptions.

**Figure 13. Children’s Malnutrition Indicators by Project**

The prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding significantly increased in the LAHIA project area, and had no significant change in the other two project areas (Figure 14). The prevalence of MAD for children 6-23 months increased in all three project areas (Figure 14). MAD was still fairly low at endline, but even these relatively small gains should be viewed as notable given the very low prevalence of MAD at baseline, at under 10 percent of children in each project area.

For the LAHIA program area, improvements were observed for both direct and indirect beneficiaries for all children’s health and nutrition indicators except diarrhea indicators (improvements for direct beneficiaries only). In the PASAM-TAI project areas, direct beneficiaries only improved on wasting and MAD, while indirect beneficiaries improved on all indicators except for EBF. In the Sawki project area, direct beneficiaries improved on the prevalence of underweight, wasting, EBF, and MAD. Indirect beneficiaries improved on all indicators except for EBF. The prevalence of MAD increased overall for each of the project areas, and also for direct beneficiaries in all three project areas. In the LAHIA and Sawki project areas, the prevalence of MAD also increased for indirect beneficiaries. Improvement on EBF and MAD were generally observed for boys and girls, with some exceptions.

\textsuperscript{56} The test of difference suggests that in the Sawki area, the probability of a true difference in stunting between baseline and endline in the population is very low.

\textsuperscript{57} It is noted that WHO considers wasting rates $>15\%$ an emergency situation that should trigger a national response.
It is noted that the PBS results observed an increase in the prevalence of diarrhea in the two-week period prior to the survey, for the PASAM-TAI and Sawki project areas (Figure 15). There was also no change in the use of ORT in any of the project areas. However, qualitative probing with beneficiaries in each of the three project areas did not corroborate these results. Instead, GD participants emphasized the knowledge they had gained on proper use of ORT, and felt the prevalence of diarrhea and other illness in children had declined during the project lifetime. In general, there was no evidence from the qualitative data of a perceived increase in the prevalence of diarrhea among children. For these reasons, the ET considers idiosyncratic differences in events or village conditions in the two-week period prior to the baseline and endline rounds of data collection to be a more likely explanation for the increased prevalence of diarrhea observed at endline.

Poverty

PBS results point to improvements in poverty indicators for the LAHIA project area, where both direct and indirect beneficiaries experienced an increase in daily per capita consumption expenditures and decreases in the prevalence and the mean depth of poverty (Figures 16-18). There was also an improvement in the daily per capita consumption and the prevalence of poverty in the PASAM-TAI project area, for direct beneficiaries only (note this is not observable in the overall estimate for this indicator). In contrast, no change in poverty indicators was observed for the Sawki project area.

While cautious of the complex and multi-faceted nature of poverty reduction, the ET considers that one potential contributor to these results is the apparent longer time frame and more extensive
implementation of village savings and loan associations/savings and internal lending committees (VSLAs/SILCs) and related income-generating activities (IGAs) in LAHIA relative to the other two DFAPs. IP documentation indicated that the LAHIA activities related to credit access, VSLAs/SILCs, and IGAs appeared to have been in place 1-3 years earlier than in PASAM-TAI and Sawki, where such activities generally were not fully underway until 2015 or 2016. The LAHIA activities also appeared to have involved more extensive coverage of beneficiaries in the LAHIA project area and the project had a dedicated IGA specialist. PASAM-TAI reported high numbers of members in their savings groups—over 13,700 in 2016—but given the much larger number of villages and households covered in PASAM-TAI, this translated to a smaller proportion of beneficiaries than was apparently covered by the LAHIA VSLA/SILCs. PASAM-TAI’s internal monitoring did, however, note that 45 percent of beneficiaries surveyed in 2016 reported an increase in income as a result of their participation in PASAM-TAI activities. This may help explain why results for per capita consumption were only significant for direct beneficiaries.

Figure 16. Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of People Living on Less Than $1.25/Day

Several other factors could at least partially contribute to the lack of movement on poverty indicators across the DFAPs. Staple food prices were above their five-year average in both Maradi and Zinder regions in 2017 (for example, millet prices were up by 31 percent in Maradi). Food and livestock markets in both regions were considered to have been negatively impacted in 2017 by new trade measures introduced by Nigeria as well as by insecurity along Nigerian trade routes, higher market prices in Nigeria, and the depreciation of the Nigerian currency. Overall, Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) reported that livestock and staple crop trading in Maradi and Zinder were 10-30 percent below the five-year average in 2017. The Nigerian currency devaluation was also anticipated to negatively affect incomes of Nigerien traders in Maradi and Zinder who rely on livestock or crop exports to Nigeria (FEWS NET 2017. Niger Food Security Outlook, June 2017-January 2018). Although such trading may not directly encompass a large number of DFAP villagers, it is possible that they are indirectly impacted by these broader dynamics.

GDs with project beneficiaries indicated that LAHIA participants had some variable results with savings, credit and IGA activities, but they noted that access to credit through the project had been important for helping those in need. In contrast, participants in Sawki GDs made multiple reference to the lack of access to any credit and barriers to access that included: inability to obtain the required deposit amount; difficulties making credit repayments that discouraged households from seeking credit; and other perceived risks associated with borrowing. In PASAM-TAI project areas, female beneficiaries mentioned that revenue generated by their agricultural activities was often not enough for their daily needs.

58 For 2016, LAHIA reported 8,540 VSLA members across 296 groups and average savings of $217 per group. Sawki reported 4,585 savings group members across 225 groups and $100 in savings per group, on average. Over the same period, PASAM-TAI reported 499 active SILCs for FY2016, and 11,831 active members. Average savings amounted to $169 per group (FY16 ARR).
Interpretation of the poverty indicator results must also take into account apparently different baseline poverty contexts across the three DFAP implementation areas. The baseline PBS poverty indicators suggest that the LAHIA project area was the worst off at baseline, in terms of household economic well-being, while the Sawki area was substantially better off in relative terms. The baseline prevalence of poverty in the LAHIA project areas was 75.8 percent of households, which was nearly 60 percent higher than in the Sawki area. The mean depth of poverty in LAHIA at baseline (expressed as a percentage of the poverty line) was 50 percent higher than in the PASAM-TAI area and more than 200 percent higher than in the Sawki project area. The direr baseline situation in LAHIA may suggest a somewhat greater opportunity for improvements during the project life time, bringing LAHIA area households to levels that are more similar to that of the other DFAP areas.

There is also indication of potentially varying but substantial donor activity in livelihoods and related spaces in all three projects areas at baseline, as well as during the DFAP lifetime. While a rigorous assessment of these differences and their potential impacts on DFAP poverty and other project outcomes is limited under a performance evaluation design, it is possible that differences in the nature or effectiveness of efforts across the different sets of donor activities could have contributed to the varying baseline poverty contexts, and/or their trajectories during the DFAP time frame.

For example, LAHIA IPs indicated that at least the following other donors were active in LAHIA areas at baseline: United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), CARE, Project FIDA/PPILDA (Fonds International de Développement Agricole/Projet de Promotion de l’Initiative Locale pour le Développement d’Aguié) and other SCI projects. PASAM-TAI IPs indicated at least one other donor (ACF) present at baseline, although apparently this was not the case for nine communes in Kantche department. Sawki IPs indicated at least the following donors present at baseline, though coverage appears to have varied across different villages: World Vision, Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), CRA, CARE, CPI, BEFEN, CRS, AZAFI, l’Agence Nigérienne pour la Promotion de l’ Irrigation Privee (ANPIP), Afrique verte, CISF, GOAL, RECCA, UNICEF, Al Ouma, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Family Farming Development Programme (ProDAF), and AQUADEV.
Cross-Cutting Gender Issues

PBS results on knowledge of the importance of health access by sex show that improvements for adult males and females were observed for the Sawki project area (direct and indirect beneficiaries) and for adult males in the PASAM-TAI project area (direct beneficiaries only) (Figure 19). No change was observed for LAHIA. Overall, findings suggest mixed results, noting that baseline levels were already relatively high on this in most of the project areas, except for adult males in Sawki.

Figure 19. Knowledge of Health Access Importance

In terms of gender relations, both men and women GD participants noted several important changes that they attributed to DFAP activities. Participants emphasized large improvements in husbands’ financial and emotion support for wives and increased labor contributions by men in household work. While women and men mentioned a similar set of changes, women highlighted their perceived increase in control of financial resources and having more leisure time. Men highlighted the support they learned to provide to wives, and both sets of respondents noted this as a substantial change (Figure 20).

A female Sawki beneficiary described these changes since the arrival of the project, “Before, even being pregnant did not save you from household chores but today, they [the men] save us from all the difficult work. Sometimes men go to look for wood instead of their wives or even do the laundry in their place. All things that were unimaginable before the arrival of Sawki.”

Figure 20. Perceived Changes in Gender Relations as a Result of the Project

60 Charts are based on number of coded GD segments by theme. Data source: GD data collected across all projects, July 2017.
With respect to greater support by husbands and increased financial control by women, another female Sawki beneficiary noted, “Before, they [our husbands] were reluctant and disliked the fact that we participated in the project activities. Now that they understand it is in their interest, they help us. In this case, in the domain of agriculture. Now they are more inclined to let us do business and often invest their own [finances] when we encounter some difficulties because they truly have understood that our success is theirs.”

CONCLUSIONS

4.1.2 To what extent did the projects meet their goals, purposes, and outcomes, and what were the key promoting or inhibiting factors? Overall and by sub-groups?

Analyses of PBS results and supporting qualitative data from beneficiaries and key stakeholders and review of IP documentation suggest that each of the three DFAPs met several overarching goals and outcomes across most of the associated technical sectors. There were some notable exceptions on the poverty indicators, WASH indicators, and the prevalence of underweight women. Across the three DFAPs, greater challenges were experienced for activities related to value chain development and other livelihoods/IGAs, water infrastructure, and latrine building, as was also generally reflected in midterm evaluations of the projects. The latter two issues may contribute to smaller or no gains on WASH indicators that were generally observed, while challenges with value chain development and other livelihoods and IGAs may contribute to smaller than anticipated reductions on poverty indicators. The use of financial services increased during the project time frame, but gains were smaller and the overall use of financial services among the project populations is still relatively small at endline. The promotion of value chain activities and broader IGAs remains a challenge in all three project areas.

However, the projects appear to have successfully implemented many of the midterm evaluations’ recommendations, particularly related to greater communication and internalization of behavior change and improved practices in agriculture, nutrition, and health activities. Improvements in the prevalence of underweight, wasting, and stunting for children were somewhat modest, but they were generally in the range of IP targets (less so for PASAM-TAI). Given the challenges associated with obtaining substantial impacts on stunting, the improvements are commendable.

Substantial adoption was noted for many of the behavior changes or improved technologies that the projects sought to introduce, particularly within the agricultural sector. This includes significant adoption of improved agricultural practices, use of improved seed varieties and fertilizers, and use of improved crop storage practices that were promoted through the DFAPs, and which led to a substantial increase in crop yields for many households. Together with the use of improved food storage practices, this appears to have led to greater availability of food for a longer period of time during the year for households, contributing to improved household food security. However, despite clear food security gains to project households, the highly marginal baseline food security situation appears to have been sufficiently tenuous that these production and storage gains are still not sufficient to carry many households through an entire year. There is fairly strong evidence of positive spillovers in agricultural practices, crop yields, and crop storage, both from direct to indirect beneficiaries within project villages and also by individuals in nearby non-project villages. As further evidence for positive spillovers, PBS analyses found improvements for both direct and indirect beneficiaries on most of the indicators across sectors. In some cases, gains for direct beneficiaries were greater than for indirect beneficiaries, as may be expected.

61 Examples of IGA challenges identified by GD beneficiaries include: having sufficient savings to participate in more lucrative commercial activities and value chains; access to more specialized training such as oil processing (not the case in PASAM-TAI); and a general sense that savings amounts were too low for any significant investment in more remunerative IGAs.
Did interventions reach the poorest individuals within target populations?

Targeting of beneficiaries within villages was intended to select the most vulnerable households, but typically the number of most vulnerable households in a village greatly exceeded the number of direct participant slots available for any given activity introduced by the DFAPs. Supplemental analyses of the PBS results were done to compare baseline and endline differences across the poorest households (below the daily per capita poverty threshold of $1.25 per day) and the rest (at or above the daily per capita poverty threshold of $1.25 per day). Results showed few differences on FFP indicators between the poorest and other households at baseline, although the poorest households in all three project areas did have a lower HDDS and WDDS. At endline, households at or above the daily per capita poverty threshold were better off than those below this threshold on several indicators, however for many indicators poorest households at endline had improvements relative to comparable households at baseline (see Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6C, Tables 6.8-6.11). Poorest households experienced significant improvements on most indicators between baseline and endline, particularly in food security, agriculture, WDDS, and children’s malnutrition indicators (see Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6C, Tables 6.8-6.11). In addition, qualitative data suggested that project beneficiaries generally felt that poorest households did receive project benefits and beneficiaries, village leaders, and IPs alike described clear direct beneficiary selection processes for activities within villages that were based on identification of poorest households. However, inequitable selection of households for different project activities was also reported, often tied to village governance dynamics and the beneficiary selection processes. While beneficiaries reported that the poorest households were often selected, such households also appear less likely to be able to continue some activities after the conclusion of project support, such as those which require payment to access services. Examples include purchasing fertilizer or improved seeds, paying to access village milling machines, or buying materials for latrine construction.

What were plausible pathways to select outcomes?

Supplemental quantitative analyses were undertaken to examine key household, program, and village factors associated with improvements the prevalence of moderate to severe hunger and women’s underweight. For the prevalence of moderate to severe hunger, multivariate regression results suggest that, net of other factors, the following project-promoted activities were associated with lower odds of a household experiencing hunger: use of at least one value chain activity and use of at least one improved crop storage method. The main project-promoted activity that was associated with lower odds of a woman being underweight was membership in a household that had accessed a form of credit. The multivariate regression results are described in full in Annex VI, Sub-Annex 6F, including Tables 6.23-6.26.

---

62 The nature of village governance dynamics such as the role of village elites potentially biasing the beneficiary selection process [despite the use of the Household Economy Approach (HEA) undertaken by the IPs to categorize households by socio-economic or wealth ranking at project start-up] is discussed in some detail in Section 4.2.3 of this report on beneficiary targeting. More rigorous selection of project beneficiaries based on HEA or other wealth ranking methods should be undertaken in future DFAPs in order to minimize more subjective selection bias by local community leaders.
4.2 EQ 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERVENTIONS: IN EACH TECHNICAL SECTOR ADDRESSED BY THE PROJECTS, WHAT WERE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND MOST EFFICIENT IMPLEMENTATION METHODS AND APPROACHES AMONG THOSE SELECTED BY IPS?

FINDINGS

4.2.1 Most Effective Implementation Approaches by Sector: Overall and by Project

Effective implementation approaches were comparable in most instances across LAHIA (SC), PASAM-TAI (CRS), and Sawki (MC). Approaches are defined as effective if they have reached their project objectives and achieved broad impact in improving the health, nutrition, hygiene, or food security outcomes of direct and/or indirect beneficiaries. Examples of highly effective implementation approaches are described below. These approaches also represent innovation and best practice to be considered for potential scale up in future FFP DFAPs in Niger and the Sahel region.

Agriculture

Private-Public Partnership (PPP): Two examples from PASAM-TAI and LAHIA have proven highly effective as promising models for improved seed varietal multiplication and distribution for potential scale up and replication beyond the DFAP target zone in the Maradi Region. Technical collaboration in the agricultural sector between CRS agronomic experts and field agents at the regional and community level, an international agricultural research center (ICRISAT), and a private-sector firm (AMATE) has achieved impressive expansion of seed multipliers and distributors to date. AMATE has deployed two model approaches to achieve rapid uptake of improved seed: 1) a franchise model of local seed producers in project villages who are trained by CRS field agents and AMATE agronomists and certified by the Ministry of Agriculture for high quality seed; and 2) a spoke and hub distribution model for establishing sales points in or near villages in the Maradi project zone.

The LAHIA project has collaborated with HALAL (a local private sector seed supplier) and the department administrative government agricultural services in using a village agent model to successfully link small scale producers with inputs and service suppliers and buyers to improve their access to farmer inputs, market, and services.

The AMATE model also provides a good case study in leveraging past USAID investments to achieve significant innovation and scale up in growing markets for improved seed multiplication and distribution. Success can be attributed, in part, to a previous USAID project investment, West Africa Seed Alliance (WASA), that established 10 sales points with AMATE. Distribution has now increased to 80 sales points with plans for continued market expansion into new areas.

63 The AMATE pilot activity exhibits strong features of scale up and sustainability. Seed sales distribution points have expanded from 10 to 80 since project start. The firm AMATE is confident it will continue to expand their outreach to rural farmers without USAID support. They are now assuming the costs of training and other related expenses previously assumed by the project and are scaling up the number of certified seed producers (both project beneficiaries and third-party contractors). This year, CRS seed producers will train 30 AMATE contractors, who are outside the project—these are large commercial producers with 15+ hectares, demonstrating strong spillover effect in expanding outreach to new emerging pro-poor markets of rural small hold cultivators outside the project.

64 The LAHIA approach to improved seed production and access utilizes both a Village Agent input distribution model and locally franchised cowpea seed production. Village agents receive a 10 percent commission from private input suppliers for the provision of improved seed (other than cowpeas), fungicides, and fertilizer. The project has also deployed a private sector model for cowpea value chains, partnering with a local seed supplier, HALAL, which trains community-based cowpea seed producers. HALAL provides all agricultural inputs, technical support, and monitoring to project participants and also pays fees for local registration/certification of the seed producers. In exchange, the seed producers reimburse HALAL in cowpea seed. HALAL also purchases any remaining surplus from the seed producers that is not sold locally. Scale up and sales have not achieved the levels of AMATE and GD beneficiaries in LAHIA have noted problems of availability of seed. Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report.
**Conservation Agriculture (CA) and Participatory Varietal Selection (PVS):** GD respondents in all three projects frequently noted significant yield increases of rainfed crops (millet, sorghum, cowpeas, groundnuts) due to improved seed varieties and conservation farming methods (zais/potholes, compost, micro dosage of chemical fertilizer) introduced by the projects. Agricultural intensification and higher crop yields on smaller land is highly significant in the Zinder region which has the highest population density nationally and severe land pressures.

All three projects adopted the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Farmer Field School (FFS) model in training farmers on a lead farmer communal field plot. The approach was perceived by beneficiaries as very effective since farmers could work together in groups to learn and ask questions, share knowledge, observe and practice the technical dimensions of improved farming practices, and support and motivate one another. This approach enhanced social bonding and solidarity within the beneficiary groups.

PVS, a collaborative approach used by ICRISAT and CRS, was linked to the use of seed fair vouchers to obtain preferred seed varieties by farmers. This participatory approach was perceived by PASAM-TAI GD respondents, CRS field agents, and the ICRISAT agronomic project manager to be highly effective in boosting crop yields and engaging farmers more proactively in making critical agronomic decisions of vital importance to their families’ well-being and food security.

**Livestock Para-veterinary Services**

A private sector service delivery model involving community-based para-vets (in LAHIA, Community Animal Health Workers) has been effective in providing greater access to veterinary supplies and animal medicines among livestock owners. The Government of Niger’s (GON’s) intervention strategy in animal health has been to train and install para-vets in villages to solve local issues around accessibility to and affordability of animal health services and products. Para-vets are officially linked to the Ministry of Livestock’s Service Vétérinaire Privé de Proximité (Private Veterinary Service or SVPP) providing veterinary products and husbandry services on a fee-for-service basis. This constitutes a source of income for the para-vets while expanding market outreach for the SVPPs. They have been well

---

65 GD respondents commonly described a doubling or tripling of output. Field trials of crop yields carried out by the IPs corroborate this observation. PASAM-TAI field trials conducted in 2014 and 2015 (PASAM-TAI FY15 and FY16 Quarter 1 Reports) by ICRISAT recorded the following improved crop yields using soil fertility management methods: 1,722 kg/ha for pearl millet vs. 1050 kg/ha in control fields (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y4); considering that average millet grain yield in Niger in farmer’s field is 500 kg/ha this shows the potential yield increase that can be reached with appropriate management: 1275 kg/ha for sorghum vs. 537 kg/ha in the control plot (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y3); 2500 kg/ha pod yield for groundnut vs. 1138 kg/ha in the control plot (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y4). ICRISAT has also worked with beneficiaries on improved varieties of millet, sorghum, groundnut, and cowpeas which perform better than the farmer’s variety: 25 kg/ha per 100 m2 for millet vs. 16 kg for the local variety (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y3); and 1553 kg/ha vs. 1473 kg/ha for the control plot (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y4); 1423 kg/ha for groundnut vs. 820 kg/ha for the control (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y4); 1920 kg/ha of cowpea pod vs. 1500 kg/ha for the control (ICRISAT annual report for PASAM-TAI Y4). In Sawki, Mercy Corps field agents with support from agronomic staff at the National Institute of Agronomic Research of Niger (INRAN) reported more than a two-fold increase in yields of improved millet and cowpea varieties introduced by the project. Examples using integrated Production and Protection Management (GIPP) practices include: millet yields of 881.5 kg/ha compared to 360.5 kg/ha for control plots; and cowpea yields of 586.5 kg/ha compared to 227.5kg/ha for control plots (Source: Sawki FY16 Annual Report.). In LAHIA, millet yields using a micro-dose of fertilizer and applying integrated crop production and protection management methods averaged 1,077.2 kg/ha compared to 688 kg/ha in control plots (Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report).

66 In PASAM-TAI, male respondents in particular were sometimes exuberant about how palpable the difference was in crop yields, significantly improving household food security and extending food supply into the hunger season.

67 The FAO FFS agricultural extension model, as well as PVS and seed fair vouchers are described in more detail in the report section on Beneficiary Targeting Approaches and Effectiveness – Selection Criteria.

68 Women served in leadership positions of the FFS management committees in LAHIA, making up 63 percent of the committee positions in FY17. However, only one woman has served as a lead farmer on the project through FY17. PASAM-TAI has had greater participation of women, with more than one third (39 percent) serving as lead farmers by the end of FY17, while Sawki had 40 percent of women lead farmers. Sources: Personal communications with Chiefs of Party and project managers for LAHIA, PASAM-TAI, and Sawki. January 9, 2018.
integrated in providing assistance to the VSLA/SILC groups involved in habbanaye and animal fattening and have made significant achievement and high impact for the communities and for themselves.  

**MCHN and WASH**

**Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC):** Peer and gender-based educator groups supported by an assemblage of IP technical field staff, community volunteers, and local government technical ministry staff in health, nutrition, rural engineering/hydraulics, agriculture, livestock, planning, and education were deemed highly effective overall in achieving positive behavioral outcomes in the sectors of MCHN and WASH. This included gendered caregiver groups of model mothers (Lead Mothers in Sawki, Mamans Lumière in LAHIA and PASAM-TAI) and model fathers [Husband Schools in Sawki and LAHIA, Male Learning Groups (GAH) in PASAM-TAI]. Approaches on the gendered caregiver models were similar across the three projects.

Activities implemented by the women’s and men’s caregiver groups covered a broad spectrum of health, nutrition, hygiene, and family planning practices. These included: exclusive (and immediate) breastfeeding; nutritional diversification (production and consumption); birth spacing and use of contraception; handwashing; and increased access to health clinic services (increased visits, pre-natal monitoring, assisted birthing, growth monitoring of infants, access to medications and contraceptives). The provision of food supplements for all infants under 2, using a 1,000 day approach was viewed as highly effective among GD respondents in all three projects. The approach identified as most

---

69 In Sawki, para-vets have made significant achievements and high impact for themselves and for the communities they serve in the two targeted regions. In FY17, LAHIA trained 40 community-based animal health workers (CAHWs) (12 women) and vaccinated 141,793 animals, earning an average of $35 per CAHW. Source: LAHIA FY17 Annual Report; LAHIA FY17 Quarter 3 Report. In FY17, Sawki had 39 para-vets and 44 women vaccinators of poultry providing vaccination and other husbandry services in the target zone. Para-vets treated 14,717 heads of livestock and 11,263 heads of poultry were vaccinated. Para-vets had average earnings of $18 per month. The percentage of households vaccinating their animals and paying for animal care has increased from 50 percent in 2013 to 79 percent in 2017. Source: Sawki FY17 Annual Report. In FY17, PASAM-TAI reported 73 para-vets trained by the project with average earnings of $18 per month providing animal health services. Source PASAM-TAI FY17 Annual Report.

70 SBCC is defined within a health context as “… a research-based, consultative process that uses communication to promote and facilitate behavior change and support the requisite social change for the purpose of improving health outcomes. To achieve social and behavior change, SBCC is driven by epidemiological evidence and client perspectives and needs. SBCC is guided by a comprehensive ecological theory that incorporates both individual level change and change at broader environmental and structural levels. Thus, it works at one or more levels: the behavior or action of an individual, collective actions taken by groups, social and cultural structures, and the enabling environment.” Furthermore, three core elements encompass SBCC: “Communication using channels and themes that fit a target audience’s needs and preferences. Behavior Change through efforts to make specific health actions easier, feasible, and closer to an ideal that will protect or improve health outcomes. Social Change to achieve shifts in the definition of an issue, people’s participation and engagement, policies, and gender norms and relations.” Source: Defining Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC) and Other Essential Health Communication Terms. Technical Brief. The Manoff Group (no date).

71 Across the three DFAPs, volunteer caregiver groups of lead mothers and male leaders work in close consort with trained community health staff to serve as community facilitators for SBCC through interpersonal counseling on health and nutrition, family planning (e.g., birth spacing), and hygiene activities such as the use of latrines and handwashing. These groups use a cascade group model in which 10-15 lead mothers selected by the community are trained in essential nutrition actions (ENA) and then conduct home visits to 10-15 mothers who are within the 1,000 day window, sharing appropriate key messages on ENA. In Sawki, lead mothers conduct home visits based on a traditional Hausa caregiver approach called Mu da Kanmu or “we change by ourselves.” An example of an effective integrated approach to SBCC is evident in LAHIA. Women’s and men’s caregiver groups mobilized beneficiaries for nutrition demonstrations and effectively integrated agriculture beneficiary groups who provided food from farming activities and supplies for the demonstrations. In another example, peer educator groups mobilized beneficiary spouses to visit and work closely with health center staff who recorded health data collected by targeted beneficiaries.

72 Despite this observation by GD respondents, a lack of full understanding of the approach was identified in the PASAM-TAI midterm evaluation. Measures have since been taken by the IP, most importantly reinforcing coordination with district health teams and local health workers to train and strengthen the capacity of health and nutrition team staff, partners, and lead mothers. Since FY16, CRS has also taken measures to integrate the approach into other sector activities such as SILC and adult literacy by training agriculture and livelihoods field agents and private sector service providers. These efforts have resulted in an improvement in health indicators since the midterm review. GD perceptions on improvements in child health are corroborated by PBS baseline/endline results as well as IP annual monitoring data. PBS data support the general perception of GD respondents in terms of supplemental feeding as being effective. PBS data show significant improvements in children’s nutrition and health outcomes, including statistically significant reduction in the prevalence of underweight and wasting in all three project areas. The prevalence of MAD for children 6-23 months also increased in all three project areas. See Figures 13 and 14 and associated
problematic was in Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) with a goal of achieving open defecation free (ODF) community certification. GD respondents in all three projects cited the promotion of cement latrines as too expensive to purchase for many, particularly the poorest members of the community.

Gender Dynamics

GD respondents across the three projects note a marked improvement in gender relations and positive change in men’s attitudes towards their spouses as a result of project interventions that raise men’s understanding and awareness in taking greater responsibility for the health and well-being of their wives and children. This occurs through cross-cutting project activities but is most evident in approaches to training and sensitization in the men’s peer educator groups (Husband Schools in LAHIA and Sawki, Men’s Apprenticeship Groups in PASAM-TAI).

Men and women consistently noted the positive attitudinal changes in the GD discussions. The most common observations made include:

- Accompanying their wives to visit the local health clinic for prenatal monitoring;
- Taking better care of their wives during pregnancy, providing them with more nutrient-rich foods (fruits and vegetables);
- Accompanying their wives to the health clinic during birthing to provide support;
- Helping more with water transport using carts;
- Buying soap for handwashing and improved hygiene; and
- Providing more financial support than previously.

Most importantly, men are first consulted and asked permission to have their wives participate in family planning activities in the village and at the clinics. Some women also noted that they are now being given permission to speak publicly, which was not allowed previously. There are also examples of men and women now openly sharing public space more often, strengthening social and conjugal bonds in the community, a major improvement from past practices. Most importantly, women feel their workloads are being reduced due to greater sharing of domestic chores (water, firewood) and greater

---

74 As of July 2017, CRS certification of ODF villages in their project target zone was 47 percent (461 villages, 217 certified), well above the average range of 27 percent—35 percent for Niger nationally. Source: communication with CRS WASH Regional Team Leader, Maradi, July 23, 2017. By the end of FY17, rates of ODF certification include: 1) 56.1 percent (265 of 472) of villages certified in PASAM-TAI; 2) 62.1 percent (18 of 29) of villages certified in LAHIA; and 3) 58.3 percent (14 of 24) of villages certified in Sawki. In PASAM-TAI, the maintenance rate for ODF after one year averaged 46 percent for the time period 2015-2017. A CLTS approach involves not only latrine infrastructure but community mobilization/community capacity strengthening aspects of hygiene and sanitation, including handwashing.

75 An example of cross-cutting integration of gender awareness across sector activities is illustrated in Sawki and PASAM-TAI. Sawki has adopted the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Husband School model in building awareness around ENA and the adoption of healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies (HTSP) activities by mobilizing more progressive husbands who support their wives’ reproductive health to serve as model couples who present testimonials to other community members on their approach to family planning. Key messaging among these couples is also disseminated during agriculture, literacy, and water and sanitation activities. Source: Sawki FY16 Annual Report. PASAM-TAI more recently adopted an approach in 2016, called Strengthening Marriages and Relationships Through Planning and Communication (SMART) Couple, focusing primarily on HTSP and family planning activities. Using the Harmonious Household approach, SMART Couple Schools have been organized to train couples to improve communication, joint decision-making, and planning to facilitate greater gender-equitable behaviors in the household. Village forums are organized in which couples meet to discuss various health-related household issues including natural family planning methods. PASAM-TAI FY17 Quarter 1, Quarter 2 Reports.

76 Due to the patriarchal nature of cultures in Niger and the prominent role of men in household decision-making, it is essential that men be consulted jointly with their spouses in reaching agreement on behavior change interventions, particularly around sensitive issues relating to birth spacing and approaches to contraception.
engagement of men in child care. Finally, traditional and religious male leaders have been actively engaged and integrated into SBCC behavior change activities such as family planning, health, nutrition, and hygiene in promoting gender equity and greater women’s household decision-making.

Women have also made significant strides in assuming leadership positions in their communities. Women’s participation as key officers in the village development committees (VDCs) in PASAM-TAI has increased by more than one third (see footnote 97). As of FY17, 40 percent of women are now members in the VDCs in LAHIA (LAHIA FY17 Annual Report).

Safe Space, Safe Schools, and Literacy Activities

Two specific approaches implemented by the IPs on Safe Space activities for adolescent girls and literacy activities for adolescents and adults exemplify effective cross-cutting activities that have strengthened gender relations among both adolescent girls and boys and adult men and women. Sawki’s experience in promoting Safe Space activities for adolescent girls across multiple sectors represents an innovative best practice that has been adopted by LAHIA and merits consideration for further scale up in future DFAP design. Safe Space activities emphasize discussion sessions with groups of adolescent girls that focus on key topics including: essential nutrition actions (ENAs); birth spacing; the importance of girls’ education; the consequences of early marriage; the roles and responsibilities of men and women in society; and gender roles and the division of labor between men and women at the household level. Safe Spaces provide an opportunity for girls to gain new skills, transfer skills to their friends and family, and become respected members of the community. Additional activities address professional vocational skills and entrepreneurship skills training, and small ruminant production (red goats) for income generation.77 Sawki leveraged funding from the Nike Foundation to support out-of-school girls to participate in accelerated learning centers with the goal of re-entering public school after two years through the “Safe School” program. With this program, Sawki has seen improved attitudes around girls’ education and parents making commitments to keep their girls in school and delay their marriage.

Improvements in gender relations have also been reinforced through literacy activities across the three DFAPs that have targeted women and men as well as adolescents. Curriculum on family planning, health, nutrition, WASH, and livelihoods have strengthened gender dynamics in the beneficiary communities. Approaches have varied slightly, but all have involved the creation of literacy centers staffed by local facilitators/trainers. Literacy strategy in Sawki has focused on integrating literacy training for adolescent girls through Safe Space activities that focus on reading, writing, and numeracy including curricula on health, nutrition, agriculture, and livestock management (Source: Sawki FY15, FY16 Annual Reports; FY17 Quarter 1, 2 Reports).

LAHIA’s approach to literacy involved close collaboration with Resilience and Economic Growth in the Sahel – Accelerated Growth (REGIS-AG) in promoting financial and functional business literacy for the Mata Masu Dubara (MMD)78 women’s VSLA groups involved in cowpea processing, warrantage, and habbanaye activities (Source: LAHIA Technical Proposal 2012; FY16 Annual Report).

PASAM-TAI’s literacy activities are directed toward male and female adults as well as adolescent girls and encompass the full spectrum of sector interventions, thus enhancing the impact and effectiveness of
all project activities. Adult women and adolescent girls were trained in the Cellphone-Based Alphabetization (ABC) approach with support from Tufts University (Source: FY16 Annual Report).

Social Capital

While FFP DFAPs generally promote objectives of improved health and nutritional well-being, food security, and livelihood development through IGAs, a less anticipated effect (unintended consequence) may well be an ancillary effect of enhanced group and community social solidarity through activities that are strengthening bonds and ties within and across groups organized by project activities. This observation was made in several GD sessions by both men and women respondents in PASAM-TAI project areas. They cited a positive strengthening of social bonds across activities that require mutual trust and interdependence in order to be effective. Among these include: women’s market gardens; early childhood development centers; VSLA/SILC activities in IGA; agricultural processing; habbanaye and animal fattening; cooking demonstrations for women and men; and literacy groups for both adolescent girls and adults.

The LAHIA project has introduced an approach, MMD, that mobilizes individual women’s VSLA around small business-oriented micro-projects that are promoted through FFS, cowpea processing units and value chains, habbanaye, and warrantage schemes. A positive feature of this approach has been the strengthening of social and governance capacities that have “...built up human capital (more solidarity, mutual help, ownership, membership, and self-worth) that helps members be more resilient.”

SILC groups for men and women in PASAM-TAI project areas have established two membership funds— one for loans, and one as a solidarity fund—to be used as a social safety net for emergency cash needs (funerals, health needs, repatriation, etc.). Thus, social as well as economic benefits have accrued to beneficiaries in savings and loan group activities, ultimately enhancing the social fabric and social resilience (bonding social capital) within communities. Some GD respondents in PASAM-TAI project areas also noted enhanced collaboration with neighboring communities (bridging social capital) as a result of project network activities in accessing markets and sharing experiences across health and nutrition groups.

4.2.2 EQ 2.1: What are the strengths of and challenges to the projects’ overall implementation approach, management, communication, and collaboration? What steps were taken by the IPs to address challenges?

Numerous strengths and challenges to project implementation were identified among GD respondents and IP administrative and technical field staff. In addition, department- and commune-level government stakeholders and non-governmental and private sector collaborating institutions were interviewed to better understand their views on the factors that enabled or constrained their ability to coordinate project activities in an effective manner. Key strengths and challenges in implementation approaches are described here, and actions taken by IPs to address challenges are noted.

Implementation Strengths

Several strengths were identified in terms of overall implementation and effective approaches to project management, communications and collaboration. These include:

- **SBCC approaches:** As noted above, variations on the peer educator, gendered caregiver model described for each DFAP have been identified as effective approaches to achieving positive behavior

---

change outcomes. These approaches, when combined with an array of innovative social messaging approaches deployed across the three projects, were considered as effective in building awareness around adoption of better health, nutrition, and hygiene practices. Social messaging methods included: community video projections; storytelling and skits; community radio listening clubs; community competitions and festivals; and traveling caravans.

- **Personnel management**: IP staff noted effective management and communications from across project administrative offices, from national headquarters to departmental, communal, and village level among project field staff. Close physical proximity of field agents to beneficiary communities has been instrumental in ensuring effective implementation of activities and responsiveness to the needs and concerns of project participants with capacity to make adjustments quickly as needed. In PASAM-TAI project areas, field agents resided in beneficiary communities, facilitating their local knowledge of community issues and needs. While posing some challenges in terms of staff fatigue and isolation (sometimes affecting morale and turnover), IP staff reported that the embedded nature of project field agents within the local milieu was construed as a strength overall in affecting positive change in the communities.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation**: IP M&E systems have deployed mobile phone software technology to improve monitoring capability, enabling them to implement changes in a reasonable time frame. The use of iPads by village field agents in PASAM-TAI, Open Data Kit (ODK) cellular software in Sawki, and KoBoCollect smartphone software in LAHIA has enhanced real time monitoring and data collection for field activities that are transmitted upward from communities to regional and headquarters M&E staff on a daily basis. This, along with standard practices in monthly, quarterly, and annual reporting as well as regular meetings of steering committees and quarterly and annual meetings of senior staff, has been an effective tool to ensure that the project responds and makes corrections to resolve issues. In LAHIA, upgrades in the M&E database system were made in FY 2016 that enable the project to more efficiently analyze and ensure validity of beneficiary information for all households, although the effectiveness is still to be proven. The KoBoCollect smartphone software has reduced survey costs, improved control of data consistency, and reduced time needed for data processing and analysis.

---

80 Each project uses a peer-based caregiver group model in which lead mothers, with the support of project health promoters, conduct home visits to share knowledge on a broad range of improved health, nutrition, and hygiene practices including: ENA; reproductive health; increasing the awareness of the importance of education; avoiding both early marriage and teenage pregnancy; and the importance of personal and public hygiene. In Sawki, this home-based approach draws from a traditional Hausa peer-group approach called *Mu da Kanmu* or “we change by ourselves.” Source: IP FY16 Annual Reports.

81 IP annual and quarterly reporting for each IP.

82 Source: Examples cited in IP annual reporting include: 1) PASAM-TAI – effective messaging through: malnutrition scoreboards; puppet shows, skits, and storytelling for children delivered by a local theater arts group, Réseau des partenaires des Arts Vivants (RAV); mobile video produced by a local mobile cinema organization, Cinéma Numérique Ambulant (CNA); community video on health, nutrition, and hygiene topics through collaboration with Digital Green on the Strengthening Partnerships Results and Innovations in Nutrition Globally (SPRING) project; and local listening clubs and broadcasting of health, nutrition, and hygiene topics through four local community radio stations; 2) Sawki – community radio listening clubs and broadcasting of debates on program-specific nutrition and health topics in collaboration with the Supporting Maternal and Child Health Support (SMACH) project funded by the Orange Foundation; and collaboration with Digital Green on diffusion of community videos on family planning and early marriage, agriculture-nutrition integration, and other health, nutrition, and hygiene practices; 3) LAHIA – partnership with Digital Green in the use of community video to empower mothers and communities to adopt optimal health and nutrition practices based on the 1,000 day approach and to improve inter-couple dialogue, complementary feeding, handwashing, and food storage and conservation.

83 In addition to ODK, Sawki uses an integrated Access database with detailed information on all 92,000 beneficiaries of the program.

84 The improved database system will generate reports and queries allowing administrative staff and technical managers to have a deeper, more comprehensive understanding of how multi-sector activities contribute to improved practices and behaviors in beneficiary households. Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report.
**Collaboration:** While there are several challenges with regards to establishing linkages with the government and other collaborating partners (discussed in the Implementation Challenges section below), IP staff and local government officials noted in KII meetings that the projects:

- Are generally aligned well with GON national policies on food security, health and nutrition, WASH, and agricultural development;
- Have established formal agreements with the Niger national government;
- Are able to make corrections and revisions on a quarterly basis; and
- Have dedicated government regional- and department-level designated focal points in the key technical ministries to monitor and support project activities as needed.

Each IP holds quarterly coordination meetings with stakeholders at the commune, department, and regional levels. This includes government extension and technical officers in agriculture, livestock, health, nutrition, education, hydraulics, and environment and mayors and prefects who discuss program progress towards achieving objectives, major challenges, and the planning of activities for the following quarter. In addition to quarterly coordination sessions, an M&E technical working group was established involving representatives from the three DFAPs and Resilience and Economic Growth in Sahel – Enhanced Resilience (REGIS-ER).

**Sector-Specific Approaches**

With respect to specific sectoral approaches, two of the most salient positive outcomes are:

**Agriculture:**

- **Crop productivity:** There is strong uptake of improved seed, coupled with CA practices (zaïs/potholes, compost, fertilizer micro dosing), resulting in significant yield increases (often doubling or tripling of output) of rainfed crops (millet, sorghum, cowpeas, groundnuts). Some farmers noted intensification of production on significantly smaller field plots and consumption smoothing by reducing the period of food shortage in the hunger season. As noted earlier, these production gains were achieved through the FAO FFS group demonstration approach on lead farmer communal plots, as well as the use of a more individualized cascade model approach involving PVS promoted by PASAM-TAI.

- **Market gardens:** There is evidence from PASAM-TAI that dry season garden production can have a positive impact on reducing seasonal migration and boosting income when capital investments in water supply and inputs, coupled with effective market linkages, are significant. This was not observed in Sawki and LAHIA, where market linkages and capital outlays were not as substantial. PASAM-TAI’s collaboration with REGIS-AG in developing crop value chain market linkages enabled beneficiaries in several market garden groups to achieve positive gains in the marketing

---


86 One such example is the national policy on management of mechanized systems for community water supply. In compliance with national policy, the three DFAPs have organized PPPs in which communes sub-contract the daily management of community water infrastructure with private water management companies in order to insure quality operation, maintenance, water service payment, and accountability of the community water supply system. The private company and village water user associations are under the supervision of commune government technical services and local authorities (mayor’s office). Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report.

87 The Sawki FY16 Annual Report (p. 5) notes that program progress, achievements, challenges, and solutions are discussed in order to adaptively manage activities and make project adjustments as needed. Promising practices and lessons learned are shared during these meetings and are quite valuable in ensuring “… significant transfer of information and sustainability in the final years of the program.” In addition to quarterly stakeholder meetings, the LAHIA M&E team has held task force meetings with the various government representatives.

88 These approaches are described in more detail in report section on Beneficiary Targeting Approaches and Effectiveness.
of garden crops.\textsuperscript{89} In LAHIA, production gains from homestead gardens have helped producers to cover the lean season shortage of nutritious foods for one to two additional months on average.\textsuperscript{90}

**Gender:**
- **Activity integration:** As a cross-cutting objective, a blended approach integrates awareness and messaging on gender equity across all project sector activities for men and women. GD respondents and IP staff alike cited improvements in awareness of gender equity as one of the hallmark achievements of the three projects. Women consistently noted greater support of their husbands in all sector activities. In MCHN and WASH, this includes prenatal consultation and health monitoring at village health clinics, more active participation in family planning, and labor and financial support for women’s participation in VSLA/SILC IGAs and agricultural field activities.\textsuperscript{91}

**Implementation Challenges**

A more exhaustive list of factors that hinder progress in implementing activities were identified by project beneficiaries, IP staff, and collaborating partners. Key challenges noted include:

- **Personnel management:** Several concerns were noted by IP staff. These included:
  - Problems in recruitment and retention of female IP project staff as well as community volunteers. Female field agents and community volunteers in the DFAPs are challenged by domestic obligations to their families as well as their employment or volunteer commitment to the project.
  - There is a view of a silo effect among technical specialists who are unable to transfer skills, communicate, and coordinate their work across sectors.\textsuperscript{92}
  - IP field agents, as well as government extension agents, often feel isolated in their community posts due to difference in ethnicity, language, and other cultural factors, resulting in high staff turnover.\textsuperscript{93}
  - Remuneration levels also vary among government, civil society, and other implementing organizations. Thus, problems in staff turnover and retention are commonplace.

- **Volunteering:** There were numerous expressions of concern by IP staff about the morale and sustained motivation of volunteers in the beneficiary villages in the absence of remuneration or other incentives. Many lead mothers, community health workers, village development committee

\textsuperscript{89} In PASAM-TAI a 2016 sample survey found that average income per farmer from market gardens was 76,528 FCFA or $132. The FY16 Annual Report (p. 11) concludes... “This additional income would allow a farmer to purchase 425 Kg of millet securing enough to provide a family of seven with food for two months. There are numerous anecdotal reports of men choosing not to migrate in the dry season to work instead on vegetable production.”

\textsuperscript{90} LAHIA FY16 Annual Report, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{91} In PASAM-TAI, Men’s Learning Groups have received gender training that is contributing to greater gender equality in the communities. GD female beneficiaries have noted that their husbands now accompany them for pre- and post-natal care visits, something that was unheard prior to project intervention. This is corroborated in the PASAM-TAI FY16 Annual Report. The LAHIA FY16 Annual Report notes a significant increase in membership of women in several project activity groups since FY13. Most notable improvements are in FFS participation (0 percent – 61 percent), Systèmes Communautaires d’Alerte Précoce et de Réponse aux Urgences (SCAP-RU) (0 percent – 35 percent), and Natural Resource Management Committees (0 percent – 30 percent).

\textsuperscript{92} This problem has been remedied to some extent by CRS in the PASAM-TAI project in which agriculture and livelihoods (SILC) field agents have been trained since the midterm review to integrate nutritional knowledge in their sector activities and to better link caregiver groups with SILC and agricultural group activities.

\textsuperscript{93} In PASAM-TAI, project managers have taken a more proactive approach in addressing staff turnover by screening potential candidates in anticipation of position vacancies to ensure greater staff continuity in implementing field activities. For example, the nutrition team now maintains an active waiting list of at least 10 qualified candidates who are able to fill field agent positions at short notice in order to ensure there are no further lapses in positions being filled. In addition, CRS has instituted a new rotating field agent system in which new agents will fill in during vacation leave of regular field agents.
members, and other committee members may participate in multiple activities and suffer from volunteer fatigue. Caregiver groups have inconsistent, variable levels of activity and, in one DFAP, there are problems of absenteeism due to lack of interest and seasonal migration of women.94

- **Donor coordination**: IP staff and collaborating partners noted a serious lack of donor coordination and communication, including inconsistent approaches or interpretations of metrics on health and nutrition, approaches to CLTS (such as the use of subsidies for latrine construction), and policies on per diem and remuneration of project volunteers.95

**Sector-Specific Challenges**

A number of sector-specific challenges were also raised in the GD sessions and KIIIs with IP staff and project collaborators. These include:

- **Agriculture**:
  - **BDL**: Degraded lands allocated to women farmers for restoration of poor soils have met with success in some instances.96 However, women who receive food rations to carry out heavy physical labor to build soil and water retention micro-catchments in the fields have abandoned field activities on occasion once food rations are depleted citing excessive labor burdens, long distances to walk, and the cost of transporting manure as major constraints. Some also mentioned building natural fencing was ineffective in deterring livestock from entering the fields and destroying crops.97 Also, accessing and transporting water in the dry season for small moringa and pomme de Sahel tree saplings was a major problem. Finally, women mentioned insufficient funds provided to purchase grass seed, which is necessary to provide protective cover of denuded soils and used as animal fodder after it is well established over a few years.98
  - **Gender and land tenure**: A widely recognized constraint among female farmers is access and ownership of land for cultivation. While activities such as BDL in PASAM-TAI and homestead gardens in LAHIA attempt to address the problem (with challenges noted above), GD female respondents frequently cited difficulties in accessing land plots of sufficient size to carry out cultivation needed to feed their families or market specific crops.99 Nonetheless, some gains in land access by them have been noted.100 It is also noteworthy that women’s access to garden

---

94 In PASAM-TAI, this has led to significant replacement and recruitment of new Lead Mothers since midterm review, coupled with the introduction of improved communications materials in the local language (Hausa), and more focused training. As a result, women have continued to participate in caregiver group activities after graduation from food distribution activities, thus demonstrating effectiveness and sustained motivation of participants in the strengthened caregiver groups.

95 On several occasions KII informants cited Niger government policy on the 3Ns initiative ("Les Nigériens Nourrissent les Nigériens," or "Nigeriens Feed Nigeriens") and the "commune de convergence" approach supported by UN institutions working in the project zones. Their policies on remuneration of volunteers, per diem and transport reimbursement, etc., are often higher than those of local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and international PVOs, posing problems for NGOs in retaining staff as well as their ability to work with local commune officials who may receive more resources from the UN organizations. This problem was also noted in one DFAP midterm review in which health volunteers were remunerated by other organizations, sometime undermining their performance in the project.

96 In Sawki, an evaluation of biomass accumulation due to BDL activities at nine rehabilitated sites revealed improvement in biomass accumulation from zero biomass pre-program to 251 tons of Dry Matter Biomass, an amount which can support 148 Tropical Livestock Units (TLU) for nine months. Source: Sawki FY16 Annual Report.

97 Livestock incursion, crop loss, and abandonment of BDL fields reported in PASAM-TAI FY16 Annual Report.

98 Despite such limitations, CRS documents positive results and guarded optimism about future participation of women and the potential for sustainability. A survey taken in 2016 (CRS PASAM-TAI FY16 Annual Report) notes that 68 percent of women trained in BDL continue the improved farm practices one year after the training and the end of Food for Work.

99 Women have constraints in having secure access to land, even when owned by their spouses. For example, women in the project zones commonly cultivate vandzou (Bambara nut) and groundnuts on small, degraded parcels provided by their husbands. These are generally cultivated in the evenings as their “own” fields. However, one well informed agronomic informant noted that once soil health is restored, men often recover the parcels for their own use.

100 LAHIA FY16 Annual Report, p. 20. This includes in LAHIA, a nearly three-fold increase in farm surface area through 10-year land leases (10 ha in FY15 to 28.5 ha in FY16) achieved by women in three villages in the commune of Guidan-Sori. LAHIA FY16 Annual Report, p. 20.
plots has enabled women to achieve both nutritional and economic objectives of enhancing dietary diversity through cooking demonstrations using locally grown foods while also increasing family revenue through profitable vegetable gardening.

- **CA**: The effectiveness of CA methods has been cited earlier. However, some beneficiaries also noted difficulties in mastering the techniques. Other challenges included the poorest farmers not having access to donkey carts to transport manure, or the means to buy manure.101

- **Micro-gardens**: Small household garden plots promoted by PASAM-TAI (termed “keyhole” gardens) were cited by GD beneficiaries as being too costly (up to 35,000 CFA, or $62) and often too distant from water sources, and thus were unpopular with some female respondents. This observation was also confirmed by at least one IP agronomic staff member.102

- **Input cost and access**: Access to improved seed and fertilizer, as well as cost, was frequently mentioned by both male and female farmers in the GD sessions as a major impediment to uptake of improved farming methods. They also noted sales points too distant from their village as another key constraining factor.

**WASH**

- **Latrines**: Two factors have limited the adoption of latrines in the CLTS beneficiary villages. In addition to the high costs of purchasing of cement, iron, and masonry labor as well as the physical labor of digging latrine pits, making bricks, or gathering sand and large stones, GD beneficiaries noted multiple instances of hand-dug pits collapsing as a result of heavy rains and inundations. This has posed physical risks to families and discouraged some after having invested significant time and labor in digging pits and having gathered building materials in preparation for the cementing of pit walls and the installation of latrine slabs. GD members also noted poor timing in the distribution of cement and construction materials during the rainy season,103 Another important constraint, identified in Sawki, cites the “…. on-going presence of socio-cultural barriers and taboos with respect to latrine construction and utilization, resulting in a reluctance to build and use the latrines.”104 Despite the challenges noted, some progress in the uptake of latrines has been achieved across all three DFAPs in terms of ODF certification (see footnote 76).

**MCHN**

- **Family planning**: CRS IP staff noted that donor and faith-based IP organizational approaches to family planning are not always concordant, as in the case of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the World Health Organization (WHO), and CRS. UN health organizations fund and promote modern birth control methods and contraceptive devices in village health clinics and centers in the project target zones, whereas CRS espouses modern methods of natural birth control. While beneficiaries access and practice modern contraception through the local health facilities, this has sometimes posed challenges in communities where cultural attitudes and values may not be harmonious with the promotion of modern contraceptive technology. CRS has effectively addressed this challenge through the introduction of natural birth control methods.
under their Strengthening Marriages and Relationships through Planning and Communication (SMART) Couple program in 2016. In addition to adjustments made by CRS around approaches to family planning, PASAM-TAI also decided to adjust its initial approach to the formation of husband schools and their linkage to awareness-raising activities on MCHN and WASH to be conducted through the integrated health centers (CSI). PASAM-TAI Men’s Learning Groups (GAH), the equivalent of husband schools for Sawki and LAHIA, did not take hold early on in the project due to the lack of interest among men to meet on topics they did not perceive as a priority for them. As a result, an adjustment was made to introduce the SMART Couple approach in 2016 which encompasses SBCC activities in MCHN and WASH as well.

- **Livelihoods**
  - **VSLA/SILC IGAs**: Women’s savings and loan rotating credit groups were beset by a number of challenges. GD beneficiaries noted that weekly savings contributions were voluntary, however, sometimes group pressures to contribute posed financial burdens for the poorest group members who were required to borrow funds to maintain membership, thus risking greater indebtedness outside the group. In the case of PASAM-TAI, the project made a recent decision not to establish new groups as originally planned, once a five-year full group cycle of rotation for small ruminant activities (habbanaye, animal fattening) beneficiaries was completed. This adjustment was made by IP staff after assessing the potential for intra-group or intra-community conflict by moving funds from a first- to second-generation/phase group. Thus, the distribution of small ruminants (sheep, goats) to a new group of beneficiaries was deemed to be too contentious in this instance. GD beneficiaries in each DFAP also cited instances where market value chain opportunities and linkages were inadequate or very limiting in terms of revenue generation potential due to market price fluctuations and uncertainties. In Sawki, some beneficiaries expressed a general lack of training by IP staff in IGA opportunities, particularly the absence of training in oil processing, which is viewed as a potentially lucrative activity by some beneficiaries. In LAHIA, warrantage systems have been introduced to store crop harvests and seeds, access agricultural credit through a local microfinance institution (ASUSU), and sell production during the hunger season when crop prices are most profitable. Despite a near doubling of producer groups from FY14 to FY16 and a roughly three-fold increase in membership, ASUSU has been unable to meet the rapid rise in demand for loans among the warrantage members.
  - **Para-vets**: Village para-vets in PASAM-TAI who were trained to provide veterinary services on a fee-for-service basis reported shortages and delays in receiving veterinary supplies from the Ministry of Livestock. They also expressed some discontent in not receiving their attestation documents certifying their formal status and affiliation with the Ministry, thus diminishing their professional image and credibility among some village members.

105 The SMART Couple approach promotes fertility awareness methods (FAM) that are modern, natural, and effective based on reproductive physiology and identifying the fertile days of a woman’s menstrual cycle. FAM options appeal to many couples and require adherence from both husband and wife, thus fostering discussion and joint decision-making among couples which has a positive effect on other dimensions of household life as well. Based on the Standard Day Method®, Two-Day Method®, and Lactation Amenorrhea, couples use color-coded prayer beads that correspond to each day in the menstrual cycle. The approach was piloted among 770 couples in 26 villages in 2016. Due to very favorable response among beneficiary couples, religious leaders, government, and other stakeholders, the approach will be expanded to 72 villages. Source: PASAM-TAI FY17 Quarter 2 Report.

106 In response to the credit shortage, the project has facilitated the integration of the MMD savings groups with the warrantage system so that access to credit through the MMD internal lending groups can offset the credit shortfall of ASUSU. Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report.

107 This is unlike the status of community volunteer health workers (termed Peer Educators in LAHIA) across the three DFAPs who are formally linked to local government health centers and village clinics and ascribed a higher professional status in the communities. Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report.
• Early Warning Systems, Disaster Risk and Resilience
  - Early Warning Systems: Across the three projects, village early warning system response units, Systèmes Communautaires d’Alerte Précoce et de Réponse aux Urgencies (SCAP-RU), were established to strengthen community resilience capacity by instituting disaster risk reduction and early warning surveillance and reporting systems and sharing information upward through a vertical chain from the Vulnerability Monitoring Centers (OSV) at the commune level to national ministries. There was broad consensus among IP staff and project collaborators that the SCAP-RU was the most ineffective and problematic activity across the three projects. A number of reasons were cited:

  ▪ A lack of responsiveness and feedback from OSV and other relevant authorities at the commune, department, and regional administrative levels;
  ▪ A lack of budgetary commitment at the national level in providing funds to build resilience capacity at the local community level;
  ▪ The geographical aggregation of SCAP-RU clusters (in PASAM-TAI) comprising several villages rather than one SCAP-RU per village; this posed major logistical and communication challenges due to the distances among some villages and resources needed to travel to hold meetings and the drafting of monthly reports for submission to the OSV. Funds were lacking to support members for transport, meals, and meeting logistics. The absence of women’s participation in the SCAP-RU (and VDCs) was also noted in the midterm evaluation of PASAM-TAI.

4.2.3 EQ 2.2: Who was targeted by and benefited from each project’s intervention activities, and how effective was/were the selected targeting approach(es) in achieving its/their respective goals?

Data from GDs and KIIs were triangulated in order to understand beneficiary perceptions of participation in project activities as well as targeting approaches taken by the IPs. The three DFAPs share a common goal to reduce food insecurity and malnutrition among the poorest and most vulnerable households in the project target zones. Thus, GD respondents, in segregated male and female groups, were asked to what extent the most impoverished members in the community were equitably selected or targeted for participation in project activities. They were also asked about their general perceptions of the beneficiary selection process and criteria used. The two most frequent observations made across both women’s and men’s groups were (Figure 21):

---

108 This observation is corroborated by quarterly and annual reporting of the IPs for FY16 and FY17.
109 Annual and quarterly reporting for each of the IPs since FY16 indicate that they have taken measures to strengthen capacity of the SCAP-RU and to better coordinate communications and sharing of information with the commune-level OSV and Mayor’s office through training sessions, meetings, and workshops. Nonetheless, problems persist at the commune level as noted. The Sawki FY16 Revised Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) reports that during the project FY15 midterm review it was evident that the implementation strategy was not producing the desired outcomes. The program revisited the strategy and identified alternate solutions, including possible partnership with other programs to achieve FY16 targets. These partnerships have not been articulated or identified since Sawki FY16 reporting.
110 Women’s participation in the VDCs in leadership roles has increased considerably since the midterm evaluation. VDCs members now include 34 percent women who are in the three leadership roles of President, Secretary or Treasurer. In most communities, women who started playing leadership roles in small groups as caregiver group lead mother, President of SILC groups, or farm organizations (OP) are now accepting the opportunity to step in and take positions on village-level committees. Having gained confidence through project activities, access to literacy courses, and various training opportunities, women leaders are much more vocal and active than before. Source: PASAM-TAI FY17 Annual Report.
111 Observations noted here by GD participants were also corroborated in KII sessions with collaborating partners and local government officials.
• Benefits were equitably and fairly distributed among community members, including the poor, however, men were three times more likely to make this observation than women;\textsuperscript{112} and
• Benefits were unequally distributed in the sense that special selection criteria were used in many instances to target beneficiaries for participation according to the type of activity being implemented.

**Figure 21. Beneficiary Perceptions of Activity Selection Process**

A small number of IP staff corroborated the view that, while targeting was fair and inclusive of the most disadvantaged members of the community, beneficiary selection was sector- and activity-specific, and contingent upon criteria generally established by those organizing and implementing the activities. This included IP senior staff and field agents, members of the VDCs, and other village leaders, including village chiefs, who would frequently organize and select activity-specific leaders to assume responsibility in mobilizing the participation of others in the community.

Additional important observations, although less frequently noted in the GD sessions, along with supporting views from limited KII data, include:

• The number of most vulnerable households in a village greatly exceeds the number of activities and participant slots available, thus limiting the optimal participation of vulnerable households across all activities.

\textsuperscript{112} Figures represent the frequency of response or number of observations in relation to specific questions such as whether beneficiary participation was equitable and open to everyone in the community, particularly the poorest individuals or households. It is not clear from the GD beneficiary sessions why men were three times more likely than women to note that participation in activities was equitable. Some women raised concerns about the criteria used for selection of PLW feeling that some women had been excluded, which may have influenced their lower response rate.
Inequitable selection of households for specific project activities was occasionally reported, often associated with village governance dynamics and the role of village elites in potentially biasing the beneficiary selection process (as noted above).

Despite the participation of the poorest households in some activities, most are too disadvantaged financially to participate in more capital-intensive activities such as market gardening, animal fattening, rainfed farming, latrine construction, and agricultural processing (e.g., milling). These activities assume capital outlays for improved seed, fertilizer, animal fodder, milling machines, cement, and technology upkeep which the poor are unlikely to sustain after the life of project.

Some project activities or trainings—particularly those that involve raising awareness around behavior change on health, nutrition, and hygiene activities—are more easily learned and adopted by non-participants or indirect beneficiaries, while other activities with perceived high benefits are not transferable to non-participant households. These include receiving food rations or a sheep or goat.

Occasional mention was made of non-selection or non-participation in activities due to the absence of individuals during the activity registration period, or due to a lack of willingness or reticence for personal or cultural/religious reasons, or a lack of clear understanding of the perceived benefits of an activity.\(^\text{113}\)

The beneficiary selection process across the three DFAPs was generally comparable, with some small variations, depending on who was leading the selection process and the nature of the activity. Selection would most often be initiated by the VDC and/or village chief, sometimes with the assistance of IP field staff who would convene a village general assembly. The assembly would then elect community members as leaders to establish a selection committee for a specific activity, typically 5-12 members representing each village neighborhood.

4.2.4 EQ 2.3: How are the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and suitability of the services provided by the project perceived by the beneficiaries and their communities? Are there major differences in these perceptions of service delivery across key beneficiary sub-groups, and what are reasons why?

Overall, beneficiaries reported being satisfied with the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and suitability of the services introduced by the project. Most respondents felt that they had received sufficient training and know-how in all project activities. However, a number of concerns about the quality of service, effectiveness, and suitability of some activities were expressed by GD respondents. The most salient observations are summarized here:

- **Mismatch of community needs and project services:** In some instances, GD respondents noted that project interventions did not always match the priorities of the community, or that the project strategy was too prescriptive and donor-centric, and not based on a diagnostic of community needs and priorities. In one example in PASAM-TAI, participants reported that they would have been interested in IGAs, such as animal fattening or habbanaye, but the project did not initiate any of them. In another community, an expressed interest to have demonstration latrines at the primary school and health center was never undertaken by the project. This mismatch of community needs and IP priorities was noted across the three DFAPs on several occasions.

- **Warrantage:** In the LAHIA project, some beneficiaries cited delays associated with the participating microfinance institution (ASUSU) paying out loans to those who participated in

\(^\text{113}\) All household heads must register formally at project start-up to participate in project activities. Those who could not attend (illness, the poor who survive on menial daily wage labor) are ineligible to participate in ongoing project activities until the next annual registration period.
warrantage. Nonetheless, GD respondents were positive overall about their experience with warrantage and felt the activity had greatly benefited both male and female participants, especially start-up funds that were of benefit to elderly group members. Credit access through the local microfinance institution (ASUSU) enabled group members to jointly make small payments on a regular basis that can then be used or financially leveraged in case a group member is in need.

- **WASH**: On occasion, the suitability of some activities planned by the IPs was called into question. In PASAM-TAI, plans to construct a well were met with resistance by one community that felt previous problems with water quality and contamination were too severe and, therefore, a new well would be inappropriate.

- **Poultry disease**: In Sawki, beneficiaries noted ongoing problems with poultry health and a disease epidemic (Newcastle disease) resulting in high poultry loss.114

- **Market value chain linkages**: Beneficiaries in Sawki and PASAM-TAI expressed concern about inadequate project approaches to more effectively link producers to markets. In PASAM-TAI, a few women’s garden groups expressed satisfaction in receiving market prices through project market information services (MIS) provided on mobile phones. However, they felt that they needed more support in establishing stronger value chain linkages to more markets. In one instance, they noted that supply exceeds demand for garden vegetables during the peak harvest period, thus depressing crop prices in the only larger regional market they can access. They felt the project should do more to help them find alternate or secondary markets for their garden crop. Beneficiaries also noted the lack of water sources or drying of wells during the garden season and the need for better water supply and conveyance from the projects. Excessive distance to gardens and the lack of labor saving technologies (e.g., micro drip irrigation) were also noted.

- **Crop pests**: In Sawki, beneficiaries noted problems with insecticides provided by the project that were ineffective in preventing insects from destroying their bean, millet, and groundnut crops.

- **Credit provision**: Beneficiaries across the three projects mentioned problems with credit provision in their savings and loan groups, particularly during periods of acute need for cash such as the hunger season.

**Beneficiary and KII Views on Improving Effectiveness of Service Delivery**

Overall, beneficiaries emphasized a need for: additional and more widespread training; more direct beneficiaries per activity; and more transparent selection to achieve greater effectiveness of service delivery under the projects. The need for more updates in training and an increase in the number of beneficiaries was also noted by IP staff and collaborating partners in KII meetings. Both beneficiaries and KII respondents also noted an interest in better credit provision and veterinary services for livestock and poultry. While beneficiaries across the three projects expressed concerns about difficulties in accessing and paying for improved seed and fertilizer, they were more inclined to note improvements needed in water services and infrastructure (schools, roads) than farm input services.

Figure 22 illustrates the relative needs and priorities emphasized by beneficiaries in terms of more effective service delivery. Men and women both equally expressed the need for improved water supply, whereas men expressed a much greater priority than women to increase the number of beneficiaries. Men also prioritized a need for more training/sensitization, improvements in beneficiary selection, and more infrastructure while women prioritized beneficiary selection, water services, and training.

114 A specific chicken breed (Isa Brown) was introduced in Sawki and was resilient and well adapted to local climatic conditions in the Maradi and Zinder regions. However, a Newcastle disease epidemic resulted in significant loss of poultry.
CONCLUSIONS

Most Effective Implementation Approaches

Several effective implementation approaches were identified across the three DFAPs. Improved seeds and conservation agriculture were both widely adopted across the three DFAPs and were associated with significant yield increases of rainfed crops. PASAM-TAI and LAHIA PPP approaches to scale and improve seed distribution and encourage seed production and sale by project villages combined with the use of seed fair vouchers to allow farmers to obtain their preferred seed varieties was found to be particularly effective and appreciated. In addition, dry season gardens were promoted by all three DFAPs, but evidence suggests that this activity tends to have a positive impact on income and seasonal migration only when combined with adequate capital investments in water supply and inputs and effective market linkages, as was done particularly well by PASAM-TAI.

Key Implementation Strengths, Challenges, and Effective Steps Taken to Address Them

Strengths and challenges were identified in implementation approaches and some corrective measures were taken to address challenges.

On implementation strengths, it is noted that:

- The combination of peer- and gender-based educator groups (for example, model mothers) and social messaging campaigns (e.g., listening clubs, community videos, and live skits) employed by all three DFAPs was found to be highly effective overall in achieving positive behavioral outcomes in MCHN (e.g., EBF, birth spacing, and nutritional diversification) and WASH (e.g., handwashing) sectors.
- Men’s peer educator groups and holistic integration of gender-based activities supported by all three DFAPs were also widely and consistently credited for the marked improvement in gender relations and positive attitudinal changes of men in supporting their spouses in various ways (e.g., domestic tasks, agricultural field activities, health clinic visits, birth control and family
planning). Gender relations were also enhanced through Safe Space activities targeting adolescent girls and literacy activities targeting adults as well as adolescents.

- Certain group interventions (e.g., VSLA/SILC in IGA, agricultural processing, habbanaye and animal fattening, market gardens, cooking demonstrations) implemented in various combinations by all three DFAPs were identified as having the ancillary effect of enhancing group and community social solidarity by strengthening the bonds and ties within and across the groups involved in these activities. In some cases, activities were even found to enhance collaboration with neighboring communities, for example as a result of sharing experiences across health and nutrition groups.

- The combination of administrative and communication strategies employed by the three DFAPs to manage personnel and project implementation across the various levels (e.g., village, departmental, and national) of project administrative offices, the close physical proximity of field agents to beneficiaries, and the use of robust information technology (IT)-based M&E systems ensured an effective implementation of project activities that is responsive to the needs and concerns of beneficiaries.

- All three DFAPs have established formal agreements with the GON and are generally aligned with national policies on food security, health and nutrition, WASH, and agricultural development. Furthermore, they also effectively engaged with key technical line ministries at the regional and department level to coordinate technical services and strategic activities.

Key implementation challenges include:

- Despite efforts by the three DFAPs, staff turnover and retention were noted as recurring problems, in particular for field agents and government extension agents—who often felt isolated in their community posts due to differences in language and ethnicity—but also more generally due to varying remuneration levels among government, civil society, and other implementing organizations. All three DFAPs also reported challenges in recruiting and retaining female staff and community volunteers who have to balance their commitment to the project with domestic obligations. A significant portion of volunteers of both genders suffered from fatigue and lack of sustained motivation due to participation in multiple activities and lack of incentive and remuneration. The three DFAPs attempted to address these issues by providing more effective training to field agents and volunteers that strengthen linkages across sector activities and more proactive recruitment and rotation of reserve staff to fill temporary vacancies.

- BDL activities for women had limited success and were sometimes abandoned by beneficiaries as a result of the: heavy physical labor involved; long walking distances to reach fields; limited effectiveness of food for work (FFW) rations as an incentive and remuneration; cost of transporting manure; ineffective fencing that did not prevent livestock incursions in fields; and, in some cases, insufficient funds provided by the projects to purchase grass seeds that form a protective cover for denuded soils.

- Cost and access (e.g., absence or distance of sales points) of certain agricultural inputs such as improved seeds and chemical fertilizer remain a key impediment to increased food production and uptake of improved farming methods for some beneficiaries, particularly the most impoverished households. Projects reported an effort to reduce the access issue by increasing the number of village-based seed producers and input distributors.

- Women’s access and ownership of land remains a key constraint on their capacity to improve household food security and boost family income despite some modest gains in terms of access to degraded lands through lease contracts and support of the local VDC and commune-level land tenure commission. This is further compounded by women’s limited autonomy in access, control, and decision-making over their own crop outputs in domestic household food production and conjugal relations to their spouses.
• Project performance in achieving ODF status through the CLTS approach and use of improved latrines has been modest due to a range of factors, including: cost; labor investment; social and cultural beliefs/taboo around personal hygiene and sanitation; and a regional climate and soil structure (intense monsoon rains, sandy soils) that destroys latrine pits and structures due to seasonal rainfall and heavy inundations.

• Women's savings and loan rotating credit groups had limited effectiveness due to: lack of training and identification of lucrative IGAs; insufficient access to credit; and weak market value chain linkages in some instances. Projects looked to mitigate these issues by: strengthening credit access through crop storage and warrantage systems; providing crop processing technologies (flour mills, solar dryers); and providing improved market information (crop pricing data and market locations) and linkages.

• Early warning systems response units (e.g., SCAP-RU) tasked to strengthening community resilience capacity were hobbled by challenges including limited responsiveness and support from the OSVs at the commune level, a lack of budgetary commitment, or resources emanating from the national ministry level. To mitigate these issues, the IPs reported more focused training in areas such as organizational development, community development, and risk management.

Efforts to address implementation challenges by the IPs appeared to be few and are not extensively documented in the post midterm evaluation annual and quarterly reporting. Notable examples include:

• Improvements in personnel recruitment and retention of field staff and volunteers have been addressed through more effective training of field agents and volunteers that strengthens linkages across sector activities and more proactive recruitment and rotation of reserve staff to fill temporary vacancies during staff vacations;

• Adjustments by IPs to reduce the number and breadth of activities and to focus on achieving depth of impact with few numbers of beneficiaries (example of reducing BDL activities, sites, and beneficiaries in PASAM-TAI);

• Continued efforts by the IPs to work with commune-level government officials and the Commission Foncière de Base (COFOB) to obtain more land lease contracts for women to carry out crop and garden production activities;

• Efforts by the IPs to increase the number of village-based seed producers and input distributors with more sales points;

• Renewed efforts by the IPs to provide crop processing technologies (flour mills, solar dryers), mobile technology for market information systems (crop pricing data and market locations), and to work with REGIS-AG in identifying improved markets linkages and crop distribution and sales points;

• Strengthening of credit access to local microfinance institutions (e.g., ASUSU) through crop storage and warrantage systems (in the case of LAHIA); and

• Ongoing efforts to strengthen the organizational capacity of the SCAP-RUs and coordination of efforts with the commune-level OSVs through more focused training, such as organizational development and community development and risk management training.

Service Delivery

Overall, beneficiaries reported being satisfied with the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and suitability of the services introduced by the three DFAPs. Most respondents felt that they had received sufficient training and know-how in all project activities. However, some specific concerns were expressed about quality of service across all three DFAPs, including: the mismatch between community needs and priorities and project services; inadequate project approaches and support to link producers to markets; and problems with credit provision in savings and loans groups, particularly during periods of acute need for cash such as the hunger season. In a few cases, beneficiaries also questioned the suitability of certain
WASH activities planned by the IP. There were also some project-specific concerns raised on occasion by beneficiaries, including:

- Participants in LAHIA’s warrantage activity cited delays associated with the payment of loans by the local microfinance institution, ASUSU.
- Some Sawki beneficiaries reported ongoing problems with poultry health and a disease epidemic (Newcastle disease) resulting in high poultry loss.
- In one instance, Sawki beneficiaries noted problems with insecticides provided by the project that were ineffective in preventing insects from destroying their bean, millet, and groundnut crops.

Beneficiaries’ perception of the targeting approaches used by the three DFAPs was generally positive. In most cases, they reported that benefits were either equitably and fairly distributed among community members, including the poor, or that they were unequally distributed for certain activities, in the sense that special selection criteria including need, capacity, and commitment were used in many instances according to the type of activity being implemented.

4.3 EQ 3: SUSTAINABILITY OF OUTCOMES: BASED ON THE EVIDENCE, WHAT PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES ARE LIKELY TO BE SUSTAINED, AND WHY?

FINDINGS

Analysis of sustainability draws from the Sustainability and Exit Strategies Conceptual Framework developed recently under the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA) as the basis for framing and evaluating the sustainability of the three DFAPs. Findings and conclusions derive from four key components or pillars of the framework that are examined here:

- **Sustained source of resources**: Which resources (natural, physical, financial, social, human) have been leveraged for sustainable service delivery and how;
- **Sustained technical and managerial capacity**: What strategies have been promoted to build and sustain technical and managerial capacity of beneficiaries and service providers;
- **Sustained motivation of beneficiaries and service providers**: What modalities have been deployed to sustain the motivation of beneficiaries to demand, and service providers to deliver, efficient and effective access to products and services; and
- **Linkages to governmental organizations and/or other entities**: What vertical linkages have been created or leveraged to augment access to resources, strengthen capacity, and motivate beneficiaries and service providers to demand, deliver, and use products and services in a sustainable manner.

Factors of capacity, motivation, resources, and institutional linkages were explored through GD and KII sessions and are examined in more detail below. Strategies introduced by the IPs to build the technical and managerial capacity of project beneficiaries and service providers to act upon technical knowledge and skills they have acquired is discussed under EQ 3.1. Most importantly, their ability to apply such knowledge and skills over time will depend in no short measure on their capacities and ingenuity to leverage resources externally through local government services and/or other relevant actors. The motivation of beneficiaries to demand services, their ability and willingness to pay, and the motivation of service providers to sustain the provision of resources are discussed under EQ 3.2.

GD beneficiary and KII respondents were asked to provide their views on what activities were likely to be sustained and those that posed challenges to future adoption. Activities and outcomes that they identified as likely to be sustained include MCHN and WASH, in particular gains in health and nutritional status of PLW and children under the age of 5, through adoption of improved behavioral practices related to hygiene, sanitation, and health. These include EBF and pre- and post-natal health center consultations.

Agriculture and livelihoods showed significant increases in crop yields through: improved cropping methods (zaïs/potholes, composting, micro dosing with chemical fertilizer, plant spacing density); access to improved seed varieties; and the promotion the tree growth in crop fields (Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration). Improved crop storage techniques such as the use of PICS sacks were also a project activity that beneficiaries highly valued and anticipated continuing to use.

While beneficiaries expressed their willingness to continue most activities introduced in the DFAPs, they also acknowledged limited capacities to pay for those services that require substantial capital outlays including:

- **Latrines**: The cost of supplies and masonry services, as well as labor inputs, were identified as major impediments to the adoption of latrines.
- **Water infrastructure**: The high cost of construction and maintenance of water points (wells, boreholes, pump systems, water storage) was identified as a clear challenge beyond the life of project.
- **Market gardens**: Beneficiaries cited high capital investments in water supply and conveyance technologies (irrigation, pumps) as key limitations to continued participation in garden activities without significant external financial support. The cost of chemical fertilizer and difficulties in accessing improved seed were also noted as factors limiting the future practice of horticultural activities.

Practices that yielded noticeable positive results quickly were the ones that beneficiaries most commonly cited as those they will continue to use beyond the lifetime of the project. However, beneficiaries in some villages reported that they trust that the knowledge they gained from the project will eventually bear fruit and that they will therefore continue to use new practices and knowledge gained throughout the project, even if noticeable benefits may take time to be realized.

4.3.1 **EQ 3.1: What processes, systems, and institutional arrangements (especially linkages and coordination with other USG and non-USG investments) were made by the IPs or members of the target population to sustain the necessary and critical services required to achieve and sustain projects outcomes?**

The overall approach of the three DFAPs has been to build technical and managerial capacity of project stakeholders at two levels: 1) at the community level involving direct beneficiaries through the formation of peer educator and interest-based groups around targeted sector activities; and 2) at the local government level involving technical extension services of key Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Livestock, Environment, and Informal Education (Alphabetization). USG and non-USG collaborating partners have been engaged to serve in focused technical roles to provide an array of training and capacity building services at both the community and government level across the key sectors of MCHN, WASH, agriculture, livelihoods, resilience, gender, and governance.116

116 The array of partners across the three DFAPs is extensive. The most prominent collaborators include REGIS-AG, Resilience and Economic Growth in Sahel - Enhanced Resilience (REGIS-ER), WHO, UNFPA, World Food Programme (WFP), FAO, UNICEF, ICRISAT, INRAN, World
Technical and managerial capacity at the community level has involved targeted training and capacity building of various community leaders, volunteers, caregivers, and religious authorities who can champion and impart knowledge, skills, and motivation to other community members to adopt and promote positive behaviors of improved health and nutrition and to take up climate-smart agricultural practices and market-based livelihoods that can boost family income and improve food security.

The most common approach to capacity building among the three DFAPs is the training of individuals who serve in a coaching or mentoring capacity of others as lead experts. Lead experts most often serve in one of two capacities, either as: 1) a volunteer responsible for mobilizing peer learning or peer educator groups, as in the case of most MCHN/WASH activities; or 2) in an auxiliary fee-for-service technical role providing training, extension services, and inputs, as in the case of lead farmers, para-vets, and VSLA/SILC IGA and micro-enterprise experts.

These two distinct approaches, designed to impart technical knowledge and leadership or managerial capacity, seek to motivate individuals to sustain their roles as leaders and mentors in one of two ways: 1) through the acquisition of knowledge (in the case of volunteers), which conveys social status, prestige, and leadership in the community, thus providing positive reinforcement to the mentor or coach to continue in their lead role; and 2) through skills acquisition to provide products and/or technical services that are rewarded through a pay-for-service arrangement.\(^\text{117}\)

The potential to sustain technical and managerial capacity, drawing from these two broad yet divergent approaches, with examples across the DFAPs, are presented here:

**MCHN and WASH**

Caregiver groups led by lead mothers, are trained by IP field agents in improved health, nutrition, and hygiene practices using various approaches promoted through FFP.\(^\text{118}\) With support from community health workers (CHWs), the lead mothers serve as peer educators in conducting group learning sessions with weekly follow-up home visits to assess and reinforce improved behavioral practices learned in group sessions. Male equivalent peer educators complement and reinforce the women’s caregiver group activities by conducting similar awareness building activities through husband schools or male mutual support groups.

The constellation of CHW volunteers, lead mothers, and male peer educators serves as the liaison between the local government health services and the caregiver groups; these participants are now formally recognized by the government as the key actors that are essential in ensuring that linkages of close collaboration and support from the local government health services are sustained over time. A number examples here illustrate the progress to date made by the three projects:

- **LAHIA**: Peer educators trained in the project have now been recognized as community focal points in direct collaboration with the commune-level health facilities. Model husbands are now responsible for communicating health behavior messaging according to district health services priorities.\(^\text{119}\)

---

Vegetable Center (AVRDC), AGRHYMET, FEWS NET, Le Centre Africain pour les Applications de la Météorologie au Développement (ACMAD), World Vision, HKI, Africare, Digital Green, Groupe de Recherche et d'Échanges Technologiques (GRET), Orange Foundation, Marie Stopes International, Populations Services International, Pathfinder, Animus Sutura, Abdou Moumoun University, ASUSU, HALAL, and AMATE.\(^\text{117}\) Capacity building efforts included guidance/training on how to promote public private partnerships and facilitating a commercial service provision model in the marketing of inputs, materials, equipment, spare parts, and available services (public or private).

\(^\text{118}\) Innovative social behavior change communications activities highlighted in Chapter 2 were widely used to build knowledge and awareness of caregiver groups on MCHN and WASH on topical interventions such as ENA, the 1,000-day approach, and HTSP.

\(^\text{119}\) Save the Children LAHIA FY17 PREP Issues Letter. Resubmitted to USAID/FFP, September 14, 2016.
- **Sawki**: In Year 5, the project will train government health agents on the *Mu Da Kanmu* (traditional caregiver) approach and will strengthen the links between health workers, community-based health promoters, and lead mothers to ensure ongoing oversight of grassroots health promotion activities.\textsuperscript{120}

- **PASAM-TAI**: In collaboration with the Ministry of Health, CRS will continue to build capacity of CHWs and lead mothers to ensure they continue using acquired knowledge and skills improved health, nutrition, and hygiene practices. CRS will also continue to involve and train community members in the construction and maintenance on health clinics and school latrines in close collaboration with the Ministries of Health and Environment. Upon completion, a formal handing-over of the infrastructure to the Ministries will take place.\textsuperscript{121}

### Agriculture and Livelihoods

Agriculture and livelihoods activities generally require substantial capital outlays (seed, fertilizer, technologies, credit) that are uncharacteristic of most MCHN/WASH activities (with few exceptions, such as latrine construction). Thus, capacity building activities generally focus much more on the acquisition of entrepreneurial skills that enable service providers to operate as micro-enterprises. The examples below demonstrate the efforts made by the IPs in Year 4 to build local technical and managerial capacities by providing specialized training in areas such as bookkeeping, management skills, and ongoing support to provide products or services on a fee-for-service basis:

- **PASAM-TAI** – CRS,\textsuperscript{122} with support from ICRISAT and REGIS-ER, will continue to work with farmer associations to acquire technical and management skills, including bookkeeping, in support of greater market integration and income generation;
- **PASAM-TAI** – SILC groups will be trained in bookkeeping; SILC field agents/local experts will be trained and certified to become private service providers providing diverse services for a fee;
- **PASAM-TAI** – will continue to provide additional training and coaching to CAHW (para-vets) who will continue to assume primary responsibility for community-based veterinary care and services after the project; they will also identify apprentices who will support them;
- **Sawki**\textsuperscript{123} will continue to establish and empower FFS local experts to become input suppliers at the community-level;
- **Sawki** – will ensure CAHWs continue to be resource-people for veterinary health by linking them with private veterinary service providers; and
- **Sawki** – will empower girls’ safe space groups to continue raising and sharing animals through the habannaye scheme, offering an incentive for girls to stay connected with their support network and improving girls’ esteem through income generation.

The above examples of building sustained technical and managerial capacity, through group as well as more individualized (lead expert farmers, para-vets, SILC advisors) approaches, are carried out in phases that have been elaborated by each IP in their Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies, finalized in Year 4. These generally entail three phases:

1. **Phase down** – progressive reduction in program resources and support;
2. **Phase over** – transfer of responsibility to local, permanent institutions; and

\textsuperscript{120} Mercy Corps Sawki FY17 PREP Issues Letter. Updated submission to USAID/FFP, October 27, 2016.

\textsuperscript{121} CRS PASAM-TAI FY16 PREP.

\textsuperscript{122} All PASAM-TAI references in this section are from CRS PASAM-TAI FY16 PREP.

\textsuperscript{123} All Sawki references in this section are from Mercy Corps Sawki FY17 PREP Issues Letter. Updated submission to USAID/FFP, October 27, 2016.
3. **Phase out – program interventions will end.**

Each IP has been engaged in the phasing down and phasing out of activities (e.g., food rations) since the midterm design of sustainability strategies (FY16 PREPs) and now accelerating in Year 4. The transfer of implementation and oversight of activities to local partners, both community beneficiaries and local government partners, will take place in Year 5. A phase over approach in the coming year will entail activities that require financial and physical inputs, initially provided by the IPs, that must now be assumed by the beneficiaries and local government partners themselves in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of activities. These inputs, or resources, are addressed in EQ 3.2 below.

In order to ensure local government ownership in assuming a lead implementing role of many project activities, Sawki is currently producing evidence-based briefs that highlight the project’s most effective interventions to share among government partners. In this manner, government actors will be better positioned to make key policy and programming decisions rooted in a solid evidence base and thorough understanding of project outcomes in carrying activities forward.

Another critical element in strengthening technical and managerial capacity is to ensure that roles and responsibilities in project implementation are well understood and that progress toward achieving outcomes is regularly communicated and shared with all key stakeholders. Thus, each IP has organized quarterly coordination meetings with the local government technical actors, IPs, and locally appointed and elected officials (mayor, prefecture) involved to gauge progress, identify challenges, and make corrections in implementation in a timely fashion. The IPs have engaged local partners in a transparent, participatory manner to ensure that roles and responsibilities and the transfer of ownership of activities is undertaken in a graduated and reasonable time frame that builds the capacity of both project beneficiaries and local institutional actors.

Despite these efforts, KII sessions with commune-level government and technical staff within the project-related sectors indicated that linkages between their offices had been generally limited. KIIIs with such individuals and IP staff suggested that greater capacity building and integration of commune-level and technical staff within sectors will be required for sustained post-project impacts.

---

124 The sustainability phase of handing over for the IPs began in year 4 (FY2016) and the process is ongoing. In years 2 and 3, the emphasis has been primarily to ensure that the relevant actors receive appropriate technical skills, resources, and inputs and also to build motivation and appropriate relationships in order to facilitate the process moving towards sustainability. The sustainability strategy does not rely heavily on the GON technical ministries. Rather, it is focused more on technical partners from the private sector in agriculture, livestock, VSLA/SILC, and water user collection activities. The primary goal is to make sure that, by the end of the program, members of the community structures established (e.g., caregiver groups, WASH committees, lead farmers, seed producers, VSLA/SILC professional service providers, para-vets/vaccinators, literacy facilitators, community health workers, VDCs) will be supporting or working directly with the relevant private entities as services providers. The GON technical services will continue to provide oversight in ensuring compliance with regulations and technical requirements. Given the weak financial capacity of the GON technical ministries, the IPs envisioned that local government services will not assume costs for capital outlays for agriculture and market gardens (seed, fertilizer, technology) in particular. In terms of water infrastructure, local commune officials are already working closely with members of the water management committees to ensure cost recovery from user fees to ensure maintenance of water supply materials and equipment. For example, PASAM-TAI, which has implemented 47 discreet activities since project start-up, has undertaken an extensive reduction and de-emphasis of certain activities in response to the project midterm evaluation in order to focus on depth and quality of results as opposed to the breadth of activities across 640 beneficiary communities. These include a de-emphasis of early childhood development activities, phasing out of any new BDL activities, and scaling back of emergency preparedness activities involving SCAP-RU. Activities eliminated include: behavior change social marketing/messaging activities; Aquatab promotion; seed varietal demonstration and integrated soil fertility management activities; most Food for Work activities; and OSV investments. Source: CRS PASAM-TAI Response Memo, January 25, 2016. In Sawki, the project is now implementing the gradual reduction, transfer, and phase out of input provisions to beneficiaries across all areas of the program. Field staff are facilitating the handover of all activities in health, nutrition, hygiene, agriculture, and livelihood activities to caregiver group leaders and lead experts to begin assuming responsibility for continuation of project activities. Source: Mercy Corps Sawki FY17 PREP Issues Letter. Updated submission to USAID/FFP, October 27, 2016.

125 Mercy Corps Sawki FY17 PREP Issues Letter. Updated submission to USAID/FFP, October 27, 2016.

126 Sawki field teams are well aware of and have reported some of the challenges of working with local government extension services. Some of these concerns include a lack of responsiveness to deliver quality, efficient, and effective services to the population and challenges with other development organizations and donors providing incentives such as per diems and other benefits that are not consistent with the policies of all
Sawki has sought to address this concern since project inception by organizing targeted trainings and capacity building workshops for community-level extension agents, management committees, and government technical services at multiple levels, from the community to commune and regional levels, to empower these stakeholders to take ownership for program achievements. These capacity building activities are intended to provide local partners with knowledge and skills as a motivation to continue promoting good behaviors in health and effective methods for agriculture and income generation.

Sawki will continue to provide refresher trainings to the extension agents with the purpose of enhancing their knowledge and capacities to effectively and efficiently deliver extension services and supervision of program investments in the target communities during and after the program. The joint supervision with extension agents will continue to prepare them to take over after the end of the program and provides motivation in continuing their work. One strong case of motivation to continue providing services in the Sawki project has been reported in which a FFS lead farmer trained in the project was solicited as a local expert for his services outside the project region.

**Perceptions of Technical and Managerial Capacity**

Project beneficiaries, IP staff, and partners (local government, collaborating institutions, private sector actors) were asked about their views on the capacity of beneficiaries and local stakeholders to sustain project activities after the life of project. The most important observations are presented here:

**Uptake by direct beneficiaries:** GD and KII results strongly suggest that many of the activities and new practices promoted by the projects have been widely adopted by participants across most, if not all, of the technical sectors. The individuals who received direct training from the projects appear to be not only using the new practices themselves, but they have also effectively conveyed them to others who were not involved in the corresponding activity.

**Uptake by indirect beneficiaries and non-participants:** A number of positive spillover effects were observed through both the PBS and qualitative results and highlighted throughout the project achievements section of the report (4.1). Among the most positive effects were the adoption of project activities by indirect beneficiaries and non-participant individuals and households, particularly from surrounding villages. As noted in the overarching findings, GD beneficiaries frequently stated that neighbors and visitors from nearby villages not directly participating in the project would often observe and discuss new behavioral practices, skills, and methods being adopted by beneficiaries and begin to replicate them as well. Examples of this included adoption of MCHN and WASH behavioral practices such as: EBF; supplemental feeding with nutritious local food sources (particularly in infant porridges); and handwashing. While farming methods are more difficult to master, some GD respondents mentioned neighboring farmers coming to visit some group trainings or individual lead farmer fields to observe conservation agricultural practices which they then adopted in their own fields. An example of inter-community sharing and learning in warrantage by a non-project village was noted in one Sawki GD session.

**Evidence of behavior change through capacity building:** While it is difficult to conclusively assess the extent to which knowledge is truly integrated by participants into their lives, GD beneficiaries reported a demonstrable, positive change in their mentality regarding several practices to which they were exposed, including: the adoption of improved seed; use of more effective planting practices,
pesticides, and fertilizers; and CA methods. Similar behavioral changes were also noted by GD participants with respect to maternal and child healthcare, such as willingness and frequency of women to visit health centers, and child feeding practices, including the adoption of EBF. In addition, women across the GDs mentioned the significant changes to their own health and comfort they experienced as a result of the use of family planning, contraceptives, and birth spacing and strongly indicated their interest to continue such practices.

Empowerment and capacity to identify local solutions: Overall, several GD participants expressed optimism that they received sufficient training through the projects and possessed enough collective ingenuity to identify solutions to unanticipated problems that may occur in the future. Often, respondents expressed hope in the ability of the VDC to foster discussions within their communities to find these solutions. However, some participants reported that they felt they had individually or even collectively become less familiar with some elements of the activities they had been taught. Most of these cases involved the provision of training by the projects in the initial years of the project, indicating that no subsequent refresher training had taken place. The ET noted that this could be overcome by providing visual training guides for communities which, over the long term, can serve as reference material for activities that are more complex.

Local managerial capacity building and scale up: In terms of managerial capacity, beneficiaries generally expressed confidence in the willingness and ability of VDCs to continue to play their roles after the project ends. Likewise, several VDC members reported that they plan to continue with their role upon completion of the project because they understand the importance of the role they play in their community. In one community, participants reported that they would like to reach the point where they are able to train and sensitize nearby villages not reached by the project.

4.3.2 EQ 3.2: What is the level of motivation of the service providers to continue providing services after the project ends, and of the beneficiaries to receive and pay (or invest time) for these services?

Beneficiary motivation to apply knowledge and skills acquired through the DFAPs as a sustained practice is a function of both tangible and intangible factors. As noted in the introduction section (EQ 3), knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired that confer a sense of social status, prestige, or importance to an individual may well become a part of daily practice over time, particularly when such knowledge contributes to the overall welfare of a community. This is certainly the case for caregiver practices among lead mothers and male peer educators engaged in promoting improved health, nutrition, and hygiene practices. Tangible factors, most notably the weighting of benefit-cost factor inputs in labor and capital needed to undertake more remunerative farming and livelihood practices, will be acted upon according to the risk tolerance threshold and financial capacities of an individual or household.129

GD beneficiaries and KII respondents confirm this observation in discussions about motivational factors that shape adoption or non-adoption of a given learned behavior or skill. Concrete examples were given of key factors that relate to motivation to continue to use a given practice or method. These include:

- The degree to which the practice improves a household’s overall economic well-being; for example, crop yield increases of a factor of 6-8 were reported several times, strongly supporting adoption of improved agricultural techniques and inputs;
- Labor saving technologies, e.g., time saved in using a flour mill to grind millet or cook stove technology to reduce time for fuel wood gathering;
- Readily observable change – the degree to which results are readily observed, e.g., land reclamation such as BDL takes a longer time to yield visible results and direct benefits;

129 GD beneficiaries and IP staff reported examples of individuals who were or were not able to invest sufficient labor and capital to purchase inputs according to their household resource capacities in family labor and income.
• Labor inputs and time, e.g., land reclamation required hard physical labor and reclamation sites were often located far from villages, requiring extensive walking time to reach them; and
• Community welfare – participants reported that their motivation to pursue activities was derived not only from their direct benefit, but also the fact that they consider what they learned to be good for their community as a whole.

**Willingness to Pay**

Across all three projects, GD beneficiaries reported they were highly motivated to continue applying the methods and practices they learned across all, or at least most, technical areas. However, it is less clear whether beneficiaries will be able to continue paying for certain pay-for-service activities or costly inputs that the projects introduced. Willingness to pay is typically derived from motivation and household resource capacities, but the ability to pay is typically a function of each household’s current situation and outside of their direct and immediate control. Demand requires a combination of both willingness and ability to pay; and this is where some important sustainability challenges were noted. Some of the beneficial practices promoted by the projects appear most likely to be sustained after the life of project by those who can most afford to pay for them. This includes some of the most important services provided by the projects and those for which participants have expressed the greatest motivation and hope to pursue.

Examples cited by beneficiaries of services or resources that only the more advantaged households may be able to afford include:

• **Access to improved seed varieties**: The poorest households cannot afford to purchase seed (or other agricultural inputs like fertilizer) and are also least likely to be able to conserve from their seed stock for next year’s planting. This might be mitigated by the active role that AMATE (seed provider) is taking (more details below).

• **Year-round vegetable consumption**: This requires household access to a vegetable garden, the ability to pay for gardening inputs, or the ability to buy vegetables available at market.

• **Use of milling and grinding machines**: These require fees for grinding and maintenance of the mills.

• **Latrines**: The materials and fees to pay masons are too expensive for many beneficiaries.

• **Birth control**: The subsidies on contraception have been provided at health centers. However, birth control may likely become too expensive for users if projects’ subsidies end.

GD respondents noted that in some communities about two thirds of households cannot afford latrines or chemical fertilizers. The ability to pay varies greatly by household and season. For example, GD participants indicated that paying even minor contributions for certain activities (e.g., 25 CFA) becomes difficult during the hunger season (*soudure*) when the priority for many families is to sufficiently feed each of their members. One exception, noted several times, was health expenditures which focus group participants said they had no choice but to pay for when health problems emerged; they would find a way to pay these expenditures, whether through other members of the community, family members, or by borrowing.

In terms of sustainability of resource delivery, the private sector model of sustained delivery of improved seed is demonstrated through a project partnership with ICRISAT and AMATE (seed provider). A significant growth in the demand and purchase of seed among project beneficiaries has been reported, although some challenges remain with regard to access to seed in areas where sales points remain distant to beneficiary communities. The private sector firm is confident that it will continue to expand its outreach to rural farmers without USAID support. It has now assumed the costs of training...
and other related expenses previously assumed by the project and is scaling up the number of certified seed producers (both project beneficiaries and third-party contractors).

Limited examples exist of beneficiaries leveraging resources provided by the project to engage in IGAs that provide evidence of sustainable economic activity over time. In Sawki, some communities that received grain mills, water carts, and other project investments have now managed to generate sustainable income by operating such equipment on a user fee basis, which also enables them to cover maintenance costs. In other cases, communities were able to purchase additional equipment beyond what was provided by the program.130

In PASAM-TAI, water user committees have been effective in collecting fees for potable water which have been reinvested in the cost of maintenance and repair of village water infrastructure.131 GD participants frequently reported they were now contributing locally sourced supplemental food rations for infants and PLW, and purchasing improved seed and fertilizer for rainfed cultivation and market gardens.

A final observation worth noting is that there is an inherent assumption across the three DFAPs that households’ ability to pay for project-promoted services is based on improvements in household economic status over the life of project. However, PBS and qualitative results both suggest high variability in the success of IGAs and livelihoods change, and indicate that widespread economic improvements have not yet been achieved at scale. This may constitute a key unrealized piece of the TOC that is likely to affect sustainability of certain outcomes after project end. Possible explanations for this include projects spreading their activities too thinly to allow much incremental change at a household level, so that critical mass of change within a given village was never reached to allow for diversification of activities, or real income-generating opportunities to take hold. Furthermore, credit activities implemented by the project, which could help the poorest households to continue certain activities, often seem to be relatively nascent based on the qualitative data collected, and it was not apparent if any IGAs implemented were successful at scale. That said, the SILC groups setup by PASAM-TAI and involving groundnut oil processing, habbanaye, and sheep fattening show promise of continued operation of IGA after the life of project. Most individuals and groups interviewed cited modest to impressive gains in revenue for their group activities. Groundnut oil processing has been highly remunerative for some women’s groups when effective downstream linkages to regional markets are made. Sheep fattening has proven to be a remunerative activity for both women’s and men’s groups as well, although investment returns occur on a slower time frame (six months to one year) than is the case for SILC IGA groups who obtain group loans on a monthly basis to invest in more modest small enterprise activities.

CONCLUSIONS

Key findings on sustainability and uptake of DFAP activities in Niger suggest the following conclusions:

- There has been widespread knowledge-sharing and uptake among direct beneficiaries of several new methods and practices promoted by the projects across most of the sectors; there is also evidence of a positive spillover effect of uptake of some practices among indirect beneficiaries and non-participant individuals and households;132
- Those interventions most likely to be sustained include: MCHN and WASH behavioral practices promoting improved health, nutrition, hygiene, and sanitation; and improved agricultural methods and crop storage;

---

131 CRS PASAM-TAI FY16 Annual Report.
132 This observation assumes that uptake of practices by indirect beneficiaries and non-participants will continue over time and thus be sustainable, since the practices are being adopted of their own initiative with no motivation or support intervention by the project.
• Those interventions in which beneficiaries expressed limited capacity to pay for service include: latrines, water infrastructure, and market gardens (cost of improved seed, fertilizer, water technologies);
• While there have been gains in building technical and managerial capacity of stakeholders, challenges remain in terms of capacity and transfer of responsibilities to some local officials at the commune level;
• Lower income and livelihoods gains are likely to be a threat for future sustainability of pay-for-service activities, absent continued donor support; and
• Greater capacity building and integration of commune-level and technical staff within sectors will be required in order to achieve sustained post-project impacts.

4.4 EQ 4: UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED:
WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF EACH OF THE PROJECTS, IF ANY, AND HOW WERE THESE CONSEQUENCES IDENTIFIED AND TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT BY THE IPS?

FINDINGS
Positive and negative unintended and unanticipated consequences were identified across the three projects. These arose primarily out of KII meetings with IP staff and collaborating partners. However, a few were noted by GD respondents as well. While analysis here seeks to draw out higher order unintended consequences that are common across the three projects, few were noted. Thus, a few of the unexpected consequences noted are unique to one IP and reflect idiosyncratic features or circumstances that were not present in the other projects. Strategies or corrective measures taken by the IPs to address negative consequences and make adjustments when necessary in implementation, management, monitoring, or other related areas are also discussed.

Positive Consequences
A number of positive unintended and unanticipated consequences were noted:

Spillover effects to non-project villages: Among the most positive spillover effects were the adoption of project activities by households from surrounding villages. As noted in the overarching findings, GD beneficiaries frequently stated that neighbors and visitors from nearby villages and hamlets not directly participating in the project would often observe and discuss new behavioral practices, skills, and methods being adopted by beneficiaries—and begin to replicate them as well. Examples of this included adoption of MCHN and WASH behavioral practices such as: EBF; supplemental feeding with nutritious local food sources, particularly in infant porridges; and handwashing. While farming methods are more difficult to master, some GD respondents mentioned neighboring farmers coming to visit some group trainings or individual lead farmer fields to observe conservation agricultural practices which they then adopted in their own fields. An example of inter-community sharing and learning in warrantage by a non-project village was noted in one Sawki GD session.

133 This section addresses “unanticipated” as well as “unintended” consequences. The former refers to project under- or over-performance due to unforeseen circumstances. The latter refers to actual outcomes that were unexpected.
134 This includes examples of project activities whose spread was felt well beyond beneficiary villages. The LAHIA FY16 Annual Report (p. 13) notes that village-based agricultural agents facilitated access to inputs for 1,326 farmers in 81 villages, of which 32 were not participating in the project. This included 13.4 tons of improved seed, 3,238 bags of fungicides, and 1.5 tons of certified fertilizer. In another example, agricultural technologies (organic manure, NPK fertilizer, urea in micro doses) promoted in Sawki were adopted by 978 farmers (690 farmers in Maradi and 288 farmers in Zinder) from communities who did not participate in the project’s Farmer Field School. Source: Sawki FY16 Annual Report.
**Agricultural intensification and crop productivity:** As noted earlier, there is a significant change occurring in the mentality of farmers regarding the adoption of conservation agriculture methods and improved seed, with widespread adoption taking place and sharing of knowledge with neighboring farmers. While this is a clear objective of the three projects, both GD respondents and IP staff noted high crop yields and gains in productivity and rates of adoption of improved seed and farming methods that were unanticipated and well above expectations. Achieving this in areas of high population density, particularly in the Zinder Region, where demographic and other pressures are severely restricting land access and reducing field size, is enthusiastically welcomed by men and women farmers in the projects. Despite the positive achievement, beneficiaries also noted challenges in purchasing improved seed and fertilizer.

**Social capital:** There has been an unanticipated positive effect of some group activities such as women’s market gardens, early childhood development centers, VSLA/SILC activities, and cooking demonstrations in strengthening group and community bonds within as well as among neighboring communities. The degree to which this has been mentioned in some GD sessions underscores an important dimension of community resilience that has perhaps been overlooked in the planning and design of the three projects.

**Seed multiplication and distribution:** The success of the PPP partnership involving CRS, the private firm AMATE, and ICRISAT, with the support of the Ministry of Agriculture, should be noted as a key unanticipated positive result that has exceeded the initial expectations of the stakeholders involved. While unique to PASAM-TAI and not generalizable across all three IPs, it is nonetheless worth highlighting since it does provide a potential model for significant scale up to other regions in Niger and beyond.

**Leveraging past USAID investments:** Discussion in Chapter 2 has noted the AMATE seed multiplication and distribution approach as a key success and highlight of the PASAM-TAI activity. It was also noted that a previous USAID investment (WASA) served as an incubator activity enabling significant ramping up of AMATE seed sales distribution points from 10 to 80 at present. While not clear if the current scale of growth was anticipated by USAID and AMATE during the inception of WASA, the enabling environment created by USAID laying the groundwork for the current rate of expansion and success of the AMATE PPP model may very well be an unintended positive consequence that should be closely examined as a best practice for future learning within USAID and FFP in particular.

**Negative Consequences**

A number of negative unanticipated consequences were also noted:136

**CLTS:** The PBS WASH indicator on the change in use of improved sanitation facilities has shown an unanticipated lack of improvement given the significant amount of resource investment by USAID and the relative weighting of WASH activities by the three IPs. Uptake of improved latrines across the three projects has encountered challenges, primarily the cost as well as problems cited by GD beneficiaries concerning destruction of hand dug pits due to intense rains and flooding and poor timing of distribution of cement and construction materials during the rainy season. Measures have been taken to address problems of pit stability caused by extreme inundation during the rainy season. However, GD

---

135 In LAHIA, crop yield trials using improved seeds, appropriate seed spacing, and micro doses of fertilizer boosted productivity by nearly 64 percent over traditional growing methods. Source: LAHIA FY16 Annual Report. In Sawki, collaboration with INRAN (see footnote 49) enabled farmers to double yields of improved millet and cowpea varieties introduced by the project. Source: Sawki FY16 Annual Report.

136 This section addresses primarily “unanticipated” rather than “unintended” consequences per earlier footnote distinction of these terms above.

137 In PASAM-TAI, technical assistance has been provided to prevent pits from collapsing through demonstration of improved building techniques. The project also established village sanitation committees who developed plans to manage sanitation challenges including collapsed latrines and support to affected households in rebuilding their latrines using improved methods to prevent reoccurrence.
beneficiaries reported that challenges remain both in terms of latrine cost and damage to pits caused by heavy rains.

**Market access:** Earlier chapters reference problems for the IPs (with the exception of PASAM-TAI in a few instances) in accessing more high-value markets for sale of their rainfed and market garden crops. This is somewhat unanticipated given the project resources invested in expanding market value chains and economic growth opportunities to reach more high-value commodity markets. In PASAM-TAI, this is due, in part, to the relatively late engagement of a key partner, REGIS-AG, as the lead IP on facilitating market value chain linkages and entry of project beneficiaries into new areas of market opportunity. Adjustments to strengthen smallholder market development and entry of LAHIA and Sawki project beneficiaries into more high-value markets have not been taken late in the project implementation cycle. Aside from attempts to improve beneficiary access to market pricing through cellular-based MIS applications, more strategic interventions to accelerate access to high-value markets has met with nominal success.

**Poultry and livestock disease:** In Sawki, widespread poultry disease (Newcastle) and high loss of poultry stock have occurred at a scale unanticipated in the project. Project beneficiaries also mentioned significant problems with livestock health and ineffective services by the project para-vet to provide veterinary care, medicines, and other supplies needed to combat livestock diseases and improve animal health. Additional measures taken by the project to further address or improve veterinary services of poultry and livestock through the current para-vet model appear to have had variable success. Project field agents noted that sensitization efforts to ensure households’ quarantine of new poultry introduced into the village, a key measure for containing disease outbreaks, were not as successful as anticipated.

**FFW:** Examples of inadequate compensation and unintended increases in the labor burdens of women or other participants in activities, such as BDL, and public works infrastructure, such as road rehabilitation, have been discussed in Chapter 2. Women beneficiaries cited long distances to walk to fields, increased dependency on food rations (abandoned field tasks once food rations depleted), and perceived inequities in food distribution as major obstacles in carrying out such activities. In Sawki, FFW activities have been suspended or significantly reduced and in PASAM-TAI IP staff are reviewing whether FFW rations are an effective incentive and equitable compensation for the heavy labor burdens and distances required to walk to fields.

**Village savings and loan rotating credit groups:** Per discussion in Chapter 2, IP staff in PASAM-TAI envisioned at project conception to expand the number of SILC groups per village once a full cycle of loan benefits had accrued to all SILC members (with average membership of 25 beneficiaries). The withdrawal of working capital after completion of a full rotation cycle among all beneficiaries to create a second phase of new beneficiaries and capping the total volume of funds is described in Chapter 2. The potential for intra-group and intra-community conflict due to creation of new SILC groups was unanticipated by the project, requiring corrections by IP staff. A decision not to enlarge the number of beneficiary SILC groups and retain group funds internally was taken to mitigate the potential for conflict within the community.

**4.5 EQ 5: WHAT KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES SHOULD INFORM FUTURE PROJECTS IN THE COUNTRY?**

The key lessons learned and best practices that should inform future projects focus on:
CLTS: Challenges to the scaling up and adoption of improved latrines are complex and involve multiple factors which have been identified in this report. While all three DFAPs have made progress in raising awareness of the interconnection between good health and personal hygiene and sanitation practices, the labor and capital investment remain beyond the reach of many impoverished families in the project target areas. Experience with the CLTS approach under the three DFAPs suggests that more in-depth study and a global review of supply and demand approaches to sanitation markets should be undertaken to identify innovative approaches to latrine design, construction, and installation that remain affordable for the very poor. Affordable latrines are particularly a challenge in a region where soil stability and pit stabilization are problematic given the monsoon rainfall patterns in the Sahel region. Lessons learned from within the Sahel region and beyond should be distilled to identify novel approaches that can be piloted and scaled up in Niger. This may require more creative financing models that directly link VSLA/SILC IGA groups to demand-driven sanitation market approaches that reflect customer preferences and economic capacities.

Market access: As previously noted, gains made by the DFAPs through the promotion of value chain activities were relatively modest between the PBS baseline and endline. Start-up of the value chain component of the DFAPs with support from REGIS-AG encountered some delays. Future design of value chain activities should be initiated earlier at project start-up and entail more rigorous studies of local market systems and identification of a wider array of market opportunities. In addition, project design should introduce a household classification system based on levels of food security. Beneficiaries could then sequence through a tiered-system that first ensures that households meet their annual subsistence needs through local production. Once achieved, families would graduate progressively into more vertical market structures involving targeted value chains and increasing integration into local and regional markets.

Poultry and livestock disease: High poultry mortality and widespread poultry disease in the Sawki project were unanticipated; these were added to significant problems with livestock health cited by GD beneficiaries. Future DFAP activities to promote poultry production and introduce new poultry stock should closely review the Sawki experience to determine how poultry husbandry can be improved. In addition, ongoing training and delays in the provision of veterinary supplies to para-vets (as reported in PASAM-TAI) from the Ministry of Livestock should be addressed.

FFW: Problems involving inadequate or inequitable compensation, significant increases in women’s labor burdens, and the risk of increased dependency on food rations have been cited in the PASAM-TAI and Sawki projects. Not enough is known about FFW as an effective tool to promote public works and land restoration activities, and to ensure that a policy of “do no harm” is operative in mitigating dependencies on food aid and minimizing the risk of unanticipated heavy labor burdens, particularly for women.

Village savings and loan rotating credit groups: Experience from PASAM-TAI raises the example of inter-group and intra-community tensions or conflicts that may arise when SILC animal lending activities are expanded for new group formation. FFP should gain a thorough understanding of the

---

138 These include social and cultural beliefs and taboos around: personal hygiene and sanitation practices; high labor and capital requirements to purchase cement latrines; maintenance and upkeep of latrine facilities; and intense monsoon rains that destroy latrines and hand dug pits due to sandy, loamy soils conditions in the Sahel region.

139 One such approach involves a successful market-based, consumer-driven strategy initiated by a U.S.-based NGO, iDE, in Cambodia and Vietnam where poor rural families play an active role in the selection of latrine models that best fit their financial means and other household characteristics. The approach has delivered promising results and is being replicated by other development organizations with support from bi- and multi-lateral donors such as the World Bank. In Cambodia, the program is promoting unsubsidized latrines “...through rural market channels at four times greater than the installation rate before the program began.” The program’s market-building approach is expected to account for “…nearly half of the Government of Cambodia’s nationwide sanitation targets for 2014-2018.”

https://www.ideglobal.org/key-project/building-momentum-in-sanitation-coverage-in-cambodia

On Vietnam:

https://www.ideglobal.org/areas-of-focus/wash
PASAM-TAI SILC experience to assess the most effective strategy for future expansion of IGA group activities that can benefit more members in a community while avoiding the potential for conflict over limited resources. Additional funding that can achieve greater reach through new group formation (breadth) may need to be weighed closely against objectives to achieve greater impact among fewer beneficiaries.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Synthesis of the ET’s findings and key conclusions leads to the following recommendations, centered on overall program design, as well as sector-specific recommendations.

5.1 PROGRAM DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Program Coverage

The current FFP implementation model in Niger tends to emphasize breadth over depth in terms of project coverage and benefits received by households within a given project village. In each DFAP a broad range of project activities have been implemented across several sectors in each community and, in two of the DFAPs, covering communities in multiple regions. It is not uncommon for a small number of households (e.g., 15-20 households) to be selected for direct training or participation in many project activities in each community. It is possible that this approach spreads resources and benefits too thinly across households within a project village to elicit large impacts at scale for desired longer-term outcomes at the end of the intended results pathway, including those related to income generation and livelihoods change.

Recommendation

Future project design may consider the potential gains associated with an implementation model that aims for fewer activities and more direct beneficiaries per activity within a given community which may in turn increase the marginal impact per household and likelihood for sustained gains across all households in a community relating to specific indicators. FFP may also wish to consider a program design that limits each DFSA activity to a single region in order to facilitate cost efficiency and more effective project administration by senior administrators.

2. Training/Capacity Building

GD and KII respondents repeatedly cited the need for refresher trainings during the course of project implementation and more ongoing support to beneficiaries as well as field staff in building knowledge and technical capacities, particularly for new activities or activities that require more frequent immersion and practice to master well. Many activities currently focus on one-off training sessions at activity start with no ongoing support.

Recommendation

Future efforts in training/capacity building should introduce periodic refresher courses or advanced technical sessions during project implementation so that beneficiaries and staff can achieve full mastery of specific skill sets and remain motivated and engaged in progressively assuming ownership of project objectives, results, and outcomes.

140 Note that discussion of breadth versus depth models refers to the scope and layering of project activities received by any given household within a given project village, and not the extent of geographic coverage of the project.

141 In PASAM-TAI, coverage of two regions was perceived by IP senior staff as inefficient, requiring a duplication of efforts among senior management in terms of distance and logistics (time to travel). Coverage was expensive and implementation entailed 47 activities.
5.2 SECTOR-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

MCHN and WASH

1. SBCC – MCHN

There has been widespread knowledge-sharing and uptake among direct beneficiaries of improved MCHN practices (e.g., infant feeding, EBF, preparation of nutritious foods, pre-natal health care visits) as a result of effect community mobilization by peer educator/caregiver groups (lead mother and husband groups). GD beneficiaries reported they are likely to continue practices related to health such as EBF and regular health center consultations for pregnant women. This finding supports the conclusion that the SBCC approach to improving health and nutrition outcomes for children and PLW is effective.

Recommendation

FFP should consider replicating and expanding the SBCC model on MCHN interventions that emphasizes gender segregated caregiver/peer educator groups promoting positive health, nutrition, and hygiene outcomes in future DFSAs in Niger. The approach using volunteer lead mothers and husbands should be carefully reviewed to ensure that incentives such as quarterly or semi-annual, updated technical training modules are built into design of MCHN messaging strategies. Furthermore, key MCHN indicators should be rigorously monitored to better understand the in-depth impacts on MCHN. For example, the HDDS should be closely monitored for measurement of impact of food rations as well as nutritious crops (vegetables) being grown on MCHN.

2. Water User Groups and Cost Recovery

Findings highlight that the user group model for WASH investments in communities (such as community wells) involving fee-for-service water use appears to be working and should be continued as qualitative data suggest that household access to and availability of water has generally improved in the project villages. The private sector model of cost recovery of water user fees for WASH investments, in particular, appears to have been successful.

Recommendation

FFP should consider further exploration and expansion of the private sector model of cost recovery of water user fees for WASH investments in infrastructure management, repair, and maintenance to ensure the longevity and sustainability of water resource investments over time.

3. CLTS

Despite some modest gains in raising awareness about the connection between health and adoption of the CLTS approach, significant progress in the uptake of latrines has not been achieved. Barriers to uptake of improved latrines involve multiple factors—the most important of which are the high cost of materials or wage labor required to build latrines—as well as engineering challenges with latrine pit stability, such that only the least poor households have the means to afford them. The current one-size-fits all, top down service model is lacking in creativity and based upon a supply- rather than demand-oriented model.

Recommendation

FFP should explore innovative approaches to sanitation markets with a focus on demand-driven solutions that allow for client choice among a range of latrine models that best fit the financial and personal preferences of the household. More novel approaches to latrine marketing could be examined to explore potential approaches to be piloted in future DFSAs. This may require more creative financing models that directly link community groups (such as VSLA/SILC IGA groups) to demand-driven
sanitation markets in which customer preferences and other household features are factored into the product design and service delivery equation.\textsuperscript{142}

\textbf{Agriculture and Livelihoods}

1. CA Practices, Crop Productivity, and Crop Storage

Successes included significant adoption of improved agricultural practices, use of improved seed varieties and fertilizers, and use of improved crop storage practices that were promoted through the DFAPs—and which led to a substantial increase in crop yields for many households. Together with the use of improved food storage practices, this appears to have led to greater availability of food for a longer period of time during the year for households, contributing to improved household food security. There is also fairly strong evidence of positive spillovers in agricultural practices, crop yields, and crop storage—both from direct to indirect beneficiaries within project villages—and also evidence of uptake by individuals in nearby non-project villages.

\textbf{Recommendation}

The package of CA techniques, improved seed varieties, and effective service delivery models (FFS, PVS) should be closely reviewed for potential scale up in future DFSA program design. The nature of collaborating institutional roles that balance agronomic research and extension with field agent and lead expert field demonstration trials has proven highly effective between CRS and ICRISAT in the PASAM-TAI project. This research-practitioner partnership model, along with variations such as engagement of the National Institute of Agronomic Research (INRAN), and local universities in the LAHIA and Sawki projects should be further explored for scale up in future DFSAs in Niger.

\textbf{Recommendation}

To better understand how crop production and consumption are affecting targeted outcomes, FFP may also consider adding questions to the PBS survey that would enable estimation of the amount or proportion of each household or farmer’s production that was consumed at home rather than sold outside the household.

2. Warrantage/Cereal Banks

LAHIA has demonstrated the capacity of farmers to use crops as collateral to obtain loans and store crops for later market sale when prices are high at the peak of the dry hunger season. As a result of this, some farmers have been able to extend household food provisioning for another one to two months in the lean season.

\textbf{Recommendation}

Future DFSA design should entail an in-depth examination and constraints analysis to identify barriers to implementation and actionable strategies needed for broader application of warrantage. Promising practices and lessons learned in LAHIA and elsewhere in Niger should be inventoried to inform more effective design and expansion of the warrantage model throughout new DFSA target zones.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{142} Another example could be creation of a community cooperation loan fund managed by a WASH committee that is trained in basic financial and credit principles providing credit to households to finance latrines. Loans could be issued according to a list that has been pre-approved by the committee and according to a first in, first served (FIFS) model. The amount of money loaned would be proportional to the contribution of each member.

\textsuperscript{143} In-depth analysis should address, among other factors: the capacity or willingness of microfinance institutions (MFIs) to provide loans; supportive interventions to be undertaken by RISE partners, such as REGIS-AG, in facilitating access to credit for warrantage/cereal banks; interventions that can be undertaken by USAID’S Development Credit Authority (DCA); and storage capacity for warehousing and crop storage in targeted communities.
3. Value Chain Market Linkages

Findings document the need to improve value chain linkages of market garden groups by enhancing their capacity to boost farm income through access to more high-value markets locally and regionally. While beneficiaries presently receive market pricing data through project-supported mobile phones using market information system technology, there is need for more targeted support of farm producer groups such as the VSLA/SILC and market garden groups. In addition, production and marketing clusters should be organized at a commune level that is able to more effectively consolidate crop harvests for collection, transport, and sale in local and regional markets in order to leverage better commodity prices based on sales volume and economy of scale.

Recommendation

Further research is needed to understand the nature of market systems in Niger and to identify opportunities to better integrate small hold producers into more high-value commodity value chains. Research is also needed to better understand how producer groups can be more effectively organized in production and marketing clusters to more efficiently consolidate production for collection and transport to more high-value regional markets.

4. Subsistence to Market Beneficiary Graduation

While targeting of the poorest and most vulnerable households has been successful in terms of achieving increased food security, as well as for MCHN and WASH objectives, successful participation in value chain activities, and integration into local and regional markets, remains limited. To strengthen value chain and market linkages activities in the future, FFP may consider reviewing how projects conceptualize the sequencing of livelihoods and value chain activities, and who within villages should be targeted for increased likelihood of effectiveness of such activities on household incomes. Targeting the poorest and most vulnerable households appears to make good sense for food security goals, as well as for MCHN and WASH objectives. For greater income generation and value chain integration, it may make sense to target those households best placed to take advantage of such activities, which may not always be the poorest or most vulnerable households. In such cases, FFP may consider a graduation model whereby projects provide inputs and activities for most vulnerable households to achieve a given level of food security. For livelihoods and market-based activities, it may make sense to target households that have reached some level of food sufficiency and have a margin of food and capital resources to engage productively in market activities.

Recommendation

Future DFSA design should consider introducing a stepped model of beneficiary food security that moves households from subsistence to market integration based on a household food security classification system. The system could categorize households according to a set of food security indicators such as those used for the baseline/endline PBS. Beneficiaries may then sequence through a tiered-system that first ensures that households meet their annual subsistence needs through local production. Once achieved, families would graduate progressively into more vertical market structures involving targeted value chains and increasing integration into local and regional markets. This may require two cycles of three-to-five year DFSA programming within the same targeted communities in which the first cycle seeks to move the large majority of beneficiaries to full food subsistence (12 months coverage) in the initial cycle, followed by a second phase of surplus crop production and progressive access to more high-value market chains.

5. PPPs

Evaluation findings suggest that the AMATE and HALAL PPP approaches to seed multiplication and distribution hold promise for scale up within and beyond the DFAP target zones.
**Recommendation**

An in-depth examination and case study of the factors shaping positive outcomes of the AMATE and HALAL PPP model merit the attention of FFP for further research, piloting, and scale up. Furthermore, DFSA design in Niger should leverage these highly effective models to expand the PPP approach by facilitating horizontal market linkages and synergies among other relevant private sector actors. An example would be to explore linkages of AMATE and HALAL to the telecom sector in order to enhance MIS capabilities in the delivery of market price information on improved seed and location of sales points, as well as linking MIS data on improved seed varietals to related agronomic and climate information services on seasonal short-term forecasts, planting dates, and seed varietals adapted to specific climatic conditions.

6. **Women’s Access to Land**

Evaluation findings underscore the structural barrier of women’s lack of access to land for cultivation of rainfed and garden crops. Efforts to obtain degraded parcels of land for restoration and crop/fodder production (BDL, homestead gardens) have made some modest gains but several challenges (labor and capital investments, distance, fencing, water availability) place in question the long-term sustainability of these initiatives. In addition, there are impediments to titling and access to legal contracts which are undermined by the corruption of local officials.

**Recommendation**

In order to improve women’s access to land in future DFAP activities, FFP should conduct a detailed review of the key factors (sociocultural, religious, economic, environmental, institutional) constraining women’s access to land in Niger and introduce targeted interventions to remove key barriers identified. While initiatives such as BDL attempt to remedy the problem, actionable strategies are needed that make land more accessible in local settings that minimize distance and key factor inputs in labor, capital, and agricultural equipment/technologies such as fencing and water supply. Project funds may be needed for investment in land titling in more fertile areas with greater production potential such as in bottom lands for market gardening.

**Resilience**

1. **Early Warning Systems and Disaster Risk Reduction**

Early warning systems response units (e.g., SCAP-RU) tasked to strengthen community resilience capacity were found to be hobbled by challenges including limited responsiveness and support from the OSVs at the commune level, a lack of budgetary commitment, or resources emanating from the national ministry level. To mitigate these issues, the IPs reported more focused training in areas such as organizational development, community development, and risk management.

**Recommendation**

A strategic review of the structural factors impeding progress of the SCAP-RU to work more effectively with commune and regional government authorities should be undertaken by FFP. The most effective strategy may be to introduce program advocacy efforts to support greater awareness and investment in community resiliency among government officials at national, regional, and commune levels. This may include support for improved coordination and communication between the SCAP-RU and OSV, budgetary support, and ensuring resource transfer from the national to regional and commune levels.
## ANNEXES

### I. IMPLEMENTING PARTNER RESULTS FRAMEWORK

#### LAHIA Results Framework Summary

**GOAL:** Food insecurity and malnutrition are reduced at the level of poor households in rural areas in the districts of Aguié and Guidan Roumdji in the Maradi region of Niger

**SO1:** Nutritional status of children under 5 years of age and pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) improved

- IR1.1: Adoption of key maternal child health and nutrition (MNCH) practices increased
- IR1.2: Utilization of key MCHN services at community and health facility levels increased
- IR1.3: Access to potable water and sanitation facilities increased

**SO2:** Access to food by vulnerable households increased

- IR2.1: Women’s roles in livelihoods diversification and protection enhanced
- IR2.2: Use of ecologically sound agriculture and natural resource management (NRM) practices increased
- IR2.3: Agricultural marketing improved

**SO3:** Vulnerability to food security shocks reduced

- IR3.1: Capacity of communities to respond to and mitigate shocks improved
- IR3.2: Capacity of communes to monitor and respond to shocks improved

**SO4 Cross-cutting: Status of women within target households and communities improved**

- IR4.1: Staff and community capacity to address gender equity improved
- IR4.2: Gender capacity across sectors strengthened

#### PASAM-TAI Results Framework Summary

**GOAL:** Food insecurity and malnutrition in rural households in the Maradi and Zinder regions of Niger are reduced

**SO1:** Households with pregnant and lactating women and children under 5 districts have reduced chronic malnutrition

- IR1.1: Households (especially pregnant and lactating women and children under five) have adopted appropriate health, hygiene and nutrition behaviors
- IR1.2: Mother-child units have accessed quality community and facility-based health, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and nutrition services

**SO2:** Vulnerable households have increased the production and consumption of food for nutrition and income

- IR2.1: Households have increased and diversified the production of more nutritious foods for consumption and income
- IR2.2: Households have adopted improved varieties of staple crops for consumption and income
- IR2.3: Households have effectively managed environmentally responsible integrated crop production systems
- IR2.4: Households have increased sources of revenue
SO 3: Targeted communities have enhanced and protected food security
IR 3.1: Community-based early warning systems function as an integral part of the national early warning system (EWS) mechanism
IR 3.2: Targeted communities manage disaster responses
Cross-cutting Gender Objective 1: Gender roles expanded to enhance sustainable results
Cross-cutting IR 1.1: Target communities have improved gender equity
Cross-cutting IR 2.1: Women and men have increased basic literacy and numeracy skills
Cross-cutting IR 3.1: Governance of communities and national structures strengthened

Sawki Results Framework Summary
GOAL: Food insecurity and malnutrition among vulnerable populations in Niger are reduced
SO 1: Reduce chronic malnutrition among pregnant and lactating women & children under five with an emphasis on children under two
IR 1.1: Pregnant women, mothers and caretakers adopt appropriate nutrition practices during their children’s first 1,000 days
IR 1.2: Adolescents adopt appropriate nutrition practices and healthy timing of first pregnancy
IR 1.3: Health centers and other community actors promote and respond effectively and appropriately to community demand for counseling and care
SO 2: Increase the local availability and households’ access to nutritious food by diversifying agricultural productivity, rural households’ income, and increasing resilience to shocks
IR 2.1: Target women and girls increase the household availability of diversified nutritious food for consumption
IR 2.2: Target households and communities increase land and livestock productivity
IR 2.3: Target households increase income through their integration into value chains offering significant nutritional value and strong potential for income
Cross-cutting IR: Local government and community structures support households’ resilience to drought
CCO 1: Target communities and local leaders actively support comprehensive community-based early warning systems
CCO 2: Target communities and local leaders increase their capacity to mitigate the impact of droughts
II. EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK

Scope of Work

Final Evaluation of the Food for Peace Title II Projects

LAHIA, PASAM-TAI and Sawki in Niger

April 12, 2017

INTRODUCTION

The final evaluation of the 2012 Niger Title II Food for Peace (FFP) projects is the second and final phase of a pre-post evaluation survey. The baseline study, conducted by ICF International between February and June 2013, employed a mixed-method approach, and was designed to provide information on all four aspects of food security – availability, access, utilization and stability. The study investigated household food access, sanitation and hygiene, agriculture, household expenditures and assets, dietary diversity, and anthropometry among women and children. As with the baseline study, the Niger performance evaluation will also use a mixed-method approach, but will also utilize and integrate secondary data and project performance monitoring data. Methods will be chosen in order to generate the highest quality and the most credible and robust evidence possible to answer evaluation questions.

BACKGROUND

During 2012, FFP funded three Title II development food assistance projects (DFAP) in Niger that sought to improve long-term food security in the Zinder and Maradi regions. Save the Children (SC), in partnership with World Vision (WV), implemented the Livelihoods, Agriculture and Health Interventions in Action (LAHIA) project in Maradi. Catholic Relief Services (CRS), in partnership with the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics and the Misola Foundation, implemented the Programme d’Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire des Ménages (PASAM-TAI) in Maradi and Zinder. Mercy Corps, in partnership with Helen Keller International (HKI) and Africare, implemented the Sawki project in Maradi and Zinder. The projects were scheduled to end in September 2017. FFP extended the projects until September 2019 to align these three projects with the RISE Initiatives timeline.

i. Overview of the Save the Children/LAHIA project

With a stunting rate of 57.6 percent, the LAHIA project area has one of the highest chronic malnutrition rates in West Africa. Seasonal food shortages, gender inequities, time poverty among women, and limited access to health services due to poverty and the Government of Niger’s (GoN) low investment in health care quality, are all contributors to food insecurity. Agricultural employment and remittances are the two key livelihoods strategies in Niger’s agro-pastoralist zone, including Maradi and Zinder where 40 percent of the country’s food is produced. Yet, most households (HHs) in Maradi are unable to access enough land to feed their own families; half the population cannot afford a balanced diet, even though sufficient food is locally available. Reliance on cash for food purchase forces males to migrate to work, leaving women behind who resort to negative coping strategies to feed their children. Gender inequities and decades of political instability add to the challenge: girls and women are most marginalized. Norms linked to land tenure, asset ownership and accumulation, early marriage and HH decision-making leave women with no safety nets, skills or economic opportunities.

LAHIA aims to reduce food insecurity and malnutrition among poor rural households in Aguié and Guidan Roumdji Districts of Maradi Region, Niger. The project targets 17,972 direct beneficiary households. The strategic objectives and the intermediate results of the project include:

144 Household Economy Approach Survey (HEA), Save the Children, 2007.
SO1: Nutritional status of children under 5 years of age and pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) improved
   IR1.1: Adoption of key maternal child health and nutrition (MNCH) practices increased
   IR1.2: Utilization of key MCHN services at community and health facility levels increased
   IR1.3: Access to potable water and sanitation facilities increased

SO2: Access to food by vulnerable households increased
   IR2.1: Women’s roles in livelihoods diversification and protection enhanced
   IR2.2: Use of ecologically sound agriculture and natural resource management (NRM) practices increased
   IR2.3: Agricultural marketing improved

SO3: Vulnerability to food security shocks reduced
   IR3.1: Capacity of communities to respond to and mitigate shocks improved
   IR3.2: Capacity of communes to monitor and respond to shocks improved

SO4 Cross-cutting: Status of women within target households and communities improved.
   IR4.1: Staff and community capacity to address gender equity improved
   IR4.2: Gender capacity across sectors strengthened

SO1: LAHIA targets the First 1,000 Days of life to address underlying causes of chronic malnutrition in children under two and among PLW. A conditional monthly food ration for PLWs and children under 2 years of age and a “protective” ration for other HH members during the hungry season will also serve as an incentive to achieve social and behavior change (SBC) for improvements in health, nutrition and hygiene practices. Adolescent girls and grandmothers, men and boys will be important added targets for SBC.

SO2: Use of a Farmer Field School/Farmer Leader approach to increase knowledge and skills of (male and female) farmers to improve rain-fed crops and irrigated vegetable production will enhance agricultural practices that simultaneously boost productivity, improve nutrition and protect the environment. Savings promotion through the Mata Masu Dubara (MMD) approach, small animal husbandry activities and market-based IGAs will also target the poorest women.

SO3: SC’s efforts to integrate the Household Economic Approach (HEA) into the national early warning system Systeme d’Alerte Précoce/Cellule de Crise Alimentaire will continue. In partnership with staff from the government of Niger (GoN), these efforts strengthen commune level early warning systems, plans and crisis response units, improve information systems, and provide food for work (FFW) resources for community-prioritized mitigation activities. Community-level emergency preparedness and mitigation capacity will be built by training and support to Village Development Committees (VDCs).

SO4: Gender training and SBC activities designed to overcome economic, social and nutritional barriers for women and girls will be identified and defined through formative research. LAHIA staff and community leaders will be trained to incorporate gender equity into their work, priorities and attitudes. An adolescent girls and boys “summit” is proposed for Year 5 so youth can share ideas/opportunities they developed from LAHIA’s multisectoral approach to gender.

ii. Overview of the CRS/PASAM-TAI project

PASAM-TAI project presents an integrated approach to reducing chronic and acute food insecurity and malnutrition, improving livelihoods and protecting against shocks in two districts of Niger: Mayahi district
in Maradi and Kantche district in Zinder. These areas have very high levels of chronic malnutrition (59.5 percent) and alarming wasting rates (16.5 percent). The project seeks to ensure sustained improvements to reducing malnutrition of pregnant and lactating women and children under five (CU5), with an emphasis on children under two (CU2), and increased access to nutritious food by diversifying agricultural productivity, rural households’ income and increasing resilience to shocks. The project targets the same households (HH) and sub-groups in all activities; establish complimentary linkages between health, nutrition and livelihoods; promote strong community and project level management and M&E systems; and strengthen government structures. The project targets 86,700 vulnerable households. The strategic objectives and intermediate results of the project include:

**SO 1: Households with pregnant and lactating women and children under 5 districts have reduced chronic malnutrition**
- **IR 1.1:** Households (especially pregnant and lactating women and children under five) have adopted appropriate health, hygiene and nutrition behaviors
- **IR 1.2:** Mother-child units have accessed quality community and facility-based health, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and nutrition services

**SO 2: Vulnerable households have increased the production and consumption of food for nutrition and income**
- **IR 2.1:** Households have increased and diversified the production of more nutritious foods for consumption and income
- **IR 2.2:** Households have adopted improved varieties of staple crops for consumption and income
- **IR 2.3:** Households have effectively managed environmentally responsible integrated crop production systems
- **IR 2.4:** Households have increased sources of revenue

**SO 3: Targeted communities have enhanced and protected food security**
- **IR 3.1:** Community-based early warning systems function as an integral part of the national early warning system (EWS) mechanism
- **IR 3.2:** Targeted communities manage disaster responses

**Cross-cutting Gender Objective 1: Gender roles expanded to enhance sustainable results**
- Cross-cutting **IR 1.1:** Target communities have improved gender equity
- Cross-cutting **IR 2.1:** Women and men have increased basic literacy and numeracy skills
- Cross-cutting **IR 3.1:** Governance of communities and national structures strengthened

**SO1:** The intervention package includes a set of integrated activities focused on health, nutrition and water, sanitation and hygiene, including the 1,000 Days Approach. Title II foods will be used to provide blanket feeding for all Mother Child Units (MCU), which include PLW and CU2.

**SO2:** Activities under this strategic objective focus on horticulture and staple crops - emphasizing linkages with nutrition and women-led approaches - as well as livelihoods and building resilience to shocks through environmental and natural resource management, and savings and internal lending communities (SILC). Title II rations will be used in FFW activities to restore degraded land and increase access to land for women.
SO3: This SO includes activities to cover integrated disaster risk management and include a response plan for predictable shocks.

Gender is a cross-cutting SO and an integral part of all strategies. Two cross-cutting Intermediate Results (IR) to address gender disparities include: 1) The cell phone-based basic literacy and numeracy project primarily targeting women and adolescent girls; 2) Governance focuses on capacity building of community and national level structures.

iii. Overview of the Mercy Corps/Sawki project

Sawki is designed to respond to the food security needs of more than 92,000 (46,865 men and 45,227 women) beneficiaries in Maradi and Zinder, two of the most food insecure regions of Niger. Within these regions, Sawki targets 62 villages: 41 villages in the Zinder region and in 21 in the region of Maradi. These communities were selected based on the criteria of social vulnerability, economic opportunity and agro-pastoral linkages. A staggering 53.8 percent of CU5 in Maradi and Zinder are suffering from chronic malnutrition. This is rooted in a combination of factors, which include poverty, high population growth, limited knowledge about appropriate health and nutrition behaviors, inadequate access to health services, gender inequity, and weak agricultural and livestock systems. Consecutive droughts and other natural disasters due to climate change contribute to the problem. Even during years of normal rainfall, child under-nutrition persists, suggesting that suboptimal nutrition and health practices contribute significantly to the problem.

Sawki’s overall goal is to reduce food insecurity and malnutrition among vulnerable populations in Niger, with a special emphasis on empowering women and adolescent girls to achieve this goal. The project has two strategic objectives:

SO1: Reduce chronic malnutrition among pregnant and lactating women & children under five with an emphasis on children under two

IR1.1: Pregnant women, mothers and caretakers adopt appropriate nutrition practices during their children’s first 1,000 days
IR1.2: Adolescents adopt appropriate nutrition practices and healthy timing of first pregnancy
IR1.3: Health centers and other community actors promote and respond effectively and appropriately to community demand for counseling and care

SO2: Increase the local availability and households’ access to nutritious food by diversifying agricultural productivity, rural households’ income, and increasing resilience to shocks

IR2.1: Target women and girls increase the household availability of diversified nutritious food for consumption.
IR2.2: Target households and communities increase land and livestock productivity
IR2.3: Target households increase income through their integration into value chains offering significant nutritional value and strong potential for income

Cross-cutting IR: Local government and community structures support households’ resilience to drought

CCO 1: Target communities and local actively support comprehensive community-based early warning systems
CCO 2: Target communities and local leaders increase their capacity to mitigate the impact of droughts

SO1: The intervention package for this strategic objective prioritizes targeting those in the 1,000 day window of opportunity between conception and a child’s second birthday. It uses a community-based
model and research-based social and behavior change communications (SBCC) strategies to motivate the adoption of practices that protect or improve the nutritional status of PLW, adolescent girls, and CUs. Using the Essential Nutrition Actions (ENA) framework, the project promotes nutritionally-appropriate practices, healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies and appropriate sanitation and hygiene practices to reduce infectious diseases. The interventions also focus on adolescent girls and those who influence their life choices with age-appropriate activities to ensure girls have the knowledge, social support, and access to the resources needed to adopt healthy behaviors.

**SO2:** The activities for this SO focus on conservation agriculture and animal husbandry. Considering households' limited access to land, the project promotes diversified food production on limited household land. The project hypothesizes that increasing productivity and diversity of food, cash crops and animals throughout the year will build resilience among target population to better cope with and adapt to shocks by mitigating and spreading risks. Producers participate in specific value chains that have high nutritional value, efficiency, and potential for growth.

**EVALUATION RATIONALE**

**a) Evaluation purpose:**

The purpose of the final performance evaluation is to measure the development outcomes of PASAM-TAI, LAHIA, and Sawki projects. The specific final evaluation objectives are to:

i. Evaluate the performance of the three development projects in achieving their project goals, strategic objectives, and intermediate results, to contribute to USAID’s efforts to improve the food security of target populations in the respective project areas. In doing so, major constraints in achieving the expected project results in an equitable and sustainable manner should be identified.

ii. Assess the functionality and performance of systems and processes established independently by the projects, as well as in collaboration with education institutions, GoN, research organizations, etc., to achieve project outcomes and sustainability. These findings should consider future project design and aim to explain successes and/or areas for improvement.

iii. Evaluate the effectiveness and relevance of the technical interventions to achieve project outcomes, and discuss those findings in relation to the projects’ theories of change.

iv. Identify best practices, strengths, and challenges in the projects’ designs, including the projects’ theories of change, and implementation to achieving project achievements and approaches that the FFP and Mission should consider in the design and development of the future projects to achieve food and nutrition security, and strengthen household and communities’ resilience capacities in the Sahel.

**b) Evaluation Topics and Accompanying Questions**

The evaluation is expected to provide substantive information on the following five key topics, with the report’s overarching purpose being to comment on both current project performance and future project design. Each topic presented below is accompanied by specific evaluation questions to support the achievement of this end:

I. **Project Achievements** - To what extent have the projects met their goals, purposes and the outcomes? What factors promoted or inhibited the achievement of the project objectives? Has the demographic shift in Niger affected livelihoods and incidence of poverty in the target areas? Based on the evidence, what are the plausible pathways and determinants of achieving the key outcomes? Who benefited from the project interventions? Did interventions reach the poorest individuals within the target population areas (landless, land poor, divorced and widowed older females in female headed households?) Are interventions appropriate and effective for these poorest individuals? How effective was the targeting approach in achieving the project goal? How were problems and challenges managed?
What are the strengths of and challenges to the overall projects' implementation, management, communication, and collaboration?

2. **Sustainability of Outcomes** - Based on the evidence, which project outcomes are likely to be sustained? What processes, systems, and institutional arrangements were made to sustain the necessary and critical services required to sustain the outcomes? How are the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the services provided by the project perceived by the community? What is the level of motivation of the service providers to continue providing services after the project ends? What has been done so far to increase the motivation of the community to demand and pay (or invest time) for the services? What would be the motivation of the beneficiaries to receive these services? Have the projects identified the necessary resources and capacity strengthening supports for the service providers? How effectively did the projects take advantage of the other USG and non-USG investments in the target area to achieve sustained outcomes as identified in the theories of change? What are the results of enhanced linkages with other service providers? What are the missed (if any) opportunities?

3. **Effectiveness and Efficiency of Interventions and Intervention Implementation** - In each technical sector, what are the strengths of and challenges to the efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions' implementation and their acceptance in the target communities? What factors in the implementation and context are associated with greater or lesser efficiency and effectiveness in producing Outputs of higher or lower quality? Which interventions and implementation processes are more or less acceptable to members of the target communities and why? What post-harvest and storage practices are used? Does access to storage vary among households? N.B. Specific questions from the FFP Niger Design Team related to this category of questions include the following: What mobile livelihood strategies are pursued by households? Are these strategies factored into DFAP planning and interventions? Do the projects take into account the amount of remittances households receive as a variable in planning and interventions? How is ownership or access to a mobile phone used as an economic strategy? Do women have access to mobile phones?

4. **Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned** - What are the unintended positive and/or negative consequences of the projects, and how can future projects minimize potential unintended negative consequences? How can FFP and its partners’ design strategies to systematically capture positive consequences? What key lessons learned and best practices should inform future projects in the country?

c) **Audience and intended uses**

The primary audience of the evaluation reports will be the three PVOs (CRS, Mercy Corps, and SC) and their sub partners, and USAID (FFP/Washington, USAID/Niger and the FFP West Africa Regional Office). The reports will also be shared with the Government of Niger. Findings from the performance evaluation will be used to determine the performance of the three projects and draw lessons learned for the selection, design, and implementation of future USAID projects, in particular those under the RISE initiatives. USAID (through the EVELYN contract) will make extensive use of findings from the evaluation to make different presentations and bulletins as part of a wider dissemination of best practices and lessons learned. The evaluation recommendations may be used by FFP to refine proposal guidelines and project policy.

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

The final evaluation will use a mixed-methods approach.

a) **Desk Review**

The evaluation team should review the following documents to contextualize and refine the evaluation questions, as well as to gain an in-depth understanding about the project design, implementation, and the
food security situation in the area. However, the literature review should not be limited to the following documents.

   a) Project proposals
   b) Annual results reports
   c) Midterm evaluation reports
   d) Baseline Study for the Title II Development Food Assistance Projects in Niger, 2014
   e) Niger Demographic Health Survey, 2012
   f) 2011- Living Standard Measurement Study
   g) Niger - Joint IDA-IMF staff advisory note on the economic and social development plan 2012-2015
   h) Striving toward disaster resilient development in Sub-Saharan Africa: strategic framework 2016–2020
   i) RISE baseline survey report, and the studies conducted by the projects to get an in-depth understanding about the context of the project areas and how these three projects
   j) Monitoring data and reports

b) Quantitative Endline Survey

The quantitative endline survey must collect data on the same population-level impact and outcome indicators (presented below) that were collected during the baseline survey.

Quantitative endline surveys must utilize the same data collection instruments, level of statistical precision, and statistical power as the baseline study\(^{145}\). Quantitative endline survey design does not need to be identical to the baseline. For example, all three projects reduced their target areas therefore the sampling frame used for the baseline needs to be adjusted.

Ideally, a quantitative endline survey should follow the data collection timeline used for the baseline survey. The baseline data were collected between February 26 and March 30, 2013. For this endline survey, the data collection will be pushed by a few weeks due to the delay in awarding EVELYN. A few additional questions will be incorporated to the household questionnaire based on FFP’s interest.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mean Depth of Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-targeted beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women (of reproductive age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>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 past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit, and/or agricultural insurance) in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced the value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (Household Hunger Scale - HHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity (Score): Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (WDDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Percentage of children under age five who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Percent of children under five years old with diarrhea treated with Oral Rehydration Therapy (ORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Percent of households using an improved drinking water source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Percent of households using an improved sanitation facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Percent of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Percent of births receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Percent of farmers that used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Percentage who recognize 2 or more reasons why access to health services is important for children under 5 and women of child bearing age including adolescent girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Percent of births in the last 24 months receiving at least 4 antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Percent of respondents who know 3 of 5 critical moments for handwashing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The household survey will be administered using the paper and pencil interviewing (PAPI) approach.

c) Qualitative Study

Primarily qualitative methods will be used to collect information to answer the questions pertaining to evaluation topics two through four (Sustainability of Outcomes, Effectiveness of Interventions and Intervention Implementation, Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned), as well as several questions within the first topic (Project Achievement). In addition, qualitative study should speak to the effectiveness of project management, systems and processes established by the project, including the sustainability strategy and its implementation, performance monitoring, strategies to improve gender equality both at the participant and project management level, environmental considerations, and conflict sensitivity. The qualitative evaluation must also capture lessons learned and best practices. The evaluation team leader and members will be responsible for collecting and analyzing the qualitative data, and also contributing to the interpretation of the quantitative results using qualitative findings.

The evaluation team will use a variety of methods for collecting information. These methods, to the maximum extent possible, will ensure that if a different, well-qualified evaluator were to undertake the same evaluation, he or she would arrive at the same or similar findings and conclusions. The evaluation team should decide on specific methodologies before traveling to Niger and finalize the methodology during the team meeting in-country. The evaluation team should also meet with FFP staff in Washington, D.C., and Mission staff in Niger before starting fieldwork.
The evaluation team will design the overall qualitative study approach and should consider a variety of primary data collection methods, including: semi-structured in-depth interviews, group discussions, key informant interviews, case studies, and direct observations. The team may use the most significant change methodology to identify a selective set of case studies.

The evaluation team may use non-probability sampling methods to select a subset of enumeration areas from the quantitative survey. In selecting sample sites, the evaluation team should strategically select large-enough-yet-manageable sample sites that generally represent the target area.

As with the quantitative household survey, qualitative sampling should include both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. In addition, the qualitative team should interview USAID personnel, project staff, knowledgeable people from the community, local government staff, community leaders, host Government officials, and other agencies and individuals as appropriate.

d) Data Analysis and Interpretation

The evaluation team will statistically compare the endline data for each of the three strata with that of the baseline for that stratum, and also for the overall country level, in order to detect changes (if any) for all key indicators. The incumbent will conduct descriptive and inferential analyses to describe the results as well as evaluate the performance of the projects through determining the changes. The team will also carry out econometric analyses to determine the magnitude and direction of changes.

In advance of fieldwork, the evaluation team should develop a data analysis plan and submit it to the CoR for approval. When analyzing the data, however, the evaluation team should not limit itself to the data analysis plan; rather, the evaluation team should keep an open and curious mind to look for correlations between variables.

In presenting the analysis, the evaluation team should be cognizant about the readers’ familiarity with the statistical presentation. Therefore, FFP suggests avoiding jargons and describing the statistical terms in a common language.

Interpreting the results is as critical as the analysis. Oftentimes, it can be difficult for a reader to fully understand the key points and utility of the findings conveyed in a report. The evaluation team should interpret the data using findings from the qualitative study, as well as econometric analysis.

The analysis and interpretation should be presented in a “story telling format” so that the readers can see a human face as they read the report. While it is important for the reader to understand whether level of stunting is reduced in the area, it is equally important to understand the pathway; for example, how learning derived from project participation influenced people’s practices, which in turn resulted in positive changes in food security outcomes at the household and/or community level. Similarly, it is equally important for the readers to know some of the challenges participants faced that might have prevented them from reaping the full benefits of the projects.

DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team shall deliver the following deliverables. All deliverables must be approved by the CoR for EVELYN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updated Work Plan:</strong> The work plan for the performance evaluation should include the endline survey and qualitative study. FFP does not expect a separate workplan for the performance evaluation but the components should be included into the EVELYN workplan.</td>
<td><strong>March 22, 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Evaluation (PE) Concept Paper:</strong> A brief (5-page) concept paper outlining the overall approach to the performance evaluation.</td>
<td><strong>March 22, 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBS Quantitative Survey Instruments:</strong></td>
<td>March 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) English version of the endline instrument.</td>
<td>(interim estimates produced by June 20, 2017; preliminary estimates produced by July 10, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Translation of instrument into Hausa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Back-translate the instrument from Hausa with a second translator to ensure accurate translation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Pilot the survey instrument in-country, and revise as needed and submit for final approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pertinent Permissions approvals, insurance:</strong></td>
<td>March 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented Official Approval from all relevant institutional review boards and from host country institutions to collect data, conduct the evaluation, and release data and reports, as required, as well as a statement affirming adherence to all requirements specified in USAID’s Scientific Research Policy, if primary data is collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBS Data Treatment and Analysis Plan:</strong></td>
<td>April 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should include how the data will be cleaned, weighted, and analyzed. The analysis plan should include descriptive, inferential, and econometric analyses plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population-based Survey Protocol:</strong></td>
<td>April 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 page protocol that includes: indicators to be collected; local country partners; sample size, design and plan; survey design; questionnaire design; fieldwork, including training and field support/supervision; data management, including quality control; analysis and reporting; and budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE Inception Report:</strong></td>
<td>April 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inception report should include a brief synthesis of the literature review, detailed qualitative evaluation methodology including evaluation questions contextualized based on the literature review, sample site selection strategy and number of sites to be selected, types of interviewees, evaluation team members and their roles, how the qualitative information will be analyzed and integrated with quantitative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Evaluation Protocol:</strong></td>
<td>May 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 page protocol that describes the evaluation questions to be answered; indicators/variables to be measured; quantitative and qualitative analysis plan; sampling methods; qualitative data collection and analysis methods; data quality assessment methods; the process or format for recording and reporting results; and the budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Methods and Tools:</strong></td>
<td>June 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical outline organized by the evaluation questions including the methods/tools for data collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft Endline Report:</strong></td>
<td>September 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 60 page report, excluding annexes and attachments, which integrates the quantitative data from the PBS and includes a statistical comparison between baseline and endline data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Analytical methods to include appropriate tests of differences; econometric analysis to evaluate the theories of change and to explore the causal relation between the outcome and activities/variables based on the theoretical models; it is expected that the contractor will interpret the analytical findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Utilization Workshops:</strong></td>
<td>November/December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Arrange and lead a utilization workshop in each country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Share the findings from the performance evaluation, lessons learned, best practices, conclusions and recommendations, and engage participants to think through the implications of the evaluation findings in designing future projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Debriefing with USAID/Niger, FFP/Washington, and Partners:** The team will present the major findings of the evaluation to USAID, the DFAP partners, donors, and Government of Niger (as appropriate and defined by USAID/Niger) through a PowerPoint presentation prior to the team’s departure from Bangladesh. The team will also debrief FFP/W upon return to the United States. The debriefings will include a discussion of evaluation findings with possible recommendations. The team will consider USAID comments and revise the draft report accordingly, as appropriate and without compromising the validity or independence of the evaluation.

**Draft Evaluation Report:** There will be three separate performance evaluation reports for the three projects. The evaluation team will analyze all data collected during the evaluation to prepare a draft performance evaluation report and submit the report. The evaluation team should substantiate all findings and recommendations through citations of information sources. Using quantitative and qualitative analyses as well as projects’ monitoring data, the report should be drafted in such way that it tells stories based on the projects’ theory of change.

The evaluation team will submit an electronic Microsoft Word version of the draft written report of findings and recommendations to the CoR, USAID/Niger, USAID West Africa Regional Office, FFP/Washington, and implementing partners will provide comments on the draft performance evaluation report within 15 business days. The evaluation team will in turn revise the draft report incorporating USAID and IP comments and suggestions within 15 business days of receipt of the written comments. The written report should clearly describe findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

**Final Endline Report:**
A revised version of the draft report that incorporates comments from FFP, Implementing Partners, the USAID Missions in the Evaluation country, and includes a three- to five-page executive summary of the purpose, background of the project, methods, findings, and, if applicable, recommendations.

**Briefings:** Hold a formal briefing for FFP in Washington, DC, on the evaluation, conclusions, lessons learned, recommendations and a summary of the key outcomes from the in-country utilization workshops.

**Final Evaluation Report:** The evaluation team will submit a final report that incorporates USAID and PVO comments and suggestions 15 business days after receiving comments from USAID on the draft final evaluation report. The team will follow the format approved by CoR. The evaluation team will edit and format the final report as appropriate to ensure a high-quality deliverable.

The final report should meet the following criteria to ensure a high-quality deliverable:

- Represent a thoughtful, well-researched and well-organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project, what did not and why;

- Address all evaluation questions included in the scope of work;

- Include the scope of work as an annex. All modifications to the scope of work, whether in technical requirements, evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, methodology or timeline need to be agreed upon in writing by the CoR;
Explain the evaluation methodology in detail. All tools used in conducting the evaluation, such as questionnaires, checklists, and discussion guides will be included in an Annex in the final report;

Include evaluation findings that assess outcomes and impact on males and females;

Disclose limitations to the evaluation, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology, e.g. selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.;

Present evaluation findings as analyzed facts, evidence, and data, and not based on anecdotes, hearsay or compilation of people’s opinions. Findings should be specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence;

Properly identify and list all sources of information in an Annex;

Include recommendations that are supported by a specific set of findings; and

Include recommendations that are action-oriented, practical, and specific, with defined responsibility for the action.

The format of the final evaluation report should strike a balance between depth and length. The report should be drafted to tell stories based on the projects’ theories of change. The report should include a table of contents, table of figures (as appropriate), acronyms, executive summary, introduction, purpose of the evaluation, research design and methodology, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations.

The report should include, in the annex, any substantially dissenting views by any Team member, USAID or the PVOs on any of the findings or recommendations, a copy of this Scope of Work, a list of persons and organizations contacted, and any other attachments deemed significant.

The report should not exceed 60 pages which integrates the quantitative analysis from the PBS and includes a statistical comparison between baseline and endline results, annual monitoring results, and qualitative study findings, excluding annexes, and should be submitted electronically in English.

It should include analytical methods to include appropriate tests of differences; econometric analysis to evaluate the theories of change and to explore the causal relation between the outcome and activities/variables based on the theoretical models; it is expected that the contractor will interpret the analytical findings.

The report will be disseminated within and outside USAID as appropriate. A second version of this report excluding any potentially procurement-sensitive information will be submitted electronically by the evaluation team to USAID’s Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC).

All quantitative data, if gathered, should be (1) provided in an electronic file in easily readable format; (2) organized and fully documented for use by those
Evaluation Team Composition

The Senior Evaluation Specialist will be responsible for designing and managing the evaluations and supervising the evaluation team members; coordinating with the implementing partners, USAID Mission and other stakeholders; coordinating with the endline PBS team; analyzing the findings and drafting the report. As this is a mixed-method performance evaluation, the endline survey will require the following personnel: Senior Survey Method Specialist, Data Analyst, Survey Coordinator, Data Management Specialist, Anthropometry Specialist, Country Operations Manager, and Survey Monitors. The qualitative component will require participation from the Qualitative Study Specialist, Subject Matter Evaluation Specialist (Agronomist), Subject Matter Evaluation Specialist (Nutritionist), Subject Matter Evaluation Specialists (Resilience or Disaster Risk Management Specialist).

Please refer to Section C.6, Key Personnel / Personnel Responsibilities and Qualifications, in the scope of work section of the contract for specific details on expected qualifications, roles and responsibilities of both key and non-key staff.

Field Logistics

The evaluation team is responsible to arrange and pay for all logistics including anthropometric equipment, and transportation.
### III. EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Type of Answers Needed</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Project Achievements</td>
<td>Qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>Comparative &amp; Descriptive &amp; Normative</strong></td>
<td>- Direct and indirect project beneficiaries&lt;br&gt;- IP staff&lt;br&gt;- USAID FFP staff&lt;br&gt;- USAID Niger staff&lt;br&gt;- Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture&lt;br&gt;- Communal and Departmental staff&lt;br&gt;- Local community leaders&lt;br&gt;- IP documentation (e.g., DFAP proposals, annual and quarterly reports)&lt;br&gt;- DFSA MTE Report</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Content analysis of beneficiary responses (FGDs) and stakeholders responses (KII) to assess their views on extent to which activities have been achieved, and on what factors promoted or inhibited project activities and outcomes&lt;br&gt;- Content analysis of IP Annual Reports that describes achievements to date and factors related to performance&lt;br&gt;- Content analysis of DFSA mid-term evaluations describing findings and conclusions on achievements to date and factors related to progress to date&lt;br&gt;- Content analysis of DFSA mid-term evaluations describing findings and conclusions on achievements to date and factors related to progress to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent have the activities of the three projects met their goals, purposes, and desired outcomes; and what factors promoted or inhibited their achievement?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Desk review&lt;br&gt;- KII using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category&lt;br&gt;- FGD using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Statistical analysis and comparison of data (targets versus actual) from PBS BL/EL indicators, and comparative analysis of IPTT BL/EL indicators. Differences in population means (or proportions, depending on the outcome/impact variable) will be measured between the BL and EL survey rounds, from the two independent cross-sections of households sampled in each round. Two-sample, two-tailed t-tests will be utilized to compare mean values of baseline and endline outcomes to determine the significance of any changes over time. Multivariate regression models that include village fixed effects and key socio-economic and intervention-specific factors as covariates will then be used to explore socio-economic and intervention-specific factors that may have influenced the observed outcome/impact changes, while controlling for village-specific influences that are unrelated to the project. Next, key covariates will be interacted with the survey-round variable, to provide estimates on how village and household characteristics directly influence program impacts. The overall sequence for the econometric analyses and model specifications thus introduces increasing precision of the project-effect estimates (by tightening the confidence interval on the estimates), and therefore rigor to detect changes in the impact/outcome variables between BL and EL, and understand the reasons for changes. Separate models will be run for each impact/outcome variable. Quantitative analysis of the PBS data will be disaggregated by IP. The quantitative analysis will also include a review of the annual performance data against targets.</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Statistical analysis and comparison of data (targets versus actual) from PBS BL/EL indicators, and comparative analysis of IPTT BL/EL indicators. Differences in population means (or proportions, depending on the outcome/impact variable) will be measured between the BL and EL survey rounds, from the two independent cross-sections of households sampled in each round. Two-sample, two-tailed t-tests will be utilized to compare mean values of baseline and endline outcomes to determine the significance of any changes over time. Multivariate regression models that include village fixed effects and key socio-economic and intervention-specific factors as covariates will then be used to explore socio-economic and intervention-specific factors that may have influenced the observed outcome/impact changes, while controlling for village-specific influences that are unrelated to the project. Next, key covariates will be interacted with the survey-round variable, to provide estimates on how village and household characteristics directly influence program impacts. The overall sequence for the econometric analyses and model specifications thus introduces increasing precision of the project-effect estimates (by tightening the confidence interval on the estimates), and therefore rigor to detect changes in the impact/outcome variables between BL and EL, and understand the reasons for changes. Separate models will be run for each impact/outcome variable. Quantitative analysis of the PBS data will be disaggregated by IP. The quantitative analysis will also include a review of the annual performance data against targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Type of Answers Needed</td>
<td>Data Source(s)</td>
<td>Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Did interventions reach the poorest individuals within the target population areas (landless, land poor, divorced and widowed older females in female headed households?)</td>
<td>Comparative &amp; Descriptive &amp; Normative</td>
<td>As for EQ 1.</td>
<td>As for EQ 1.</td>
<td>As for EQ 1 for both qualitative and quantitative analyses, with further disaggregation by each beneficiary sub-group for sub-groups analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Based on available evidence, what are plausible/potential pathways to achieving outcomes across a priority set of project activities selected by USAID for additional learning?</td>
<td>Descriptive &amp; Normative</td>
<td>As for EQ 1.</td>
<td>As for EQ 1.</td>
<td>Qualitative: - Document review using each IP’s DFAP RF and descriptive narrative of the theory of change as the reference point. Assess how well IPs implementation of projects followed or deviated from the causal pathways in the FFP RF. - Supplement analysis with data from KII and FGDs. Quantitative: Statistical analysis and comparison of selected PBS BL/EL data. Differences in population means (or proportions, depending on the outcome/impact variable) will be measured between the BL and EL survey rounds, from the two independent cross-sections of households sampled in each round. Two-sample, two-tailed t-tests will be utilized to compare mean values of baseline and endline outcomes to determine statistically significant changes over time. Multivariate regression models that include village fixed effects and key socio-economic and intervention-specific factors as covariates will then be used to explore socio-economic and intervention-specific factors that may have influenced the observed outcome/impact changes, while controlling for village-specific influences that are unrelated to the project. Next, key covariates will be interacted with the survey-round variable, to provide estimates on how village and household characteristics directly influence program impacts. The overall sequence for the econometric analyses and model specifications thus introduces increasing precision of the project-effect estimates (by tightening the confidence interval on the estimates), and therefore rigor to detect changes in the impact/outcome variables between BL and EL, and understand the reasons for changes. Separate models will be run for each impact/outcome variable. Quantitative analysis of the PBS data will be disaggregated by IP. The quantitative analysis will also include a review of the annual performance data against targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Type of Answers Needed</td>
<td>Data Source(s)</td>
<td>Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. In each technical sector addressed by the projects (maternal & child health & nutrition; agriculture / livelihoods; early warning systems / disaster risk / resilience), what were the most effective and most efficient implementation methods and approaches among those selected by IPs? | Comparative & Descriptive & Normative | **Qualitative:**  
- Direct and indirect project beneficiaries  
- IPs staff  
- USAID FFP staff  
- USAID Niger staff  
- Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture  
- Communal and Departmental staff  
- Local community leaders  
- IP documentation (e.g., DFAP proposals, annual and quarterly reports)  
- Previous evaluation reports (e.g., DFSA Mid-Term Evaluation Reports)  
**Quantitative:**  
- EVELYN Niger PBS BL/EL data  
- IPTT BL/EL data | **Qualitative:**  
- Desk review  
- KIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category.  
- FGDs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category.  
**Quantitative:**  
Desk review, baseline and endline surveys | **Qualitative:**  
- Content analysis of beneficiary responses (FGDs) and stakeholders responses (KIs) to assess their views on effectiveness and efficiency of projects’ implementation methods across the multiple technical sectors, as well as for specific project activities and sub-activities for which USAID indicated particular interest via its comments.  
- Content analysis of IPs’ DFSA proposal, annual reports and mid-term evaluation report(s) to understand changes in implementation approaches, costs associated with specific technical sector and activity, etc.  
**Quantitative:**  
Statistical analysis and comparison of data from PBS BL/EL indicators, and analysis of IPTT BL/EL indicators to assess the relative effectiveness of approaches selected. |
| 2.1. What are the strengths of and challenges to the projects’ overall implementation approach, management, communication, and collaboration? What steps were taken by the IPs to address challenges? | Descriptive | **Qualitative:**  
- IP documentation  
- Previous evaluation reports  
- IP staff  
- USAID FFP staff  
- USAID Niger staff  
- Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture  
- Communal and Departmental staff  
- Staff at other NGOs and donors implementing projects in same areas  
- Private sector service providers  
- Local community leaders | **Qualitative:**  
- Desk review  
- KIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category  
**Qualitative:**  
- Content analysis of relevant KIs (e.g., IPs staff, Nigerien government staff, USAID FFP staff, other NGO/donor staff implementing in same area) to assess their views on strengths and challenges associated with each project.  
- Content analysis of KIs (e.g., IPs staff, Nigerien government staff, USAID FFP staff, other NGO/donor staff implementing in same area) to address challenges in project management, partnership, M&E, decision making processes, and adaptations.  
- Content analysis of DFSA proposals describing implementation approach, management, communication and collaboration to be compared with annual reports to identify strengths and challenges and steps IPs took to address challenges  
- Review of mid-term evaluation reports to identify strengths, challenges and weaknesses of project implementation approach, management, communication, collaboration…compare with subsequent IP annual reports to determine if these strengths are still evident and what steps IPs have taken to address challenges., how they have been overcome (and if so, how) –  
- Compare results of these reviews with content analysis of KII data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Comparative &amp; Descriptive</th>
<th>Qualitative:</th>
<th>Quantitative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Who was targeted by and benefited from each project's intervention activities, and how effective was /were the selected targeting approach(es) in achieving its respective goals?</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>- IP documentation - Previous evaluation reports - IPs staff - USAID FFP staff - USAID Niger staff - Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture - Communal and Departmental staff - Local community leaders</td>
<td>- Desk review - KIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category - EVELYN Niger PBS BL/EL data - IPTT BL/EL data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability of Outcomes**

2.3. How are the quality, frequency, effectiveness, and suitability of the services provided by the project perceived by the beneficiaries and their communities? Are there major differences in these perceptions of service delivery across key beneficiary subgroups, and what are reasons why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative &amp; Descriptive</th>
<th>Qualitative:</th>
<th>Quantitative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Direct and indirect project beneficiaries - Previous evaluation reports - IP project documentation - Private sector actors - USAID FFP staff - USAID Niger staff - Communal and Departmental staff - Local community leaders | - Desk review - KIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. - FGDs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. | - Content analysis of FGDs with direct and indirect beneficiaries by select subgroups to assess their perception of the activities they were involved in - Content analysis of relevant KIs (e.g., local community leaders, private sector actors) to assess their perception of the activities they or their peers were involved in. -Comparison of findings related to perception of project activities in previous evaluations with those found in this round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Type of Answers Needed</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Based on the evidence, what project activities and outcomes are likely to be sustained, and why?</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> - Direct and indirect project beneficiaries - IP Sustainability Plans, - IP Exit Strategies - Previous evaluation reports - IPs staff - USAID FFP staff - USAID Niger staff - Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture - Communal and Departmental staff - Staff at other NGOs and donors - Private sector actors - Local community leaders <strong>Quantitative:</strong> - EVELYN Niger PBS BL/EL data - IPTT BL/EL data</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> - Desk review - KIIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. - FGDs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. <strong>Quantitative:</strong> Desk review, PBS and IPTT data is collected independently.</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> - Content analysis of FGDs with direct and indirect beneficiaries to assess changes in practices and behaviors, as well as service utilization and satisfaction by direct and indirect beneficiaries. - Content analysis of FGDs and KIIs to assess capacity of beneficiaries and service providers to sustainably maintain systems and services after project close out. - Content analysis of FGDs and select KIIs to assess perceived changes in behavior, potential for other funding sources or mechanisms, and motivation to sustain some or all of the activities. - Content analysis of project documents and select KIIs to assess the type of linkages and processes/systems in place between projects and other organizations (national government, NGOs, funders, etc.) -Content analysis of IP Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies -Review of DFSA MTE reports that discuss the likelihood of sustainability based on IP Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies - Review of subsequent IP Annual Reports to determine if IPs followed up on findings/conclusions/recommendations from MTE to ensure sustainability of activities and outcomes <strong>Quantitative:</strong> - Statistical analysis and comparison of PBS BL/EL data and analysis of IPTT BL/EL data to assess changes in practices and behaviors, as well as activity involvement, service utilization, and satisfaction by direct and indirect beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. What processes, systems, and institutional arrangements (especially linkages and coordination with other USG and non-USG investments) were made by the IPs or members of the target population to sustain the necessary and critical services required to achieve and sustain projects outcomes?</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> - IPs project documentation - Mid-term evaluation reports - IPs staff - USAID FFP staff - USAID Niger staff - Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture - Communal and Departmental staff - Staff at other NGOs and donors - Communal and Departmental staff - Local community leaders</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> - Desk review - KIIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. - FGDs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category.</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> - Content analysis of IPs project documents and relevant KIIs (e.g., IPs staff, Ministries’ and Departmental staff, USAID staff, staff at other donors and NGOs) to assess the type, strength, and nature of processes, systems, and linkages in place, and their level of importance in sustaining the projects. - Content analysis of IP Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies -Review of DFSA MTE reports that discuss the likelihood of sustainability based on IP Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies - Review of subsequent IP Annual Reports to determine if IPs followed up on findings/conclusions/recommendations from MTE to ensure sustainability of activities and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Type of Answers Needed</td>
<td>Data Source(s)</td>
<td>Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2. What is the level of motivation of the service providers to continue providing services after the project ends, and of the beneficiaries to receive and pay (or invest time) for these services? | Descriptive            | **Qualitative:**  
- Direct and indirect project beneficiaries  
- IPs project documentation  
- Mid-Term Evaluation reports  
- IPs staff  
- USAID FFP staff  
- USAID Niger staff  
- Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture  
- Communal and Departmental staff  
- Staff at other NGOs and donors  
- Private sector service providers  
- Local community leaders | **Qualitative:**  
- Desk review  
- KIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category.  
- FGDs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. | **Qualitative:**  
- Content analysis of KIs with service providers and FGDS with beneficiaries to assess motivation to invest (money and/or time) into providing and/or purchasing services, as well as their perception of the value of activities (crossover with 2.c.)  
- Content analysis of relevant KIs (e.g., local community leaders, IPs staff, Niger’s Ministries’ staff) to assess their motivation to continue services and fund them.  
- Review of IP project documents to identify indications that beneficiaries are already investing time and/or money into certain activities (e.g., cost-share, volunteering, resumption of discontinued activity).  
- Content analysis of IP Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies  
- Review of DFSA MTE reports that discuss the likelihood of sustainability based on IP Sustainability Plans and Exit Strategies  
- Review of subsequent IP Annual Reports to determine if IPs followed up on findings/conclusions/recommendations from MTE to ensure sustainability of activities and outcomes |

**Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned**

| 4. What are the positive or negative unintended consequences of each of the projects, if any, and how were these consequences identified and taken into account by the IPs? | Descriptive            | **Qualitative:**  
- Direct and indirect project beneficiaries  
- IP project documentation  
- Previous evaluation reports  
- IPs staff  
- USAID FFP staff  
- USAID Niger staff  
- Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture  
- Communal and Departmental staff  
- Staff at other NGOs and donors  
- Private sector actors  
- Local community leaders | **Qualitative:**  
- Desk review  
- KIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category.  
- FGDs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category. | **Qualitative:**  
- Content analysis of FGDs with direct and indirect beneficiaries, and relevant KIs (e.g., Nigerien IPs, IP staff, USAID FFP staff) to identify and assess their views on negative or positive unintended consequences.  
- Content analysis of select KIs for lesson learned, adaptive management in project implementation to address such consequences, and recommendations to minimize negative consequences (if identified).  
- Content analysis of project documents to identify unintended consequences, and of previous evaluation reports to assess whether any previously identified unintended consequences remain relevant and how their magnitude may have evolved. | **Quantitative:**  
If applicable, additional tailored statistical analysis of PBS data to identify certain types of unintended consequences and quantify them. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Type of Answers Needed</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. What key lessons learned and best practices should inform future projects in the country?</td>
<td>Descriptive &amp; Normative</td>
<td>Qualitative: - IP project documentation - Previous evaluation reports - IPs staff - USAID FFP staff - USAID Niger staff - Staff at Niger’s Ministries of Health, Education, and Agriculture - Communal and Departmental staff - Private sector actors - Local community leaders</td>
<td>Qualitative: - Desk review - KIIs using semi-structured instruments specific to given respondent category.</td>
<td>Qualitative: - Content analysis of relevant KIIIs (e.g., IPs staff, Nigerien IPs, USAID FFP staff) to assess their views on lessons learned and best practices for future design of FFP projects. - Content analysis of project documents to identify lessons learned and review of mid-term evaluation reports to avoid duplicating previous lessons and best practices, as well as identifying those that seem to have not held over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Three evaluation questions originally identified by the FFP Design Team do not directly fit within the revised evaluation questions proposed in this protocol (see Annex B for more information.) The evaluation team proposes to address them as stand-alone questions in the following way:

- **Has the demographic shift in Niger affected livelihoods and incidence of poverty in the target areas?** To answer this question credibly would require different data than is available in the PBS. The evaluation team will instead provide any relevant data that emerges from analysis of PBS data and during FGD and KII discussions, if applicable.
- **What mobile livelihood strategies are pursued by households?** The evaluation team will use any existing PBS data, if available, to address this question.
- **Do women have access to mobile phones?** The evaluation team will use relevant variables as indicators from the PBS data, supplemented by collection of qualitative data, to address this question.
# IV. QUALITATIVE FIELDWORK SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda- Niamey</th>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday June 28, 2017</td>
<td>Team Orientation and work plan 3 teams</td>
<td>Hotel Gaweye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday June 29, 2017</td>
<td>Orientation- LAHIA project- Save the Children (SC)- meeting at 8h00 at Gaweye Hotel LAHIA team, 3 team leaders, 2 subject matter experts</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h00-13h00</td>
<td>Orientation- SAWKI project- Mercy Corps (MC) SAWKI team, 3 team leaders, 2 subject matter experts</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h00-17h00</td>
<td>ORIENTATION – PASAM-TAI project– Catholic Relief Services (CRS) PASAM-TAI team, 3 team leaders, 2 subject matter experts</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday June 30, 2017</td>
<td>8h30 – 10h30 Orientation- USAID Food for Peace (FFP) 3 team leaders</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11h00 – 12h30 SAREL project 3 team leaders</td>
<td>SAREL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h00 – 17h00</td>
<td>Session T-Evelyn Orientation 3 team leaders, 6 subject matter experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday July 1, 2017</td>
<td>Training 3 teams, 3 team leaders, 6 subject matter experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9h00 – 11h30</td>
<td>Session II- Introduction to data collection instruments - Community Profile - Guide for group discussion- Agriculture and livelihood 3 teams, 3 team leaders, 6 subject matter experts, 31</td>
<td>Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h30 – 11h45</td>
<td>Break Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h45 – 12h30</td>
<td>Session II- Discussion of group discussion instruments - Guide for group discussion- Agriculture and livelihood 3 teams Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h30 – 14h00</td>
<td>Lunch Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h00 – 16h00</td>
<td>Session III- Discussion of group discussion instruments - Guide for group discussion- MCHN/WASH Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16h00 – 16h15</td>
<td>Break Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16h15 – 18h00</td>
<td>Session IV- Introduction to KII instruments Grand Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday July 2, 2017</td>
<td>Field Agenda ( Maradi, Zinder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8h00-18h00</td>
<td>Travel to Maradi 3 teams Maradi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday July 3, 2017</td>
<td>Instrument pre-test 3 teams Maradi region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8h00-17h00</td>
<td>Revision of instrument, and final field work preparation 3 teams Maradi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FIELD DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULES – SAMPLE SIZE - 28 COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM-TAI- CRS (12 communities- 3 Maradi, 9 Zinder)</th>
<th>Wednesday July 5, 2017</th>
<th>Begin field data collection in Maradi PT team Maradi region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday July 10, 2017</td>
<td>Complete data collection in Maradi, travel to Zinder PT team Maradi to Zinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday July 11, 2017</td>
<td>Begin field data collection in Zinder PT team Zinder region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday July 17, 2017</td>
<td>Complete data collection in Zinder, travel to Maradi PT team Zinder to Maradi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday July 24, 2017</td>
<td>Travel from Maradi to Niamey PT team Niamey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday July 25, 2017</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders in Niamey and synthesis of data PT team Niamey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday July 27, 2017</td>
<td>Complete Key Informant Interviews, field synthesis, debrief preparation PT team Niamey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday July 28, 2017</td>
<td>USAID Mission out-brief – preliminary findings Team leader, 2 subject matter experts USAID, Niamey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SAWKI-MC (8 communities- 3 Maradi, 5 Zinder) | Wednesday July 5, 2017 | Begin field data collection in Maradi SAWKI team Maradi region |
| Sunday July 9, 2017                           | Complete data collection in Maradi, travel to Zinder SAWKI team Maradi to Zinder |
| Monday July 10, 2017                          | Begin field data collection in Zinder SAWKI team Zinder region |
| Sunday July 16, 2017                          | Complete data collection in Zinder, travel to Maradi SAWKI team Zinder to Maradi |
| Monday July 17, 2017                          | Travel from Maradi to Niamey SAWKI team Niamey |
| Tuesday July 18, 2017                         | Key Informant Interviews, field synthesis, debrief preparation SAWKI team Niamey |
| Wednesday July 19, 2017                       | Mission out-brief – preliminary findings Team leader, 2 subject matter experts Niamey |

| LAHIA- SC (8 communities- Maradi) | Wednesday July 5, 2017 | Begin field data collection in Maradi LAHIA team Maradi region |
| Sunday July 9, 2017               | Complete data collection in Maradi, return to Niamey LAHIA team Maradi to Niamey |
| Monday July 17, 2017              | Key Informant Interviews, field synthesis LAHIA team Niamey |
| Tuesday July 18, 2017             | Key Informant Interviews, field synthesis, debrief preparation LAHIA team Niamey |
| Wednesday July 19, 2017           | Mission out-brief – preliminary findings Team leader, 2 subject matter experts Niamey |
### Module A. Identification and informed consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01 HOUSEHOLD NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02 SURVEY AREA NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03 NAME OF VILLAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF COMMUNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A05 REGION ZINDER 1 MARADI 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER'S VISITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A06 FIRST VISIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME OF THE VISIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT VISIT: DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13 TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL OUTCOME OF INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 REFUSED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NAME OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD | [ ] |

### V. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

#### a. Quantitative Instrument

Population Based Survey
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT: IT IS NECESSARY TO INTRODUCE THE HOUSEHOLD TO THE SURVEY AND OBTAIN THE CONSENT OF ALL PROSPECTIVE RESPONDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. IF A PROSPECTIVE RESPONDENT (E.G. A FEMALE DECISION MAKER) IS NOT PRESENT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE INTERVIEW, BE SURE TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE AND OBTAIN CONSENT BEFORE INTERVIEWING HIM OR HER.

HELLO. MY NAME IS __________________. I WORK WITH BAGNA SOLUTIONS. WE ARE CONDUCTING A SURVEY TO LEARN ABOUT AGRICULTURE, FOOD SECURITY, FOOD CONSUMPTION, NUTRITION AND WELFARE OF HOUSEHOLDS IN NIGER. YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAS BEEN CHOSEN FOR THE SURVEY. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR HOUSEHOLD. THESE QUESTIONS CAN TAKE UP TO THREE HOURS TO COMPLETE. WE CAN COME BACK TOMORROW IF WE DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO GO THROUGH ALL QUESTIONS TODAY. ALL THE ANSWERS PROVIDED BY YOU WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL NOT ONLY BE SHARED WITH ANYONE OTHER THAN MEMBERS OF OUR SURVEY TEAM FOR NON PROFESSIONAL AND LEARNING PURPOSES. YOUR IDENTITY SHALL NOT BE DISCLOSED ON ANY PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATA OR REPORTS. The data collected in this baseline survey may be used as part of a panel study in the future. If your household is selected for the panel study then a second survey will be conducted, and if you agree, the data from this study will be used for comparison. You don’t have to agree to participate in either study, but we hope you will agree to answer the questions for this study since your views are important. YOU ARE NOT OBLIGED TO PARTICIPATE. BUT WE HOPE YOU WILL AGREE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SINCE YOUR OPINION IS IMPORTANT. IF I ASK YOU ANY QUESTION

GIVE CARD WITH CONTACT INFORMATION
Do you have any questions about the survey or your participation?

ASK THE FOLLOWING CONSENT QUESTIONS TO ALL PROSPECTIVE RESPONDENTS.
AS APPLICABLE, CHECK AND SIGN THE CONSENT BOX BELOW.

1. Who is the main adult (15 years or older) decision-maker in the household? ________________________
   [NAME], do you agree to participate in the survey?
   RESPONDENT ACCEPTED _____  RESPONDENT DID NOT ACCEPT_____

2. Is there a mother or caregivers of children under six that have not been mentioned?
   Do you agree to participate in this survey as well as weigh and take the measurements of your children who are eligible?
   NAME: __________________________   RESPONDENT ACCEPTED ____  RESPONDENT DID NOT ACCEPT____
   NAME: __________________________   RESPONDENT ACCEPTED ____  RESPONDENT DID NOT ACCEPT____
   NAME: __________________________   RESPONDENT ACCEPTED ____  RESPONDENT DID NOT ACCEPT____
   NO CHILDREN LESS THAN 5 YEARS ______

OTHER ELIGIBLE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD

3. NAME____________________________Do you agree to participate in the survey?
   ______

4. NAME____________________________Do you agree to participate in the survey?
   ______

5. NAME____________________________Do you agree to participate in the survey?
   ______

6. NAME____________________________Do you agree to participate in the survey?
   ______

7. NAME____________________________Do you agree to participate in the survey?
   ______

My signature affirms that I have read the verbal informed consent statement to the respondent(s), and I have answered any questions asked about the study. The respondent consented to the interview.

NAME AND CODE OF THE INTERVIEWER ____________________________________________

SIGNATURE AND DATE _____________________________  DAY    MONTH   2    0    1    7
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### Module B. Household roster

#### If less than 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE NUMBER</th>
<th>USUAL RESIDENTS OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP WITH HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
<th>PRIMARY CAREGIVER</th>
<th>MARRITAL STATUS</th>
<th>SURVIVALS AND RESIDENCE OF BIOLOGICAL PARENTS</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>RECENT SCHOOL ENROLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definitions:

- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Farmers, including herders and fishers**: 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/ODR) 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 refugees/internally displaced person camps. 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.

#### Codes for Q3: Relationship with the Head of Household

- **01** HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD
- **02** SPOUSE
- **03** CHILD
- **04** SIBLING IN LAW
- **05** GRANDCHILD
- **06** PARENTS
- **98** DON’T KNOW

#### Start Time Hour Minute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>START TIME</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>MINUTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### If 5 years and above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE NUMBER</th>
<th>USUAL RESIDENTS OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP WITH HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
<th>PRIMARY CAREGIVER</th>
<th>MARRITAL STATUS</th>
<th>SURVIVALS AND RESIDENCE OF BIOLOGICAL PARENTS</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>RECENT SCHOOL ENROLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definitions:

- **Father/Mother**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
- **Primary caregiver**: the person who knows the most about how and what the child is fed. Usually, but not always, this will be the child’s mother.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE NUMBER</th>
<th>USUAL RESIDENTS OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If less than 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>E, I</th>
<th>F, HG-H6</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>PRIMARY CAREGIVER</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY</th>
<th>MARRITAL STATUS</th>
<th>SURVIVALS AND RESIDENCE OF BIOLOGICAL PARENTS</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>RECENT SCHOOL ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 15 and above

| 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |

If between 0 to 17 years

| 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |

If 5 years and above

| 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |

If between 5 to 24 years

| 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |

**CODES FOR Q3: RELATIONSHIP WITH THE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD**

- **01 HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD**
  - 00 PARENTS IN LAW
  - 02 SPOUSE
  - 03 CHILD
  - 04 SON/DAUGHTER IN LAW
  - 05 GRAND CHILD
  - 06 PARENTS/GRANDPARENTS
- **98 DON'T KNOW**

**CODES FOR Q4, 18 AND 20: EDUCATION**

- **01 HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD**
  - 00 PARENTS IN LAW
  - 02 SPOUSE
  - 03 CHILD
  - 04 SON/DAUGHTER IN LAW
  - 05 GRAND CHILD
  - 06 PARENTS/GRANDPARENTS
- **98 DON'T KNOW**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>CODING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>SKIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F00</td>
<td>RECORD MODULE START TIME</td>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F01</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD AND SURVEY AREA NUMBER</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>VN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F02</td>
<td>RESPONDENT’S LINE NUMBER ON THE HOUSEHOLD MEMBER ROSTER (COLUMN 10) (HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR OTHER ADULT IN CHARGE)</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRINKING WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F04</th>
<th>What is the main source of drinking water for members of your household?</th>
<th>RUNNING WATER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER SUPPLY NETWORK WITHIN THE HOUSE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER SUPPLY NETWORK IN THE YARD / PREMISES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TAPS AND STANDPIPES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WELLS AND BOREHOLES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUG WELLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROTECTED WELLS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON PROTECTED WELLS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROTECTED SPRING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON PROTECTED SPRING</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAIN WATER</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TANKERS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUCKS EQUIPPED WITH SMALL BARRELS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SURFACE WATER RIVER / DAM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAKE / POND / SPRING / CHANNEL / (IRRIGATION CHANNEL)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOTTLED WATER</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F05 | Where is this source of water found? | WITHIN THE HOUSE | INSIDE THE YARD / PREMISES | ELSEWHERE | |
|-----|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|
|     | F07 |

| F06 | How long does it take to go fetch for water and come back? | IN MINUTES | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|     | F07 |

| F07 | Is water usually available at this source? | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|
|     | F07 |

| F08 | During the last two weeks, was water unavailable at this source throughout the day or more? | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|
|     | F07 |

| F09 | Does it occur to you to make your water consumable? | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|
|     | F11 |

| F10 | What do you usually do to make your water drinkable? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE] Anything else? | BOIL | PUT BLEACH / CHLORINE | FILTER USING A CLEAN CLOTH | USE WATER FILTER (CERAMIC / SAND / COMPOST / ETC.) | SOLAR DISINFECTION | LEAVE TO SETTLE | PURIFICATION USING PLANT PARTS (ROOTS, GRAINS, BARKS, ASHES) | OTHERS | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
|     | F11 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F04</th>
<th>What is the main source of drinking water for members of your household?</th>
<th>RUNNING WATER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER SUPPLY NETWORK WITHIN THE HOUSE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER SUPPLY NETWORK IN THE YARD / PREMISES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC TAPS AND STANDPIPES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WELLS AND BOREHOLES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUG WELLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROTECTED WELLS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON PROTECTED WELLS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROTECTED SPRING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON PROTECTED SPRING</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAIN WATER</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TANKERS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUCKS EQUIPPED WITH SMALL BARRELS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SURFACE WATER RIVER / DAM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAKE / POND / SPRING / CHANNEL / (IRRIGATION CHANNEL)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOTTLED WATER</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F05 | Where is this source of water found? | WITHIN THE HOUSE | INSIDE THE YARD / PREMISES | ELSEWHERE | |
|-----|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|
|     | F07 |

| F06 | How long does it take to go fetch for water and come back? | IN MINUTES | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|     | F07 |

| F07 | Is water usually available at this source? | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|
|     | F07 |

| F08 | During the last two weeks, was water unavailable at this source throughout the day or more? | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|
|     | F07 |

| F09 | Does it occur to you to make your water consumable? | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|----|----|------------|
|     | F11 |

<p>| F10 | What do you usually do to make your water drinkable? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE] Anything else? | BOIL | PUT BLEACH / CHLORINE | FILTER USING A CLEAN CLOTH | USE WATER FILTER (CERAMIC / SAND / COMPOST / ETC.) | SOLAR DISINFECTION | LEAVE TO SETTLE | PURIFICATION USING PLANT PARTS (ROOTS, GRAINS, BARKS, ASHES) | OTHERS | DON'T KNOW | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>CODING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>SKIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SANITATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>What kind of toilet do the members of your household usually use?</td>
<td>FLUSH TOILET / MANUAL FLUSHING CONNECTED TO A SEWER SYSTEM</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO A SEPTIC TANK</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO A CESSPIT</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO SOMETHING ELSE</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW WHERE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CESSPIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMPROVED CESSPITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-VENTILATED</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CESSPITS WITH SLAB</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CESSPITS WITHOUT SLABS/OPEN HOLE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPOST TOILETS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAIL/LATRINE BUC.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUSPENDED TOILETS/LATRINES</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO TOILETS/NATURE</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OTHERS</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SPECIFY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Do you share your toilet with other households?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>How many households use this toilet?</td>
<td>LESS THAN 10 HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 OR MORE HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WASHING OF HANDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Please, show me where members of the household usually wash their hands.</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT IN THE HOUSEHOLD/YARD/PREMISES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAS D' OBSERVATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT AUTORISED TO SEE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO REMARKS FOR ANOTHER REASON</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td><strong>RESERVED FOR REMARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OBSEVE THE PRESENCE OF WATER AT THE PLACE INDICATED FOR WASHING HANDS.</strong></td>
<td>THERE IS WATER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THERE IS NO WATER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td><strong>RESERVED FOR REMARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OBSEVE THE PRESENCE OF SOAP, DETERGENT, OR AUTRE PRODUIT NETTOYANT.</strong></td>
<td>SOAP OR DETERGENT (SOLID, LIQUID, POWDER, PASTE)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASH, MUD, SAND</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>What are the important moments to wash hands?</td>
<td>BEFORE EATING</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</strong></td>
<td>AFTER EATING</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL THE ANSWERS GIVEN BY THE RESPONDENT.</td>
<td>BEFORE PRAYING</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.</td>
<td>BEFORE BREASTFEEDING OR FEEDING THE CHILD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BEFORE COOKING OR PREPARING FOOD</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER USING THE TOILET / LATRINE</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER CLEANING OR CHANGING THE DIAPER OF A CHILD WHO DEFCATED</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHEN MY HANDS ARE DIRTY</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER CLEANING THE TOILET OR POT</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>END TIME OF THE MODULE</td>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOVE TO MODULE G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FINAL REPORT - SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF NIGER FFP PROJECTS**
### Module G. AGRICULTURE

#### I. INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND ADOPTION OF IMPROVED PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G04</td>
<td>Do you have access to a plot of land (even if it is just a small portion) on which you decide on what to plant or how to manage the harvest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKE SURE THE RESPONDENT UNDERSTANDS THAT HAVING “ACCESS” AND TAKING “DECISIONS” ON A PLOT OF LAND DOES NOT REQUIRE YOU TO BE THE LEGAL OWNER OF THE LAND. A PERSON CAN HAVE ACCESS AND TAKE DECISIONS ON A PLOT OF LAND (FOR EXAMPLE A SMALL KITCHEN GARDEN), EVEN IF HE/SHE IS NOT THE LEGAL OWNER OF THE LAND. IF THERE IS JOINT DECISION ON ONE PLOT OF LAND (OR A GROUP OF ANIMALS), ONLY ONE FARMER HAS TO BE INTERVIEWED FOR EACH PLOT OF LAND (OR GROUP OF ANIMALS). THE INTERVIEWER MUST IDENTIFY CRITERIA TO SELECT JUST ONE FARMER TO ANSWER WHEN THERE IS A JOINT DECISION ON JUST ONE PLOT OF LAND (OR GROUP OF ANIMALS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G05</td>
<td>Do you have animals or aquaculture products on which you decide how to manage production?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G06</td>
<td>CHECK ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS G4 AND G5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G07</td>
<td>Did you grow millet during the last farming season?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G08A</td>
<td>Which type of seed did you use to grow the millet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G08B</td>
<td>Are you the one who decided on the seed to plant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G08C</td>
<td>How many tias of millet seeds did you use per hectare?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G08D</td>
<td>Did you preserve the millet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G08E</td>
<td>What are the main methods that you have used to preserve this crop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G09</td>
<td>Did you grow sorghum during the last farming season?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G09A</td>
<td>Which type of seeds did you use to grow sorghum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G09B</td>
<td>Are you the one who decided on the seed to plant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G09C How many tias of sorghum seeds did you use per hectare?</td>
<td>LESS THAN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORE THAN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G09D Did you preserve the sorghum?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G09E What are the main methods that you have used to preserve this crop?</td>
<td>TRIPLE IN SACHET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUTE BAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAR / POD (STORED ON TREES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN BARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN DRUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN JAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLLECTIVE STORE (WARRANTAGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10 Did you grow <em>irrigated maize</em> during the last dry season?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10A Which type of seeds did you use to grow irrigated maize?</td>
<td>TRADITIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPROVED / CERTIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRADITIONAL AND IMPROVED / CERTIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10B Are you the one who decided on the seed to plant?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10C How many tias of maize seeds did you use per hectare?</td>
<td>LESS THAN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORE THAN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10D Did you preserve the maize?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10E What are the main methods that you have used to preserve this crop?</td>
<td>TRIPLE IN SACHET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUTE BAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAR / POD (STORED ON TREES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN BARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN DRUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN JAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLLECTIVE STORE (WARRANTAGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11 Did you grow <em>non irrigated maize</em> during the last dry season?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11A Which type of seeds did you use to grow non irrigated maize?</td>
<td>TRADITIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPROVED / CERTIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRADITIONAL AND IMPROVED / CERTIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11B Are you the one who decided on the seed to plant?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11C How many tias of maize seeds did you use per hectare?</td>
<td>LESS THAN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORE THAN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11D Did you preserve the maize?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11E What are the main methods that you have used to preserve this crop?</td>
<td>TRIPLE IN SACHET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUTE BAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAR / POD (STORED ON TREES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN BARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN DRUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN JAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLLECTIVE STORE (WARRANTAGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Module G. AGRICULTURE**

| G12  | Did you grow niébé during the last farming season? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 | 

| G12A | Which type of seeds did you use to grow niébé? | TRADITIONAL 1
|      | IMPROVED / CERTIFIED 2
|      | TRADITIONAL AND IMPROVED / CERTIFIED 3
|      | DON'T KNOW 8 |

| G12B | Are you the one who decided on the seed to plant? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |

| G12C | How many tias of niébé seeds did you use per hectare? | LESS THAN 7 1
|      | 7 2
|      | MORE THAN 7 3 |

| G12D | Did you preserve the niébé? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |

| G12E | What are the main methods that you have used to preserve this crop? | TRIPLE IN SACHET A
|      | JUTE BAG B
|      | ATTIC C
|      | EAR / POD (STORED ON TREES) D
|      | IN BARREL E
|      | IN DRUM F
|      | IN JAR G
|      | COLLECTIVE STORE (WARRANTAGE) H
|      | OTHERS X |

| G13A | CHECK G07 IF YES, CONTINUE. IF NO, GO TO G13B | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |

| G13B | Do you sow millet and niébé on the same plot of land? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |

| G14  | Have you produced herbs (green leaves) at home for family consumption over the last 12 months? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |

| G15  | What types of herbs (green leaves) have you produced at home for family consumption over the last 12 months? | ALAYEHU/AMARANTH/TCHAPATA A
|      | YODO B
|      | MOLOHIYA C
|      | MORINGA (ZOGALA) D
|      | PEPPER E
|      | OKRA F
|      | TOBACCO G
|      | KAHI AMARIA (CLOVE) H
|      | SORREL I
|      | MINT J
|      | PARSLEY K
|      | OTHERS X |

| G16  | Have you produced herbs (green leaves) at home for commercial purpose over the last 12 months? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |

| G17  | What types of herbs (green leaves) have you produced at home for commercial purpose over the last 12 months? | HENNA A
|      | ALAYEHU/AMARANTH/TCHAPATA B
|      | YODO C
|      | MOLOHIYA D
|      | MORINGA (ZOGALA) E
|      | PEPPER F
|      | TOBACCO G
|      | KAHI AMARIA (CLOVE) H
|      | SORREL I
|      | MINT J
|      | PARSLEY K
|      | OTHERS X |

| G18  | Have you grown vegetables (market gardening) for family consumption during the last 12 months? | YES………………………………………………… 1
|      | NO ………………………………………… 2 |
### INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G19 What types have you planted in the last 12 months? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEPPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABBAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEETROOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZUCCHINI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALABASIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGGPLANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUCUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN ONION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN BEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTATOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEET POTATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.

### IMPROVED PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G20 How do you preserve your seeds? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRIPLE IN SACHET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUTE BAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAR / POD (STORED ON TREES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN BARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN DRUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN JAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLECTIVE STORE (WARRANTAGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DO NOT PRESERVE SEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G29 Do you fertilize your crops?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G30 What are the fertilization practices have you used for your crops over the last 12 month? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]

| G30 | What are the fertilization practices have you used for your crops over the last 12 month? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE] |
|-------------------------------|
| COMPOST                       | A |
| CHEMICAL FERTILIZER           | B |
| MICRO-DOSE                    | C |
| GREEN MANURE                  | D |
| ANIMAL MANURE                 | E |
| INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT OF SOIL FERTILITY | F |
| OTHERS                        | X |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G31 Do you have fruit trees or high value trees in your plot?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G32 Do you implement practices to protect your fruit trees and high value trees so that they can be more productive?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G33 What are the practices that you use to protect your fruit trees and high value trees? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECHALAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEANING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUMPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAFTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEWAL OF PLANTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G34 Have you had problems with your crops over the past 12 months?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module G. AGRICULTURE

#### I. INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G35</th>
<th>What problems or difficulties you faced with your crops?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE RESPONDENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISEASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PESTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUSH FIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVAILABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCES TO PARTICIPANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LACK OF WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS RAIN, DROUGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOO MUCH RAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LACK OF QUALITY SEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOSS AFTER HARVEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PESTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LACK OF LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFERTILE SOIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INCREASE OF RENTAL FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G36 | Have you used chemicals on your crops?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES………………………………………………… 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO …………………………………………………… 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G37 | What other practices do you use to fight against diseases and pests?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE RESPONDENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CULTURAL PRACTICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MECHANICAL TREATMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATURAL EXTRACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THERMAL PROCESSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G38A | Have you participated in the production of forest trees?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES………………………………………………… 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO …………………………………………………… 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G38B | How do you produce tree seedlings for reforestation?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE RESPONDENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIAL NURSERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMUNITY NURSERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMERCIAL NURSERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G38C | What are the practices that you use for forest management?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE RESPONDENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGROFORESTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATURAL FOREST REGENERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REFORESTATION (NEW PLANTATIONS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATERSHED MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MANAGEMENT OF FOREST PLANTATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NURSERY (PRODUCTION OF FOREST PLANTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IV. MANAGEMENT OF FORESTS

| G39A | Have you participated in the production of forest trees?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES………………………………………………… 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO …………………………………………………… 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### V. ADOPTION OF IMPROVED PRACTICES FOR LIVESTOCK

| G39 | Do you currently practice breeding?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES………………………………………………… 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO …………………………………………………… 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G40 | Which animals do you rear?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE RESPONDENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POULTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAMELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RABBITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONKEYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HORSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEESES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module G. AGRICULTURE

#### G41 INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

**[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]**

- POUTRY
- CAMELS
- RABBITS
- DONKEYS
- HORSES
- SHEEP
- GOATS
- FISH
- BEES
- COWS
- OTHERS
- NONE

#### G41A Is the facility for animals equipped with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>OUI</th>
<th>NON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ROOF?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DRINKING TROUGH?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A MANGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G42 SEE QUESTION 40 TO MAKE SURE THAT THE PERSON

**[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]**

Has a POUTRY. IF "YES" ASK:

- Have you vaccinated your poultry?
- DISINFECTION
- SUPPLEMENTS
- VACCINATION
- TRIMMING OF HOOVES
- OTHERS

#### G42A SEE QUESTION 40 TO MAKE SURE THE PERSON REARS

**[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]**

RUMINANT (SHEEP, GOATS, COWS, CAMELS). IF "YES" ASK.

- What are the prophylactic services that you use for ruminants?
- RECORD ALL ANSWERS PROVIDED BY THE RESPONDENT.
- PARAVETERINAIRE AUXILIAIRE (PVA)
- SOI-MÊME
- VETERINAIRES PRIVES
- GOUVERNEMENT
- ONG
- OTHERS

#### G43 Who supplies these prophylactic services?

**[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]**

- RECORD ALL ANSWERS PROVIDED BY THE RESPONDENT.
- PARAVETERINAIRE AUXILIAIRE (PVA)
- SOI-MÊME
- VETERINAIRES PRIVES
- GOUVERNEMENT
- ONG
- OTHERS

#### G44 What are the products you get from your farm activities?

**[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]**

- MEAT OR FISH
- EGGS
- GOAT MILK
- COW MILK
- SKIN
- HORN
- BUTTER
- YOUNG FISH (FISHERY PRODUCT)
- HONEY
- MANURE
- BLOOD
- OTHERS

#### G45 What are the products you consume from your farm activities?

**[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]**

- MEAT OR FISH
- EGGS
- GOAT MILK
- COW MILK
- SKIN
- BUTTER
- HONEY
- OTHERS
## Module G. AGRICULTURE

### I. INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

**G46** What are the products that you sell from your livestock activities?

[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAT OR FISH</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGGS</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT MILK</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COW MILK</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKIN</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORN</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG FISH (FISHERY PRODUCT)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONEY</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANURE</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOOD</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G47** Have you faced problems with your livestock farming?

- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO ………..…….…….…….……..……………… 2

**G48** What problems have you faced with your livestock farming?

[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]

- LACK OF MONEY  A
- NO WATER     B
- LACK OF FOOD C
- THEFT       D
- NOT ENOUGH SPACE E
- BAD WEATHER F
- NATURAL PREDATORS G
- PARASITES    H
- OTHERS X
| (SPECIFY) |

**G49** What you do with what you produce?

- CONSUMPTION  1
- SALE          2
- BOTH          3
| G64 |

**G50** What types of products do you sell?

[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]

- AGRICULTURE  A
- LIVESTOCK    B
- CRAFTS       C
- FOREST PRODUCTS (WOOD, GRAPES, HERBS)  D
- AGROINDUSTRY E
- TEXTILES     F
- OTHERS X
| (SPECIFY) |

### VI. FORMAL MARKETING

**G49** What do you do with what you produce?

- CONSUMPTION  1
- SALE          2
- BOTH          3
| G64 |

### VII. ACTIVITIES OF THE VALUE CHAIN

**G51** Before selling your products, do you make some changes on it?

- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO ………..…….…….…….……..……………… 2
| G52A |

**G51A** If yes, what kind of change do you make?

[MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]

- DRYING  A
- SMOKING   B
- POWDERING  C
- JAM        D
- FRYING     E
- OIL EXTRACTION F
- SALTING   G
- FERMENTATION (CHEESE, MILK, ETC.) H
- WIRING    I
- FOOD PASTE (TALIA, BEROUA, ETC) J
- TANNING   K
- CONFECTIONERY L
- MOULDING   M
- OTHERS X
| (SPECIFY) |

**G52A** Do you sort your products before selling?

- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO ………..…….…….…….……..……………… 2
### Module G. AGRICULTURE

#### I. INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G52A Do you classify your products before selling?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G52B Do you transport your products in bulk before selling?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G53 Do you trade or sell your products in whole, retail or export?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G54 Are you a member of an association or informal cooperative of producers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G54A If yes, what are your activities within this association or cooperative in relation to your products? (MUltiple Answers Possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchase of Inputs</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorting</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment / Processing</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading / Marketing</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### VIII. TRADE PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G55A Do you have an estimate of your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G55B Do you estimate the profits your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G55C Do you have a notebook in which you record the estimates of your business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G56 Have you received assistance from a lending organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G57 What are the organizations that have provided loans for your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G58 Do you have the support of a savings institution or group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G59 What are the organizations where you make your savings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G60 Have you faced problems that have affected your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G61 What are the types of problems that your company has faced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G62 Do you have a plan for production and sales?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. TRADE PRACTICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G55A Do you have an estimate of your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G55B Do you estimate the profits your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G55C Do you have a notebook in which you record the estimates of your business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G56 Have you received assistance from a lending organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G57 What are the organizations that have provided loans for your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G58 Do you have the support of a savings institution or group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G59 What are the organizations where you make your savings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G60 Have you faced problems that have affected your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G61 What are the types of problems that your company has faced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G62 Do you have a plan for production and sales?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module G. AGRICULTURE

#### INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

**G63** Where do you sell your products? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]
- LOCAL MARKET
- WEEKLY MARKET
- MAJOR MARKETS
- MIDDLEMAN / COLLECTOR
- EXPORT MARKET
- OTHERS

**G64** Have you received counselling (extension services) on agricultural issues during the last season?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2

**G65** What counselling (extension services) on agriculture or production have you received during the last season? [MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE]
- HOW TO IMPROVE ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTI (FOOD CROPS AND MARKET GARDEN)
- HOW TO DO MARKETING
- HOW TO IMPROVE ON BUSINESS
- HOW TO EARN MORE MONEY
- PRINCIPLES OF THE COOPERATIVE
- HOW TO IMPROVE ON THE BREEDING OF CATTLE / LIVES
- OTHERS

**G66** During the last season, who counselled you (extension services) on agriculture or production?
- GOVERNMENT (STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES)
- ASSOCIATION
- APV (PARA-VETERINARY/GUARD AUXILIARY)
- MOBILE PHONE
- COMMUNITY BASED STRUCTURE
- PRODUCTION SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS (LIKE NGOs)
- MARKETING SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS
- PARENTS
- NEIGHBOURS
- ON THE RADIO
- ON NEWSPAPERS
- ON TELEVISION
- SPEAKER
- OTHERS

#### INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION RELATING TO PRODUCTION

**G67** Have you received any agricultural credit, in cash or in kind in the [PAST 12 MONTHS]?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2
- DON’T KNOW

**G68** Have you saved money (money kept to be used later) in the [PAST 12 MONTHS]?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2
- DON’T KNOW

**G69** Some farmers insure their agricultural production against circumstances such as strong winds, floods and pests. Have you taken any agricultural insurance in the [PAST 12 MONTHS]?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2
- DON’T KNOW

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES

**G67** Have you received any agricultural credit, in cash or in kind in the [PAST 12 MONTHS]?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2
- DON’T KNOW

**G68** Have you saved money (money kept to be used later) in the [PAST 12 MONTHS]?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2
- DON’T KNOW

**G69** Some farmers insure their agricultural production against circumstances such as strong winds, floods and pests. Have you taken any agricultural insurance in the [PAST 12 MONTHS]?
- YES………………………………………………… 1
- NO …………………………………………………... 2
- DON’T KNOW

**G70** END TIME OF MODULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>MINUTE</th>
<th>GO TO MODULE C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module C. Access to food (HDDS and HHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>CATEGORIES DE CODAGE</th>
<th>SKIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C00</td>
<td>RECORD TIME AT THE START OF THE MODULE</td>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD NUMBER AND SURVEY AREA</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>VN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01A</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER ON THE HOUSEHOLD ROSTER (COLUMN 6) OF THE PERSON IN CHARGE OF FOOD PREPARATION FOR THE HOUSEHOLD THE NIGHT BEFORE THE SURVEY OR AN ADULT IN CHARGE WHO EAT IN THE HOUSEHOLD THE DAY BEFORE</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HDDS QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C02</td>
<td>Was yesterday an unusual or special day (Festival, funerals, etc.) during which most of the members were absent from the household?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03</td>
<td>Now I want to ask you about the types of food that you or someone else in your household ate yesterday during the day and at night.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04</td>
<td>Bread, biscuits, cakes, donuts, couscous, rice, pasta, porridge, cereals and other foods made from corn, rice, fonio, wheat (bulgur, doumé), sorghum, millet?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C05</td>
<td>Potato, yam, cassava, colocasia (mankani), sweet potato, miritchi, garin rogo, any food made from roots or tubers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06</td>
<td>Vegetables?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07</td>
<td>Fruits?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C08</td>
<td>Beef, pork, lamb, goat, rabbit, game offal, chicken, duck, and other birds, liver, kidney, heart, or other meat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C09</td>
<td>Eggs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Fresh or dried fish or shellfish?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Foods made beans, peas, lentils and nuts, such as peanuts, vouandzou, yadia, gonda, durm, peas, dan-wari, locust bean / soumbala?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Cheese, yogurt, milk or other dairy products?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Food based on oil, grease or butter?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>Sugar or honey?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>All other foods, such as seasoning, coffee or tea?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HHS QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>During the last [4 WEEKS / 30 DAYS] has it occurred that there is no food at all in your house due to lack of resources to fetch for food?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>How many times has such a situation occurred during the last [4 WEEKS / 30 DAYS]?</td>
<td>VERY RARE (1-2 TIMES)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>During the last [4 WEEKS / 30 DAYS] have you or any other member of your household gone hungry because there was not enough to eat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>How many times has such a situation occurred during the last [4 WEEKS / 30 DAYS]?</td>
<td>VERY RARE (1-2 TIMES)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>During the past [4 WEEKS / 30 DAYS] have you or another member of your household spent a day and a whole night without eating anything at all because there was not enough food?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>How many times has such a situation occurred during the past [4 WEEKS / 30 DAYS]?</td>
<td>VERY RARE (1-2 TIMES)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Have you or someone from your household regularly participated in [PASAM TAI / LAHIA / SAWKJ] activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Have you received food rations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>Have you regularly participated in nutrition training/meetings?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>Have you regularly participated in agriculture related training/meetings?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>Have you participated in any other activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>END TIME OF MODULE HOUR</td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</td>
<td>FIRST ELIGIBLE CHILD</td>
<td>SECOND ELIGIBLE CHILD</td>
<td>THIRD ELIGIBLE CHILD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D00</td>
<td>RECORD THE START TIME AT THE BEGINNING OF MODULE</td>
<td>NAME_____________</td>
<td>NAME_____________</td>
<td>NAME_____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD IDENTIFICATION</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD NUMBER</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SURVEY AREA NUMBER</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D02</td>
<td>CAREGIVER IDENTIFICATION CODE</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D03</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHILD CODE IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D04</td>
<td>What is the sex of [NAME OF CHILD]?</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>. . . . . . 1</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>. . . . . . 2</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D05</td>
<td>I want to ask you some questions about [CHILD'S NAME]. Does [CHILD'S NAME] has a health/vaccination card with the birth date?</td>
<td>DAY . . .</td>
<td>DAY . . .</td>
<td>DAY . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D06</td>
<td>How old was [CHILD'S NAME] during his last birthday? AGE IN YEARS COMPLETED</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D07</td>
<td>How many months is [CHILD'S NAME]? (SEE TABLE CONVERSION) RECORD THE CHILD'S AGE IN MONTHS</td>
<td>MONTH . . .</td>
<td>MONTH . . .</td>
<td>MONTH . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D08</td>
<td>CHECK CONSISTENCY FOR D05, D06, AND D07 A) THE YEAR RECORDED IN D05 IS CONSISTENT WITH THE AGE RECORDED IN D06?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) ARE THE YEAR AND MONTH OF BIRTH RECORDED IN D05 IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AGE RECORDED IN D07?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF THE ANSWERS A OR B IS &quot;NO&quot;, SOLVE ALL INCONSISTENCIES. IF THE DATE OF BIRTH WAS RECORDED FROM THE HEALTH CARD, USE THIS DATE AS THE GOOD SOURCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BIRTHDATE TO AGE IN MONTHS CONVERSION TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>15 16 17</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>27 28 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>14 15 16</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>26 27 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>13 14 15</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>25 26 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>12 13 14</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>24 25 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>-- 0 1 2</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>11 12 13</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>23 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>-- -- 0 1</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>-- -- -- 0</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>9 10 11</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>-- -- -- --</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>8 9 10</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>20 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>-- -- -- --</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>19 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 19 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIRTHDATE TO AGE IN MONTHS CONVERSION TABLES - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>39 40 41 42</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>51 52 53 54</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>63 64 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>38 39 40 41</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>50 51 52 53</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>62 63 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>37 38 39 40</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>49 50 51 52</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>61 62 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>36 37 38 39</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>48 49 50 51</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>60 61 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>35 36 37 38</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>47 48 49 50</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>59 60 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>34 35 36 37</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>46 47 48 49</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>58 59 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>33 34 35 36</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>45 46 47 48</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>57 58 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>32 33 34 35</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>44 45 46 47</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>56 57 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>31 32 33 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55 56 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIRTHDATE TO AGE IN MONTHS CONVERSION TABLES - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>29 30 31 32</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>19 20 21 22</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>23 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>28 29 30 31</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>18 19 20 21</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>17 18 19 20</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>26 27 28 29</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>16 17 18 19</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>20 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>25 26 27 28</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>15 16 17 18</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>19 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>24 25 26 27</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>14 15 16 17</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>23 24 25 26</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>13 14 15 16</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>17 18 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>22 23 24 25</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>12 13 14 15</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>16 17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>21 22 23 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 20 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIRTHDATE TO AGE IN MONTHS CONVERSION TABLES - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>29 30 31 32</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>19 20 21 22</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>23 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>28 29 30 31</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>18 19 20 21</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>17 18 19 20</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>26 27 28 29</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>16 17 18 19</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>20 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>25 26 27 28</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>15 16 17 18</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>19 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>24 25 26 27</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>14 15 16 17</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>23 24 25 26</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>13 14 15 16</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>17 18 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>22 23 24 25</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>12 13 14 15</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>16 17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>21 22 23 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 20 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### EXCLUSIVE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>FIRST ELIGIBLE CHILD</th>
<th>SECOND ELIGIBLE CHILD</th>
<th>THIRD ELIGIBLE CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAME___________</td>
<td>NAME___________</td>
<td>NAME___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D14**

**CHECK D07:**

* IS THE CHILD LESS THAN 60 MONTHS (5 YEARS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D61 FOR THE NEXT CHILD OR TO D66 IF THERE IS NO OTHER CHILD)</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D15**

**CHECK D07:**

* IS THE CHILD LESS THAN 24 MONTHS (2 YEARS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D54 FOR THE FIRST COLUMN)</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D16**

Has [CHILD’S NAME] already been breastfed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D18)</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D17**

Was [CHILD’S NAME] breastfed yesterday during the day or at night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D18)</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes, babies are breastfed in different ways, for example with a spoon, cup or bottle. This can occur when the mother can not always be with her baby. Sometimes babies are breastfed by another woman or the breast milk given by another woman with a spoon, cup, bottle, or otherwise. This can happen if a mother cannot breastfeed her baby.

Did [CHILD’S NAME] consumed breast milk using one of these methods during the day or yesterday night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D19**

Now I want to ask you some questions about medicines and vitamins that are sometimes given to children.

Did [CHILD’S NAME] took vitamin drops or other drugs as drops yesterday during the day or at night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D20**

Did [CHILD’S NAME] received oral rehydration solution yesterday during the day or at night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D21A**

Then, I would like to ask you some questions about certain liquids that [CHILD’S NAME] may have taken yesterday during the day or at night.

Do you know if [CHILD’S NAME] consumed:

**D21**

Tap water?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D22**

Infant preparations such as Francelait, nan (nativa), Nestle dairy product for infants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES . . . . . . . . 1</th>
<th>NO . . . . . . . . 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D24)</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . . 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D23**

How many times during the day or at night yesterday did [CHILD’S NAME] CONSUME AN infant preparation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TIMES . . . . . . .</th>
<th>TIMES . . . . . . .</th>
<th>TIMES . . . . . . .</th>
<th>TIMES . . . . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>FIRST ELIGIBLE CHILD</th>
<th>SECOND ELIGIBLE CHILD</th>
<th>TROISIÈME ENFANT ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24</td>
<td>Did [CHILD’S NAME] consume can, poudre or fresh milk?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D25)</td>
<td>(GO TO D25)</td>
<td>(GO TO D25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25</td>
<td>How many times during the day or at night yesterday did [CHILD’S NAME] consume milk?</td>
<td>TIMES 3</td>
<td>TIMES 3</td>
<td>TIMES 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>Did [CHILD’S NAME] drink juice or drinks?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D27)</td>
<td>(GO TO D28)</td>
<td>(GO TO D27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>Light soup?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D29)</td>
<td>(GO TO D30)</td>
<td>(GO TO D30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>Yoghurt?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D31)</td>
<td>(GO TO D32)</td>
<td>(GO TO D31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>Haw many times during the day or at night yesterday did [CHILD’S NAME] consume yoghurt?</td>
<td>TIMES 3</td>
<td>TIMES 3</td>
<td>TIMES 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>Did [CHILD’S NAME] consume pap such as cowpea puree, soup, enriched soup (koko),</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>misola, CSB, grandiben?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>Any other liquid such as thea, decoction, sugared water rouboutou?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D33)</td>
<td>(GO TO D34)</td>
<td>(GO TO D33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>Other liquids?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D35)</td>
<td>(GO TO D36)</td>
<td>(GO TO D35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>Cereal-based foods such as bread, cookies, cakes, donuts, couscous, rice, pasta,</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>porridge, cereals and other foods made from corn, rice, fonio, wheat (bulgur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doume), sorghum, millet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D34</td>
<td>Carrots, marrow, sweet potatoes, yams, monkey bread, gonda, whose interior is</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yellowish or orange-yellow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>Potatoes, yams, cassava, tarot, sweet potato, other food made of roots or tubers?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D37)</td>
<td>(GO TO D38)</td>
<td>(GO TO D37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36</td>
<td>Spinach, lettuce, sorrel, molohiya, baobab leaves (Kouka), yodo, okra leaves,</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moringa tchapatta, other local dark green leafy vegetables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>Ripe mangoes, ripe papayas, melons?</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D39)</td>
<td>(GO TO D40)</td>
<td>(GO TO D39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>Other fruits and vegetables such as: cabbage, cauliflower, watermelon, squash /</td>
<td>YES 1</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zucchini, onion, tomato, okra, yalo, green bean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YESTERDAY, DURING THE DAY OR IN THE NIGHT DID [CHILD’S NAME] DRINK/EAT [FOOD FROM THE GROUP]?
CIRCLE “1” IF RESPONDENT SAYS YES, “2” IF NO, AND “8” IF “DOES NOT KNOW”*
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| NON. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS                                                                 | FIRST ELIGIBLE CHILD | SECOND ELIGIBLE CHILD | TROISIÈME ENFANT ELIGIBLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D39</td>
<td>Liver, kidneys, heart, or other offal?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NON . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>Any meat such as beef, pork, lamb, goat, chicken or duck?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>Eggs?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D42</td>
<td>Fresh or dried fish, shellfish, seafood?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>Beans-based foods, peas, lentils and nuts, such as cowpea vouandzou, peas, dan-wari, locust / soumbala?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>Cheese, yoghurt, or other dairy products?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D45</td>
<td>Oil, grease, butter, or foods based on one of these products?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>All sugary foods such as chocolates, sweets, pastries, cakes, cookies</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>Condiments for flavour, such as pepper, spices, herbs, or fish powder?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D48</td>
<td>Larvae, snails, and insects?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D49</td>
<td>Foods made of red palm oil, of red palm nuts, or red palm nuts pulp sauce?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CHECK QUESTIONS D33 - D49:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;NO&quot; TO ALL → D50</td>
<td>&quot;NO&quot; TO ALL → D50</td>
<td>&quot;NO&quot; TO ALL → D50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ANY OTHER RESPONSES → D51</td>
<td>FOR ANY OTHER RESPONSES → D51</td>
<td>FOR ANY OTHER RESPONSES → D51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>Does [CHILD'S NAME] eat solid, semi-solid or soft foods during the day or in the night yesterday?</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RETURN TO D33-49 AND RECORD THE FOOD CONSUMED AND GO TO D51</td>
<td>RETURN TO D33-49 AND RECORD THE FOOD CONSUMED AND GO TO D51</td>
<td>RETURN TO D33-49 AND RECORD THE FOOD CONSUMED AND GO TO D51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IF &quot;YES&quot; PROBE:</strong> [CHILD'S NAME] has eaten what type of solid, semi-solid or soft food?</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GO TO D54.</td>
<td>GO TO D54.</td>
<td>GO TO D54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE FIRST COLUMN DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
<td>THE 2ND COLUMN DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
<td>THE 3RD COLUMN DOES NOT KNOW 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D51</td>
<td>How many times did [CHILD'S NAME] eat solid, semi-solid or soft food other than liquids during the day or in the night yesterday?</td>
<td>TIMES . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>TIMES . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>TIMES . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td></td>
<td>GO TO D54 IN THE FIRST COLUMN</td>
<td>GO TO D54 IN THE 2ND COLUMN</td>
<td>GO TO D54 IN THE 3RD COLUMN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Module D. Children’s Nutritional Status and Feeding Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>FIRST CHILD ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>SECOND CHILD ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>THIRD CHILD ELIGIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>START WITH THE LAST BORN. Has (NAME) had diarrhoea during the last 2 weeks? (1)</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D01 FOR NEXT CHILD, OR D66 IF NO OTHER CHILD)</td>
<td>(GO TO D01 FOR NEXT CHILD, OR D66 IF NO OTHER CHILD)</td>
<td>(GO TO D01 FOR NEXT CHILD, OR D66 IF NO OTHER CHILD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D55</td>
<td>Was there blood in his/her stool?</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D56</td>
<td>I would like to know the quantity of water that (NAME) consumed during this diarrhoea period (including breast milk). did he/she drink less water than usual?</td>
<td>MUCH LESS .......................... 1</td>
<td>MUCH LESS .......................... 1</td>
<td>MUCH LESS .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOMETIME LESS......... 2</td>
<td>SOMETIME LESS......... 2</td>
<td>SOMETIME LESS......... 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME ...... 3</td>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME ...... 3</td>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME ...... 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORE ..................... 4</td>
<td>MORE ..................... 4</td>
<td>MORE ..................... 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTHING TO DRINK ............. 5</td>
<td>NOTHING TO DRINK ............. 5</td>
<td>NOTHING TO DRINK ............. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>When (NAME) was suffering from diarrhoea, did he/she eat less than usual, roughly the same quantity,more than usual or nothing at all?</td>
<td>MUCH LESS .......................... 1</td>
<td>MUCH LESS .......................... 1</td>
<td>MUCH LESS .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOMETIME LESS......... 2</td>
<td>SOMETIME LESS......... 2</td>
<td>SOMETIME LESS......... 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME ...... 3</td>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME ...... 3</td>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME ...... 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORE ..................... 4</td>
<td>MORE ..................... 4</td>
<td>MORE ..................... 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STOPPED EATING........ 5</td>
<td>STOPPED EATING........ 5</td>
<td>STOPPED EATING........ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAS NOT FED ............. 6</td>
<td>WAS NOT FED ............. 6</td>
<td>WAS NOT FED ............. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW ............. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D58</td>
<td>Did you ask somebody for advice or treatment against diarrhoea à quelqu'un?</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td>NO .......................... 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D62)</td>
<td>(GO TO D62)</td>
<td>(GO TO D62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module D. Children's Nutritional Status and Feeding Practices

#### FIRST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D59</td>
<td>Where did you ask for advice or treatment?</td>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsewhere?</td>
<td>INTEGRATED HEALTH CENTER (CSI)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROBE TO IDENTIFY EACH TYPE OF SOURCE.</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT HEALTH POST</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE SOURCE IS PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, WRITE THE NAME OF THE SOURCE.</td>
<td>PUBLIC PHARMACY</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHARMACEUTICAL WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER SECTOR</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NAME OF PLACE(S))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D60</td>
<td>CHECK D59: NUMBER OF CIRCLED CODES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORE CODES</td>
<td>TWO OR MORE CODES</td>
<td>TWO OR MORE CODES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCLED</td>
<td>ENCERCLÉ</td>
<td>ENCERCLÉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D62)</td>
<td>(GO TO D62)</td>
<td>(GO TO D62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SECOND CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED HEALTH CENTER (CSI)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT HEALTH POST</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC PHARMACY</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACEUTICAL WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SECTOR</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAME OF PLACE(S))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### THIRD CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED HEALTH CENTER (CSI)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT HEALTH POST</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC PHARMACY</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACEUTICAL WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SECTOR</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAME OF PLACE(S))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D61

Where do you first go for advice relating to treatment? USE LETTER CODES IN D59.

| FIRST PLACE | |
|-------------|  |
| FIRST PLACE | |
| FIRST PLACE | |

### D62

Did he/she drink one of the following beverages since the diarrhoea started:

a) A fluid prepared from a special packet [SRO sachet]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACHET</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) A homemade fluid maison recommended by the government [Sugared salted water(SSW)]?

| HOME | 1 | 2 | 8 |

---
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### Module D. Children’s Nutritional Status and Feeding Practices

#### Questions and Filters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>FIRST CHILD ELIGIBLE NAME</th>
<th>SECOND CHILD ELIGIBLE NAME</th>
<th>THIRD CHILD ELIGIBLE NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D63</td>
<td><strong>Was any (other) drug administered for the treatment of the diarrhoea?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Was any (other) drug administered for the treatment of the diarrhoea?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Was any (other) drug administered for the treatment of the diarrhoea?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
<td>YES .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ............................ 2</td>
<td>NO ............................ 2</td>
<td>NO ............................ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GO TO D01 FOR NEXT CHILD, OR D66 IF NO OTHER CHILD) DOES NOT KNOW ........... 8</td>
<td>(GO TO D01 FOR D0UR NEXT CHILD, OR D66 IF NO OTHER CHILD) DOES NOT KNOW ........... 8</td>
<td>(GO TO D01 FOR D0UR NEXT CHILD, OR D66 IF NO OTHER CHILD) DOES NOT KNOW ........... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D64</td>
<td><strong>What (other) drug was administered for the treatment of the diarrhoea?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What (other) drug was administered for the treatment of the diarrhoea?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What (other) drug was administered for the treatment of the diarrhoea?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TABLET OR SIROP</strong></td>
<td><strong>TABLET OR SIROP</strong></td>
<td><strong>TABLET OR SIROP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANTIBIOTIC ................. A</td>
<td>ANTIBIOTIC ................. A</td>
<td>ANTIBIOTIC ................. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANTIMOTILITY ................ B</td>
<td>ANTIMOTILITY ................ B</td>
<td>ANTIMOTILITY ................ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZINC ........................ C</td>
<td>ZINC ........................ C</td>
<td>ZINC ........................ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER (NOT ANTIBIOTIC, ANTIMOTILITY, OR ZINC) ............... D</td>
<td>OTHER (NOT ANTIBIOTIC, ANTIMOTILITY, OR ZINC) ............... D</td>
<td>OTHER (NOT ANTIBIOTIC, ANTIMOTILITY, OR ZINC) ............... D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIROP OR TABLET</td>
<td>SIROP OR TABLET</td>
<td>SIROP OR TABLET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNKNOWN ........................ E</td>
<td>UNKNOWN ........................ E</td>
<td>UNKNOWN ........................ E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INJECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>INJECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>INJECTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANTIBIOTIC ................. F</td>
<td>ANTIBIOTIC ................. F</td>
<td>ANTIBIOTIC ................. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON ANTIBIOTIC ................ G</td>
<td>NON ANTIBIOTIC ................ G</td>
<td>NON ANTIBIOTIC ................ G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INJECTION ........................ H</td>
<td>INJECTION ........................ H</td>
<td>INJECTION ........................ H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(IV) INTRAVENOUS ............... I</td>
<td>(IV) INTRAVENOUS ............... I</td>
<td>(IV) INTRAVENOUS ............... I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOME MEDICATION/PHYTOTHERAPY</td>
<td>HOME MEDICATION/PHYTOTHERAPY</td>
<td>HOME MEDICATION/PHYTOTHERAPY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER ........................ X</td>
<td>OTHER ........................ X</td>
<td>OTHER ........................ X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other

- **D65**
  - **WRITE THE END TIME OF THE MODULE**
  - **HOUR** [ ] **MINUTE** [ ]

#### Notes

1. The term(s) used for diarrhoea must include expressions used for all forms of diarrhoea, including bloody stool (compatible with dysentery), watery stool, etc.
**Kish grid for selection of women 15-49 years**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. Check column 9. If there is more than one woman between 15-49 in the household, use this method below to select one for interview.
2. Write down in the table all the women between 15-49 living in the household (from the oldest to the youngest).
3. Check the last figure of the household number on the first page and circle the corresponding figure in the column below.
4. Check where the number of the last figure of the household number (column) and the number of women between 15-49 years in the household (row) correspond.
5. The figure in the cell or row and the column match, corresponding to the choice of the woman in the household to whom the female questionnaire should be addressed (MODULE E).

Example: If the number of women between 15-49 years = 3 and the last figure = 5, woman 2 will be selected in the list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Last figure of household number (see first page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 4 2 6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 4 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module E. Women's Nutritional Status and Dietary Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>NAME OF THE WOMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E00</td>
<td>RECORD THE START TIME</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF THE MODULE</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD NUMBER</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SURVEY AREA NUMBER</td>
<td>VN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION NUMBER</td>
<td>LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF THE WOMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E03</td>
<td>In what year and month</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>were you born?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF THE MONTH IS NOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNOWN, MARK &quot;98&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF THE YEAR IS NOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNOWN, MARK &quot;9998&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E04</td>
<td>Please, what was your</td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age on your last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birthday?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE IN YEARS COMPLETED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E05</td>
<td>Are you between 15 and</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 years?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E06</td>
<td>CHECK E03, E04 AND</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E05 (IF APPLICABLE):</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS THE RESPONDENT</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETWEEN 15 AND 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YEARS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;IF THE INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN E03, E04 AND E05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS CONFLICTING,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DETERMINE QUELLE EST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA PLUS PRÉCISE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RETURN TO THE KISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TABLE AND SELECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANOTHER WOMAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIETARY DIVERSITY

Did you eat yesterday during the day or at night [AFOOD FROM E11-E27]?

| E11  | Bread, biscuits, cakes, donuts, couscous, rice, pasta, pap, cereals and other foods made from corn, rice, fonio, wheat (bulgur, doumè), sorghum, millet? | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E12  | Pumpkin: carrots, squash, sweet potatoes, yams, yam bread, gonda, yellowish or yellow orange inside? | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E13  | Potatoes, yams, cassava, colocasia (Mankani), sweet potato, mititchi, Garin Roggo, any food gotten from roots or tubers? | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E14  | Spinach, lettuce, sorrel, molohiya, baobab leaves (Kouka), iodine, okra leaves, Moringa tchapatta, other local dark green leafy vegetables | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E15  | Ripe mangoes, ripe papayas, melons                     | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E16  | Other fruits and vegetables such as: cabbage, cauliflower, watermelon, squash / zucchini, onion, tomato, okra, yalo, green bean? | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E17  | Liver, kidney, heart or meat organs?                   | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
| E18  | Other meat; beef, pork, lamb, goat, chicken?           | YES     | 1       |
|      | NO                                                      | 2       |
|      | DOES NOT KNOW                                          | 8       |
## Module E. Women’s Nutritional Status and Dietary Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>NAME OF THE WOMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E19  | Eggs?                  | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E20  | Dry or smoked fish, shellfish or seafood | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E21  | Food based on beans, peas, lentils and nuts, such as groundnuts, cowpeas, vouandzou, yadia, gonda, doum, cowpeas, dan-wari, locust bean/ soumbala? | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E22  | Cheese, yogurt, other dairy products | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E23  | Oil, fats, butter, or food based on one of these elements. | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E24  | Sweet food: chocolate, candies, sweets, pastries, cakes or biscuits. | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E25  | Flavours: chilis, species; herbs or fish powder | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E26  | Grubs, snails or insects | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E27  | Food made from palm oil, red palm nuts, nuts or juice from palm nuts. | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8 |
| E28  | I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU QUESTIONS ON PREGNANCIES AND DELIVERIES THAT YOU HAVE HAD Are you pregnant? | YES ............... 1  
GO TO E33  
NO ............... 2  
DOES NOT KNOW .... 8  
| E29  | Have you been pregnant? IF “NO”, PROBE BY ASKING Have you ever been pregnant, even if this pregnancy did not result in the birth of a live baby? | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
GO TO E33  |
| E30  | Have you ever given birth? IF “NO”, PROBE BY ASKING I mean, to a child, even if this child survived for only minutes or a few hours, or it was stillborn? | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
GO TO E33  |
| E31  | When was the last time you gave birth (even if your child is no longer alive)? IF THE RESPONDENT DOES NOT KNOW THE DATE OF BIRTH, ASK: Do you have a health / vaccination card for that child with the date of birth on it? WRITE DOWN THE DATE OF BIRTH AS INDICATED ON THE CARD | Date of last birth  
DAY  
PUT ‘98’ BELOW IF DNK  
MONTH  
YEAR  
| E32  | CHECK E31: DID THE LAST BIRTH OCCUR DURING LAST 24 MONTHS? | YES ............... 1  
NO ............... 2  
| E33  | END TIME OF MODULE | HOUR  
MINUTE  
GO TO MODULE I.1 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non.</th>
<th>Questions and Filters</th>
<th>First Child Eligible (0-24 Months)</th>
<th>Second Child Eligible (0-24 Months)</th>
<th>Third Child Eligible (0-24 Months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1.00</td>
<td>RECORD THE START TIME OF THE MODULE</td>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.01</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SURVEY AREA NUMBER</td>
<td>VN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.02</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION CODE OF THE WOMAN IN THE HOUSEHOLD ROSTER</td>
<td>LINE NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.04</td>
<td>I would like to ask you some questions on [CHILD'S NAME].</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you receive antenatal care for [CHILD'S NAME] pregnancy?</td>
<td>(GO TO THE NEXT)</td>
<td>(GO TO THE NEXT)</td>
<td>(GO TO THE NEXT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANTHROPOMETRY</td>
<td>NO OTHER CHILD</td>
<td>NO OTHER CHILD</td>
<td>NO OTHER CHILD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASK IF THE HEALTH / ANTENATAL CARD IS AVAILABLE, AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION IS CORRECT</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.05</td>
<td>How old was your pregnancy when you first went for antenatal care?</td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.06</td>
<td>How many antenatal consultations did you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.07</td>
<td>While going for antenatal visits during this pregnancy, did you do at least one of the following tests?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you do a urine test?</td>
<td>Urine test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urine test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you do a blood test?</td>
<td>Blood test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blood test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was your blood pressure taken?</td>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.08</td>
<td>During one of your antenatal visits, did you receive information on how to identify possible signs indicating that there is a problem with the pregnancy?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.09</td>
<td>GO TO NEXT PREGNANCY</td>
<td>PASSER À LA NEXT PREGNANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.10</td>
<td>END TIME OF MODULE</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### ANTHROPOMETRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD NUMBER</th>
<th>D67</th>
<th>D68</th>
<th>D69</th>
<th>D70</th>
<th>D71</th>
<th>D72</th>
<th>D73</th>
<th>D74</th>
<th>D75</th>
<th>D76</th>
<th>D77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUTE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN UNDER 5 (0-59 MONTHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE NO. OF HOUSEHOLD ROSTER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D D M M Y A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEIGHT AND SIZE OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 (0-59 MONTHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE TAKEN</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>MEASURED:</th>
<th>ABSENT:</th>
<th>REFUSED:</th>
<th>OTHER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LYING: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDING: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMMENTS:

- SOURCE OF THE DATE OF BIRTH:
  1. BIRTH CERTIFICATE
  2. BAPTISM OR RELIGIOUS CERTIFICATE
  3. VACCINE OR MEDICAL CARD
  4. HOUSEHOLD RECORD
  5. STATEMENT OF PARENTS
  6. OTHER

### INFORMATION OF THE WOMAN SELECTED (15-49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE NO. OF HOUSEHOLD ROSTER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D D M M Y A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D D M M Y A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D D M M Y A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEIGHT AND SIZE OF THE WOMAN SELECTED (15-49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE TAKEN</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>MEASURED:</th>
<th>ABSENT:</th>
<th>REFUSED:</th>
<th>OTHER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LYING: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDING: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMMENTS:

- SOURCE OF THE DATE OF BIRTH:
  1. BIRTH CERTIFICATE
  2. BAPTISM OR RELIGIOUS CERTIFICATE
  3. VACCINE OR MEDICAL CARD
  4. HOUSEHOLD RECORD
  5. STATEMENT OF PARENTS
  6. OTHER
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- PRINT NAME OF ANTHROPOMETRIST: 
- SIGNATURE:  
- ID #:  
- DAY:  
- MONTH:  
- YEAR:  

- PRINT NAME OF SUPERVISOR: 
- SIGNATURE:  
- ID #:  
- DAY:  
- MONTH:  
- YEAR:  

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>CODING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>SKIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I2.00</td>
<td>INSERT START TIME OF THE MODULE</td>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.01</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD NUMBER</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER OF THE SURVEY AREA</td>
<td>VN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.02</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF A RESPONSIBLE ADULT MALE (1) AND FEMALE (2)</td>
<td>LINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.02A</td>
<td>SEX OF RESPONSIBLE ADULT</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.03</td>
<td>Do you think access to health services for women of reproductive age, including adolescents is:</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.04</td>
<td>Why do you think that access to health services for women of reproductive age, including adolescents is important?</td>
<td>Antenatal care</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postnatal care</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pregnant women receive a micronutrient supplementation (iron and folic acid)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The MCUs receive 1,000 messages daily, including the prevention of key childhood diseases.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving treatment for diseases</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving further nutritional assessments (Body Mass Index)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving advice (health timing/birth spacing; STDs or something else)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving ready to use therapeutic foods (RUTF)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs)</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.05</td>
<td>Why do you think that access to health services for children between 0 and 5 years is important?</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.06</td>
<td>Why do you think access to health services for children between 0 and 5 years is important?</td>
<td>Neonatal care</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving vitamin A supplements</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving complete course of vaccination before their first birthday</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving treatment for diseases</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving further nutritional assessments (Body Mass Index)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving advice (weight, size, growth, after being screened at Community level by the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC))</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving ready to use therapeutic foods (RUTF)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.07</td>
<td>HAS THE RESPONDENT IDENTIFIED AT LEAST 2 REASONS WHY ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES IS IMPORTANT FOR MOTHERS AND ADOLESCENTS AND AT LEAST 2 REASONS WHY ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES IS IMPORTANT FOR CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2.08</td>
<td>END TIME OF THE MODULE</td>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>MINUTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Module H1. Poverty Measurement

**Household Number (ID) from Module A**

**Survey Area Number from Module A**

**ID Code of Respondent Following Members List (Column 6)**

### Module H1. Food Consumption Over Past 7 Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes = 1</th>
<th>No = 2</th>
<th>Food Consumption Over Past 7 Days</th>
<th>Purchases</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>From Agriculture</th>
<th>From Gift and Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IF &quot;NO&quot; GO TO THE NEXT ITEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much in total did your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>household eat in the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seven days?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much quantity of [PRODUCT]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was bought?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much did you spend on what was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eaten last week?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If family ate part but not all of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>something they purchased,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate only cost of what was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much came from own-production?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much came from gifts and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Wheat flour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Fonio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Other cereals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Corn flour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Cassava flour (attiéke, garri, tapioca, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Pasta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Biscuit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Bean fritter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Wheat fritter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>Pancakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Other pastries (cakes, Viennese pastries)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Salad (lettuce)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Fresh onion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Fresh okra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Fresh tomato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Fresh pepper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit Codes**

- Bunch: 1
- Yanguo: 4
- Kg: 7
- Line: 10
- Heap: 15
- To: 20
- 40 Kg Bag: 5
- Gram: 9
- Container: 11
- Other: 96
- Basket: 3
- 100 Kg Bag: 8
- Unit: 8
- Sachet: 12
### Module H1: Food Consumption Over Past 7 Days

**Over the past one week (7 days), did you or others in your household eat any [ITEM]?**

- **INCLUDE FOOD BOTH EATEN COMMUNALLY IN THE HOUSEHOLD AND SEPARATELY BY INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS. DON'T INCLUDE FOOD EATEN OUTSIDE THE HOME.**

**IF "NO" GO TO THE NEXT ITEM.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES = 1</th>
<th>NO = 2</th>
<th>FOOD CONSUMPTION OVER PAST 7 DAYS</th>
<th>PURCHASES</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>FROM AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>FROM GIFT AND OTHER SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much in total did your household eat in the past seven days?</td>
<td>How much quantity of [PRODUCT] was bought?</td>
<td>How much did you spend on what was eaten last week?</td>
<td>If family ate part but not all of something they purchased, estimate only cost of what was consumed</td>
<td>How much came from own-production?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1.03A QUANTITY | H1.03B UNIT | H1.04A QUANTITY | H1.04B UNIT | H1.05 AMOUNT IN FCFA | H1.06A QUANTITY | H1.06B UNIT | H1.07A QUANTITY | H1.07B UNIT |
|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|

**UNIT CODES**

- Bun = 1
- Tonigolo = 4
- Kg. = 8
- Unit = 10
- Litter = 13
- Tia = 2
- 50 Kg Bag = 5
- Gram = 8
- Centilitre = 11
- Other = 16
- Basket = 3
- 100 Kg Bag = 6
- Unit = 8
- Sachet = 12

---
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### MODULE H1. FOOD CONSUMPTION OVER PAST 7 DAYS

**CODE**  | **ITEM** | **YES = 1** | **FOOD CONSUMPTION OVER PAST 7 DAYS** | **PURCHASES** | **TOTAL EXPENDITURE** | **FROM AGRICULTURE** | **FROM GIFT AND OTHER SOURCES**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| Over the past one week (7 days), did you or others in your household eat any [ITEM]? INCLUDE FOOD BOTH EATEN COMMUNALLY IN THE HOUSEHOLD AND SEPARATELY BY INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS. DON'T INCLUDE FOOD EATEN OUTSIDE THE HOME | IF "NO" GO TO THE NEXT ITEM | How much in total did your household eat in the past seven days? | How much quantity of [PRODUCT] was bought? | How much did you spend on what was eaten last week? | If family ate part but not all of something they purchased, estimate only cost of what was consumed | How much came from own-production? | How much came from gifts and other sources? |

**Code** | **Item** | **Quantity** | **Unit** | **Quantity** | **Unit** | **Amount in FCFA** | **Quantity** | **Unit** | **Amount in FCFA** | **Quantity** | **Unit** |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
751 | Taro and cocoyam | 1 | 2 | 752 | Sweet potato | 1 | 2 | 753 | Other tubers n.e.s | 1 | 2 | 754 | Mango | 1 | 2 | 755 | Pineapple | 1 | 2 |
756 | Orange | 1 | 2 | 757 | Other citrus fruit (mandarin orange, lemon, grapefruit) | 1 | 2 | 758 | Sweet bananas | 1 | 2 | 759 | Watermelon | 1 | 2 |
760 | Dates | 1 | 2 | 761 | Sugar cane | | | | | | | |
762 | Melon | 1 | 2 | 763 | Borassus palms (fruit) | 1 | 2 | 764 | Kola nut | 1 | 2 | 765 | Other fruits n.e.s | 1 | 2 |
766 | Beef | 1 | 2 | 767 | Camel | 1 | 2 | 768 | Mutton | 1 | 2 | 769 | Goat | 1 | 2 |
770 | Penguins | 1 | 2 | 771 | Offal | 1 | 2 | 772 | Game | 1 | 2 | 773 | Other meats n.e.s | 1 | 2 |
774 | Fresh fish | 1 | 2 | 775 | Smoked fish | 1 | 2 | 776 | Dried fish | 1 | 2 | 777 | Canned fish | 1 | 2 |
778 | Other canned fishing products | 1 | 2 | 779 | Palm oil | 1 | 2 |

**UNIT CODES**
- Bunch: 1
- Tingle: 4
- Kg: 1
- Litre: 10
- Heap: 13
- 50 Kg Bag: 5
- Gram: 8
- Centilitre: 11
- Other: 9
- 100 Kg Bag: 6
- Unit: 9
- Sachet: 12
## Module H1. Food Consumption Over Past 7 Days

Over the past one week (7 days), did you or others in your household eat any [ITEM]? INCLUDE FOOD BOTH Eaten communally in the household and separately by individual household members. Don't include food eaten outside the home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES = 1</th>
<th>NO = 2</th>
<th>Food Consumption Over Past 7 Days</th>
<th>Purchases</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>From Agriculture</th>
<th>From Gift and Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **If "NO" go to the next item**
- How much in total did your household eat in the past seven days?
- How much quantity of [PRODUCT] was bought?
- How much did you spend on what was eaten last week? If family ate part but not all of something they purchased, estimate only cost of what was consumed.
- How much came from own-production?
- How much came from gifts and other sources?

### Unit Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bunch</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kilogram</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gram</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Litre</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Centilitre</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sachet</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Box or sachet bag</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>100 Kg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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MODULE H1. FOOD CONSUMPTION OVER PAST 7 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES = 1</th>
<th>FOOD CONSUMPTION OVER PAST 7 DAYS</th>
<th>PURCHASES</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>FROM AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>FROM GIFT AND OTHER SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 2</td>
<td>IF &quot;NO&quot; GO TO THE NEXT ITEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How much in total did your</td>
<td>How much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>household eat in the past</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seven days?</td>
<td>of [PRODUCT]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bought?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B08</td>
<td>Millet ball with milk</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>Millet ball without milk/Millet gruel</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Millet-based preparation with greener leaves (no meat or fish)</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Sorghum-based preparation with greener leaves (no meat or fish)</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Maize-based preparation with greener leaves (no meat or fish)</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Other preparation with millet, sorghum and maize base</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Boiled beans</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Niebe rice</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Rice with baobab leaves sauce</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Rice with tomato sauce</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Rice with buffalo fat</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>Rice with fish/chicken fat</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Pasta</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Hot coffee</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>Hot tea</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSUMPTION OUTSIDE THE HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>Food bought or eaten outside the home</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>Soft drinks consumed outside the home</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>Carbonated drinks consumed outside the home</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIT CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT CODES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bunch</td>
<td>. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongolo</td>
<td>. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litre</td>
<td>. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CentiLitre</td>
<td>. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heap</td>
<td>. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg Bag</td>
<td>. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gram</td>
<td>. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litre</td>
<td>. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CentiLitre</td>
<td>. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>. 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Kg Bag</td>
<td>. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachet</td>
<td>. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MODULE H2. NON-FOOD EXPENDITURES OVER PAST 7 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</th>
<th>CODING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>AMOUNT IN FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Matchsticks</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Charcoal/Coal</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Batteries, candles</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Urban Transport by taxi, bus, motorcycle</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Prepaid Cards / Shap Shap mobile phone</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Costs of molding cereals</td>
<td>YES 1 TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Others?</td>
<td>OTHER ITEMS:</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MODULE H3. NON-FOOD EXPENDITURES OVER PAST 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS (ONE MONTH REFERENCE)</th>
<th>CODING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>AMOUNT IN FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Over the past one month, did your household use or buy any [...]?</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Domestic gas</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Vehicle fuel (gasoline, gasoline blend; Diesel)</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Lubricants (engine oil, brake fluid, battery fluid (acid), fat, other lubricants nes)</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Repair and maintenance services (oil change, lubricating, etc.) of personal transportation means.</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(voitures, motos, bicyclette, etc.)</td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Laundry soap, powdered laundry, detergents (bleach, etc.).</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Insecticide, mosquito twist</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Toilet soap</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Body milk, body toilet lotion (glycerin, petrolatum, etc.).</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Sanitary napkins, baby disposable diapers, etc</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Other toiletry products (razor, shampoo, cotton, etc.).</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Hair costs for man and woman (hairdressing salon, weaving, cutting, etc.), manicure, pedicure</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Toothpaste</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Toothbrush</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Toilet paper</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Light bulbs</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Fees of postage stamp, term shipping, fax sending, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Costs of telephone calls</td>
<td>YES . . . . ........ 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . ........ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS (ONE MONTH REFERENCE)</td>
<td>CODING CATEGORIES</td>
<td>AMOUNT IN FCFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Over the past one month, did your household use or buy any [...]?</td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs of using the Internet in a cybercafé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Over the past one month, did your household use or buy any [...]?</td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legalization fee (making) of administrative documents (acts of civil status, degrees, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Document photocopying costs</td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of collecting household wastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of collecting household wastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs of clothing laundering, linens, etc... (Pressing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House staff salary (guard, boy, driver, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport by pirogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal-powered transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES ............... 1</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ................ 2</td>
<td>(NEXT ITEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercity transport by bus, car, bush taxi, motorcycle taxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS (ONE YEAR REFERENCE)</td>
<td>CODING CATEGORIES</td>
<td>AMOUNT IN FCFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Clothing materials: loincloth, Weaver loincloth, synthetic cloth, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td>How much did you pay (how much did they cost) in total?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Men’s Clothing (15 years and over): shirt, pants, jacket, suit, work clothes, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Men’s underwear (15 years and over): underpant, socks, tee shirt and undershirt, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Women’s Clothing (15 years and over): dress, skirt, pants, suit, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Woman underwear (15 years and over): snickers, petticoat, shirt, bra, tights, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Children’s clothing (0-14 years): layette for baby, boy pants, girl dress, slip kid, blouses, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Other articles of clothing: veils/scarves, ties, belt, hat/bonnet, handkerchief, notions (buttons, sewing thread etc.).</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Cost of making and repairing man clothes : suit, pants, shirt, repair, clothing rental, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Cost of making and repairing woman clothes : dress, pants, skirt, suit, repair, rental, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Cost of making and repairing childrens’ clothes</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Mens’ shoes</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Womens’ shoes</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Childrens’ shoes</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Shoe Repair: resoling, polishing, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Linens and related items (towels, sheet, blanket, bedspread, pillows, mosquito net, mats, curtains, fan, etc.).</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Crockery: plates, knife, fork, spoon, cups, glasses, etc.</td>
<td>YES . . . . . . . . 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO . . . . . . . . 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module H4. Non-food Expenditures Over Past 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions and Filters (One Year Reference)</th>
<th>Coding Categories</th>
<th>Amount in FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Over the past twelve months (one year), did your household use or buy any [ITEM]?</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td>How much did you pay (how much did they cost) in total?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen utensils: pan, pot, local sieve, kitchen utensils repair, etc..</td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Other household utensils: bucket, kettle, feeding bottle, dustbin, cups, non electric coffee maker, tea pot, calabash, ladle, jar, canary, mortar, pestle, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Food, maintenance costs, veterinary fees for pets (dogs, cats, etc.).</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Home tooling : flashlight, torch, oil lamp, hand tools (hammer, screwdriver, etc.); gardening tool (shovel, rake, wheelbarrow, etc.).</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Equipment for maintenance and repair of the dwelling.</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Labor and maintenance and current repair of the dwelling services (septic tank, labor for the maintenance of dwelling, etc.).</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Spare parts of individual means of transport: tire, battery, candle, carburetor, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Small electronic equipment for personal use: cassettes, CD/DVD, USB drive, printer ink, photo printing paper, photo film, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Repair of furniture (armchairs, chairs, beds, cupboards, etc.).</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Repair of household appliances (iron, refrigerator, cooker, oven, stove, air conditioner, fan, water heater, etc.).</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Repair of electronic equipment: radio, radio cassette, TV, camera, CD/DVD player, computer, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Sporting and leisure equipment : ball, Ludo game, shot (petanque), card game, children's toys, video games, small musical instruments, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Entry cost (purchasing a ticket) of sporting events, cinema, concerts, theater, museums, exhibitions, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Other recreational services: PMU ticket, photography services (development, printing), ID photo , etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Other cultural services: non-academic books, cartoon, paper ream, envelopes, drawing items (brushes, paper, paint, etc..), etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Personal care items: perfumes and toilet waters, cosmetics (varnish, lipstick, hair straightener etc..), streaks, wigs, etc..</td>
<td>YES ……………….. 1  →  TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ……………….. 2  (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MODULE H4. NON-FOOD EXPENDITURES OVER PAST 12 MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS (ONE YEAR REFERENCE)</th>
<th>CODING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>AMOUNT IN FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the past twelve months (one year), did your household use or buy any [ITEM]?</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td>How much did you pay (how much did they cost) in total?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Hosting Services: hotel rooms, etc..</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Watches, alarm clocks</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Earrings, necklaces, bracelets, jewelry and other items nes</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Other personal effects : suitcase, travel bag, handbag, sunglasses, umbrellas, sunshade, cane, coin purse, wallet, smokers items (ashtray etc..), baby items (stroller, seats), funerary items, etc..</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Other services: announcement on the radio, in a newspaper/television, funeral, etc..</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>private lessons</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Fees for adult courses</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Corrector glasses, eyeglass frame</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Hearing aid</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Dental prosthesis</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Wheelchair and bicycle for disabled persons with or without motor</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Crutches</td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Other therapeutic and orthopedic appliances nes...</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Other therapeutic and orthopedic appliances nes...</td>
<td>NON .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Insurance costs of individual means of transport (car, motorcycle, etc..)....</td>
<td>YES ............... 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO .................. 2 (NEXT ITEM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Module H4. Non-Food Expenditures Over Past 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Questions and Filters (One Year Reference)</th>
<th>Coding Categories</th>
<th>Amount in FCFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Over the past twelve months (one year), did your household use or buy any [ITEM]?</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td>How much did you pay (how much did they cost) in total?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Consumption costs to water distribution network</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Consumption costs to electricity distribution network</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Council tax (developed and undeveloped buildings), road tax</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Renting a vehicle for personal use: car, motorcycle/bike, etc..</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Air travel in the country and abroad</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Fees of visa, airport tax</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Pilgrimage costs</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Removal costs</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Building materials or large repair for masonry: cement, bricks, concrete iron, sand, gravel, etc..</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Other materials of construction or lar repairs: sheet metal, timber, planks, battens, plywood, straw, paint, lime, electrical materials, plumbing, etc..</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Labor, building and major repair costs of housing: masonry, electrical, plumbing, carpentry, painting, flooring, etc..</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Acquisition costs of land or housing</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Study and architect costs, connection charges (electricity, water, telephone)</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Fees for ceremonies (Ramadan, Tabaski, Christmas, Easter, New Year, weddings, baptisms, funerals, and other events)</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Fees for transfer sent to family members or others</td>
<td>YES .................. 1 → TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>QUESTIONS AND FILTERS</td>
<td>CATEGORIES</td>
<td>SKIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>What is the status of the dwelling: Do you own or are you purchasing this house, is it provided to you by an employer, do you use it for free, or do you rent this house?</td>
<td>OWNER: 01</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO-OWNER: 02</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BEING PURC: 03</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EMPLOYER PROVIDES: 04</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FREE, AUTHORIZED: 05</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FREE, NON AUTHORIZED: 06</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENTED: 07</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS: (SPECIFY) 96</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW/NO RESPONSE: 98</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE: 8</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>If you sell this dwelling today, how much would you sell?</td>
<td>AMOUNT IN FCFA</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW/NO RESPONSE: 98</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>How many years ago was this dwelling built?</td>
<td>YEARS</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW: 98</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>If you rent out this dwelling today, how much rent would you receive?</td>
<td>AMOUNT IN FCFA</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAY: 1</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEEK: 2</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MONTH: 3</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YEAR: 4</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW/NO RESPONSE: 8</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE: 8</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>How much do you pay to rent this dwelling?</td>
<td>AMOUNT IN FCFA</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAY: 1</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEEK: 2</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MONTH: 3</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YEAR: 4</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOES NOT KNOW/NO RESPONSE: 8</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE: 8</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>GO TO NEXT MODULE</td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MODULE H6. VALUE OF ASSETS

Does your household own a [ITEM]?
CIRCLE 1 (YES) OR 2 (NO) IN THE NEXT COLUMN.
IF THE ANSWER IS "NO" ASK QUESTION FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM CODE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES = 1</th>
<th>NO = 2</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS FOR EACH ITEM</th>
<th>AGE OF ITEM</th>
<th>PRICE IF SOLD</th>
<th>ITEMS PURCHASED IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT PAID FOR ITEMS IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Armchair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Complete lounge (armchairs and coffee table)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Full dining table (table and chairs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Single bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Single mattress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Bed and mattress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Other furniture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Gas stove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Kerosene stove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Sewing machine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Moulinex/Food Processor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Gas cooker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Improved stoves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Refrigerator/Freezer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Fan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Air-conditioner/Split</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Single Radio/Radiocassette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Video recorder/CD/DVD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YES" CIRCLE "1"  
"NO": CIRCLE "2" AND GO TO THE NEXT
### MODULE H6. VALUE OF ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM CODE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES = 1</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
<th>AGE OF ITEM</th>
<th>PRICE IF SOLD</th>
<th>ITEMS PURCHASED</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT PAID</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>COUNTRY CODE</th>
<th>YES = 1</th>
<th>NO = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Satellite dish/decoder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Private car (excluding official car)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Moped/Auto-cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Musical Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Fixed phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Video camera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Wheelbarrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H6.8** Do you have a cell phone?

**H6.8A** What is your cell number?

**H6.9** Do you use your cell phone to [READ EACH OPTION AND CIRCLE YES OR NO]?

**H6.10** RECORD END TIME OF MODULE
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INTERVIEWER'S OBSERVATIONS
TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE INTERVIEW

COMMENTS ON THE RESPONDENTS

COMMENTS ON THE SUB DIVISION AND TOWNSHIP

OTHER COMMENTS
b. Qualitative Instruments

The following tools were used to collect qualitative data (in French):

I. Protocol and Group Discussion Guide - MCHN and WASH

ÉVALUATION DE LA PERFORMANCE - USAID NIGER FOOD FOR PEACE
LAHIA, PASAM-TAI ET SAWKI À NIGER

PROTOCOLE POUR LES GROUPES DE DISCUSSION:

INTRODUCTION ET CONSENTEMENT

[POUR DEBUTER, LE MODÉRATEUR DOIT LIRE LE SCRIPTE DE CONSENTEMENT QUI SUIT]:

Bonjour et merci d’avoir accepté de me parler. Je m’appelle (nom d’intervenante/intervenant) ___ et voici mon collègue ___ qui prendra des notes pendant la conversation et ____ qui lui servira d’interprète. Nous travaillons pour le compte d’un groupe d’organisations de recherches basé aux États-Unis qui comprend Mendez England & Associates (ME&A) et NORC à l’Université de Chicago. USAID nous a chargés de mener une étude pour évaluer les performances de trois programmes visant à remédier aux niveaux élevés d’insécurité alimentaire et de malnutrition présents dans les communautés rurales des régions de Maradi et Zinder au Niger.

Dans le cadre de cette étude, nous voudrions parler avec vous de l’évolution des pratiques et des moyens liés à la nutrition, l’eau, l’assainissement et l’hygiène dans votre communauté. La discussion dure au maximum 2 heures. L’objectif de cette discussion est de vous écouter et de saisir vos expériences d’activités à la nutrition des femmes enceintes et des jeunes enfants, à l’eau, l’assainissement et l’hygiène offres par <nom de projet> dans votre communauté, ainsi que de votre perception des changements qui en ont découlés.

Nous allons vous poser des questions sur vos expériences sur le projet et les activités. Notez qu’il n’y a pas de bonnes ou mauvaises réponses. Sentez-vous libre de partager vos expériences et réactions, positives ou négatives et d’être spécifique. Si c’est possible, donnez les exemples pour soutenir ce que vous dites.

Notre rôle ici est de poser des questions et écouter vos avis et expériences. Nous allons enregistrer cette discussion afin de noter fidèlement le contenu de la conversation, et de ne rien oublier de tous ce qui a été dit. Vos identifiants ne sont pas divulgués. Les informations qui vont être rassemblées à travers cette discussion sont conservées en sécurité et sont considérées comme confidentielles, elles ne sont pas partagées avec USAID que de façon anonyme.

Votre participation est entièrement libre et vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à une question ou d’interrompre votre participation à tout moment si vous trouvez les discussions gênantes ou vous vous sentez mal à l’aise. Néanmoins, votre contribution est très importante pour aider l’USAID à rendre leurs programmes de nutrition et sécurité alimentaire plus efficace et mieux adapté aux besoins de la population du Niger. Si vous avez des questions sur l’étude, vous pouvez nous les poser maintenant, ou contacter Mr. John Magistro par téléphone: 92 08 56 30.

Être-vous d’accord de participer à la discussion d’aujourd’hui que nous allons enregistrer?  OUI  NON

[SI LES INTERVIEWÉS DISSENT OUI, CONTINUEZ LA DISCUSSION]

[DEMARRER L’ENREGISTREUR]

Parfait, dans ce cas, commençons!
**Groupe de discussion Répondant** Catégorie:
- Bénéficiaires des activités d’agriculture / moyens de subsistance
- Bénéficiaires des activités de MCHN/WASH
- Autre:

Facilitateur: ____________________ Enregistreur: ____________________

Heure de début: ___ : ___ AM / PM (encercler un) Heure de fin: ___ : ___ AM / PM

Nom du recording file: _______________________________________

**EVELYN Niger Evaluation du rendement: DFSA** Nom de l’activité: ____________________________ Date: Juillet Jour: ____ Année: 2017

Département: _______________________ Commune: _______________________ Village: _______________________

### Liste des répondeurs

| M   | F   | <15 | 16 - 25 | 26 - 50 | 51+ | Primaire | Secondaire | Tertiaire | Hausa | Activité | Nombre | Zarma | Activité | Nombre | Touareg | Activité | Nombre | Peul | Activité | Nombre | Kanuri | Activité | Nombre | Autre | Activité | Nombre |
|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------|-----|----------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|----------|--------|-------|----------|--------|-------|----------|--------|-------|----------|--------|

**Commentaires sur tout aspect du GD** (niveau de discussion - par exemple, très consensus actif, désengagée, général, / contentieux, dominante individuelle s, etc.):
GUIDE DE SUJETS DE DISCUSSION GROUPE - MCHN & WASH

DOMAINES TOPIQUES:
EQ 1. RÉALISATIONS DU PROJET
EQ 2. EFFICACITÉ ET EFFICACITÉ DES INTERVENTIONS
EQ 3. DURABILITÉ DES RÉSULTATS
EQ 4. CONSÉQUENCES NON INNOVÉES

Les répondants: 12 participants, composés d’une large représentation des membres de la communauté. Deux membres de chacun des groupes de village suivants participeront:
1) Groupes d’apprentissage masculins ou mères, 2) Comités WASH, 3) Comités des jeunes. Le reste sera des bénéficiaires directs du programme dans toutes les autres activités de programme liées à MCHN & WASH (par exemple, les jeunes, les adolescents et les mères adolescentes, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ (s)</th>
<th>Des questions</th>
<th>Instructions du modérateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nous aimerions vous parler de vos expériences avec [NOM DU PROJET]</td>
<td>Pour évaluer la familiarité des participants avec le programme et assurer l'utilisation de la terminologie du programme tel que connu par les participants tout au long du reste de la discussion. Gagnez des points de vue des participants sur les activités du programme et leur participation. Renvois cette information sur la documentation IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Connaissez-vous bien ce projet ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Par quel nom appelez-vous le projet dans votre village ? Pouvez-vous décrire brièvement ce qu’il a fait ici dans ce village ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discutons maintenant en détails des activités du projet et comment ces activités ont affecté vos conditions de vie et quelles sont vos impressions générales du projet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCHN &amp; WASH ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Utilisez des groupes clés ou des grappes d’activités dans la liste des activités ci-dessous pour obtenir un bref aperçu sur ce qui a participé à quoi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Dans quelles activités de santé et de nutrition avez-vous participés, en particulier celles pour les femmes et les petites enfants ? Et pour les activités de WASH et assainissement ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderateur:

UTILISEZ DES GROUPES CLES OU DES GRAPPES D’ACTIVITES DANS LA LISTE DES ACTIVITES CI-DESSOUS POUR OBTENIR UN BREF APERÇU SUR CE QUI A PARTICIPE A QUOI.

LES ACTIVITES LIEES A LA SNMI OFFERTE PAR LES PROGRAMMES SUIVANTS:

SNMI:
- Organisation de groupes d'apprentissage masculins pour sensibiliser cette population et promouvoir les pratiques clés par l'éducation par les pairs
- Organisation de groupes de soins et de mères chefs de file pour promouvoir des pratiques clés en matière de nutrition et de planification familiale grâce à l'éducation par les pairs et aux visites à domicile. Fait également partie du système actif de dépistage et de référence pour la malnutrition au niveau communautaire
- Démonstrations culinaires
- Diffusion de messages ou de discussions à la radio, fourniture de sketches, de films et de clubs d'écoute sur l'alimentation des femmes enceintes et des enfants, de bonnes pratiques d'hygiène ou de la surveillance de la santé des enfants
  - Les radios ont également été distribuées au début du projet.
- Fourniture de rations alimentaires Titre II
- Formation du personnel de santé, des promoteurs de la santé, des bénévoles de la santé et des membres de la communauté sur l'approche de 1 000 jours
- Surveillance et promotion de la croissance et renvoi aux centres de santé au besoin

**Général / chevauchement:**
- Concours WASH et nutrition dans et à travers les villages
- Les écoles d'époux sur l'équité entre les sexes
- Les centres de développement de la petite enfance pour faciliter l'apprentissage, fournir des aliments quotidiens
- Formation des enseignants sur le bon WASH et les pratiques nutritionnelles à transmettre aux enfants, suivi de l'hygiène et de l'éducation nutritionnelle dans les écoles
  - WASH Désignation amicale des écoles et fourniture de matériel de nettoyage

**LAVAGE / Assainissement:**
- Installation de latrines en ciment (p. Ex., Autour de l'école)
- Construction de latrines de ciment et élaboration d'un plan de maintenance
  - Formation de maçons dans la construction de latrines
- Les forages et les puits neufs ou remis à neuf et l'installation des pompes
  - Formation communautaire sur la réparation et la fourniture de boîtes à outils
- Analyse chimique de l'eau
- Installation d'installations de lavage des mains
Maintenant, nous allons discuter les sujets différents de projet. Pour chaque sujet nous voulons votre avis sur quelles activités du projet ont les plus aide le menage, et quelles en sont les raisons.

3. Pour chaque des thématiques suivant, quelles sont les activités du projet qui ont le plus aide les ménages ? Quelles en sont les raisons ?
   - Alimentation, d’hygiène de gestion de l’eau, de preparation de la cuisine, en particulier pour les femmes enceintes et les enfants
   - Acquérir plus de connaissance sur le suivi de la sante de vos enfants et de prendre des mesure appropriées en cas de besoins
   - Acquérir plus de connaissance due les méthodes de planification familiale et comment les utiliser
   - Modifier l’accès des enfants et des femmes enceintes aux services de sante
   - Change l’accès des ménages à des sources améliorées d’eau potable
   - L’accès des ménages aux infrastructures sanitaires améliorées
   - L’accès des ménages aux différents types d’aliments consommes par les ménages
   - Les pratiques des ménages en matières d’allaitement maternelle
   - L’hygiène et assainissement

4. Certains menages ont-ils pu bénéficier plus que d’autres ? Pourquoi?
   a. Quelles catégories de ménages ont bénéficié le moins des activités agricoles et de moyens de subsistance dans votre communauté?
   b. Pourquoi ces ménages ont le moins profité?
   c. Quelles suggestions faites-vous pour que ces ménages bénéficient davantage?

5. Pour chaque de ces sujets, y a-t-il des activités qui n’aient vraiment pas aidé les ménages? Quelles activités? Quelles sont les raisons? Donnez-nous des exemples précis.

Maintenant nous voudrons discuter les defis lie aux ces sujets dans cette village.
6. En matière d’alimentation, d’hygiène de gestion de l’eau, de préparation de la cuisine, en particulier pour les femmes enceintes et les enfants, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

7. En matière de connaissance sur le suivi de la santé de vos enfants et de prendre des mesures appropriées en cas de besoins, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

8. En matière de connaissance sur les méthodes de planification familiale et comment les utiliser, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

9. En matière d’accès des enfants et des femmes enceintes aux services de santé, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

10. En matière d’accès des menages à des sources améliorées d’eau potable, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

11. En matière d’accès des menages aux infrastructures sanitaires améliorées, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

12. En matière d’accès des menages aux différentes types d’aliments consommés par les menages, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?

13. En matière d’allaitement maternel, quels défis avez-vous été confronter au début du projet?
   a. Ces défis persistent toujours?
   b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future ?
14. Y a-t-il des changements dans votre communauté concernant l’attitude des maris, et le niveau de soutien a leurs épouse en matière de suivi de grossesse, d’alimentation/ nutrition et de planification familiale?
   a. De quelle manière, et pourquoi? (positif ou négatif)
   b. Quelles activités ont eu le plus grand effet dans le changement d’attitude des hommes pour soutenir les femmes dans leurs tâches agricoles ou d’autres activités de subsistance et pourquoi?
   c. Y-a-t-il d’autres contraintes que les femmes rencontrent qui les empêchent d’avoir plus de soutien des hommes dans cette communauté? Pouvez-vous donner quelques exemples?

CIBLAGE ET DISTRIBUTION DE GROUPE DES AVANTAGES

2.2, 2.2, 1.1

15. Quelles catégories de menages ont bénéficié le moins des activités de santé, de nutrition, d’hygiène et d’assainissement, dans votre communauté?
   15.1 Pourquoi ces ménages ont le moins profité?
   15.2 Quelles suggestions faites-vous pour que ces ménages bénéficient davantage?

QUALITÉ DE SERVICE ET CONDUITE

2.3

16. Quoi d’autres le projet aurait pu faire pour mieux travailler avec les membres de cette communauté pour aider à améliorer la santé, la nutrition, l’hygiène et l’assainissement?

DURABILITÉ

I. SANTÉ ET NUTRITION

3, 3, 2

17. Les membres de la communauté pratiquent-ils encore les méthodes les méthodes de nutrition maternelle et infantile, et la santé, qu’ils sont reçu sur les formations du projet? [LISTE DEDROIT]
   a. Qu’est-ce qui encouragerait les membres de la communauté à continuer à utiliser ces méthodes à l’avenir?
   b. Pensez-vous que d’autres personnes non-bénéficiaires dans la communauté ont également appris à utiliser ces méthodes? Comment l’ont-elles apprises?
   c. Ces méthodes se sont-elles répandues dans d’autres communautés en dehors de la zone d’intervention du projet?
   d. [SI OUI] Comment cela s’est-il passé?

18. Avez-vous payé quelque choses pour les produits ou services de nutrition, ou de santé fournis par le projet?
   a. [SI OUI] Lesquels?
   b. Pourquoi avez-vous décidé de payer pour ces services ou produits?
   c. Continuerez-vous à payer pour ces services ou produits à l’avenir?
   d. [SI NON] Pourquoi pas? [VOIR LES EXEMPLES À DROITE]

LISTE DES ACTIVITÉS MCHN
- Groupes d’apprentissage masculins
- Groupes de soins
- Mères chefs
- Démonstrations culinaires
- Formation du promoteur de la santé et bénévoles de la santé
- Surveillance et promotion de la croissance

LES EXAMPLES:
- Coûte trop d’argent, trop cher
- Nécessitent trop de temps ou de travail
## LAVAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| e. Seriez-vous disposé à payer un peu plus pour certains de ces produits / services? [SI OUI] Le (s) quel (s)? | • Nécessitent plus de formation, formation insuffisante  
• Aucun impact notable ou résultat positif                                                                                   |
| f. Y a-t-il autre chose qui vous inciterait à payer pour l’un de ces produits et/ou services? |                                                                                                                                         |

### II. LAVAGE

19. Les membres de la communauté pratiquent-ils encore les méthodes les méthodes d'assainissement qu'ils sont reçu sur les formations du projet? [LISTE DEDROIT]
   a. Qu'est-ce qui encouragerait les membres de la communauté à continuer à utiliser ces méthodes à l'avenir?
   b. Pensez-vous que d'autres personnes non-bénéficiaires dans la communauté ont également appris à utiliser ces méthodes? Comment l'ont-elles appris?
   c. Ces méthodes se sont-elles répandues dans d'autres communautés en dehors de la zone d'intervention du projet?
   d. [SI OUI] Comment cela s'est-il passé?

20. Avez-vous payé quelque choses pour les produits ou services d'assainissement fournis par le projet?
   a. [SI OUI] Lesquels?
   b. Pourquoi avez-vous décidé de payer pour ces services ou produits?
   c. Continuez-vous à payer pour ces services ou produits à l'avenir?
   d. [SI NON] Pourquoi pas? [VOIR LES EXEMPLES À DROITE]
   e. Seriez-vous disposé à payer un peu plus pour certains de ces produits / services? [SI OUI] Le (s) quel (s)?

   Y a-t-il autre chose qui vous inciterait à payer pour l’un de ces produits et/ou services?

### LISTE DES ACTIVITÉS DE LAVAGE
- La concurrence WASH à l'intérieur et à travers les villages
- Formation sur les pratiques WASH dans les écoles
- Entretien des installations de lavage des mains
- Installation et entretien des latrines
- Entretien des forages et des puits

### LES EXAMPLES:
- Coûte trop d'argent, trop cher
- Nécessitent trop de temps ou de travail
- Nécessitent plus de formation, formation insuffisante
- Aucun impact notable ou résultat positif

### FERMETURE

21. Y a-t-il autre chose que vous voudriez ajouter au sujet du projet que nous n'avons pas évoquer?

22. Merci. Avez-vous des questions pour nous?
2. Protocol and Group Discussion Guide - Agriculture and Livelihoods

ÉVALUATION DE PERFORMANCE – USAID & FOOD FOR PEACE au Niger
LAHIA, PASAM-TAI, SAWKI

PROTOCOLE POUR LES GROUPES DE DISCUSSION:

INTRODUCTION ET CONSENTEMENT

[POUR DEBUTER, LE MODÉRATEUR DOIT LIRE LE SCRIPTE DE CONSENTEMENT QUI SUIT]:

Bonjour et merci d’avoir accepté de me parler. Je m’appelle (nom d’intervieweur/intervieweuse) ____ et voici mon collègue ___ qui prendra des notes pendant la conversation et _____ qui lui servira d’interprète. Nous travaillons pour le compte d’un groupe d’organisations de recherches basé aux États-Unis qui comprend Mendez England & Associates (ME&A) et NORC à l’Université de Chicago. USAID nous a chargés de mener une étude pour évaluer les performances de trois programmes visant à remédier aux niveaux élevés d’insécurité alimentaire et de malnutrition présents dans les communautés rurales des régions de Maradi et Zinder au Niger.

Dans le cadre de cette étude, nous voudrions parler avec vous de l’évolution des pratiques agricoles et des moyens de subsistance dans votre communauté. La discussion dura au maximum 2 heures. L’objectif de cette discussion est de vous écouter et de capturer vos expériences des activités liées à l’agriculture et aux moyens de subsistance offertes par le <Nom du Projet> dans votre communauté, ainsi que de votre perception des changements qui en ont découlés.

Nous allons vous poser des questions sur vos expériences sur ce projet et ses activités. Notez qu’il n’y a pas de bonnes ou mauvaises réponses. Sentez-vous libre de partager vos expériences et réactions, positives ou négatives, et d’être précis. Si c’est possible, donnez des exemples pour illustrer ce que vous dites.

Notre rôle ici est de poser des questions et d’écouter vos avis et expériences. Nous allons enregistrer cette discussion afin de noter fidèlement le contenu de la conversation, et de ne rien oublier de tout ce qui a été dit. Vos identités ne seront pas divulguées. Les informations qui vont être collectées à travers cette discussion sont conserver en sécurité et sont considérées comme confidentielles, elles ne seront partagées avec USAID que de façon anonyme.

Votre participation est entièrement libre et vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à une question ou d’interrompre votre participation à tout moment si vous trouvez les discussions gênantes ou vous vous sentez mal à l’aise. Néanmoins, votre contribution est très importante pour aider l’USAID à rendre leurs programmes de nutrition et sécurité alimentaire plus efficace et mieux adapté aux besoins de la population du Niger. Si vous avez des questions sur l’étude, vous pouvez nous les poser maintenant, ou contacter Mr. John Magistro par téléphone: 92 08 56 30.

Etes-vous d’accord de participer à la discussion d’aujourd’hui que nous allons enregistrer? OUI: / NON: __/_

[SI LES INTERVIEWÉS DISENT OUI, CONTINUEZ LA DISCUSSION. SI NON], REMERCIEZ LA PERSONNE ET ARRETER L’INTERVIEW

Parfait, dans ce cas, commençons! [DEMARRER L’ENREGISTREUR]
### Focus Group Respondent Category:

- [ ] Beneficiaires males
- [ ] Beneficiaires femelles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitateur: _______________</th>
<th>Enregistreur: _______________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debut: ____ :____ AM/PM (Encerclez)</td>
<td>Fin: ____ :____ AM/PM (Encerclez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numéro de l’enregistrement: _______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVELYN Evaluation de Performance, Niger:** Nom de l’activité: ____________________________

**Date:** JUILLET JOUR: ____ Année: 2017

| Département: ________________________ | Commune: ________________________ | Village: ________________________ |

**[COMPTER LE NOMBRE DE REPONSONDANTS QUI LEVENT LA MAIN POUR CHAQUE CATEGORIE CORRESPONDANTE]**

**[NOURRITURE POUR BIENS PHYSIQUES – ENUMEREZ L’ACTIVITE DE TRAVAIL & LE NUMERO CORRESPONDANT]**

**[ENUMEREZ LE NUMERO DU REPONDANT CORRESPONDANT A L’ACTIVITE PRATIQUEE DANS CHAQUE PROJET]**

**[AUTRE GROUPE D’ACTIVITE– ENUMEREZ TOUT AUTRE GROUPE D’ACTIVITE EN RELATION AVEC L’AGRICULTURE & LES MOYENS DE SUBSISTANCE]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexe (#) (M/F)</th>
<th>Group d’age(#)</th>
<th>Niveau d’Education Achevé (#)</th>
<th>Groupe Ethnique (#)</th>
<th>Rations Alimentaires/ Travail (Activite &amp; (#)</th>
<th>Jardin Maraiche Membre (#)</th>
<th>Elevage Ecoles (#)</th>
<th>Epargne de groupe &amp; Prêts (#)</th>
<th>Legumes Ameliorees / Production de Cultures &amp; Modes de Stockage Apres-Recoltes (#)</th>
<th>Formation sur la Gestion des Sols (#)</th>
<th>Autres Activites de Group (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Alphabetisation Adult _____</td>
<td>Hausa ____</td>
<td>Activite_______</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Primaire _____</td>
<td>Zarma ____</td>
<td># _____</td>
<td>Activite_______</td>
<td># _____</td>
<td>Activite_______</td>
<td># _____</td>
<td>Activite_______</td>
<td># _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>16 – 25</td>
<td>Secondaire _____</td>
<td>Touareg _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td>Tertiaire _____</td>
<td>Peul _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>51+</td>
<td>Kanuri _____</td>
<td>Autre _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentaires sur tout aspect du GD** (niveau de discussion - par exemple, très consensus actif, désengagée, général, / contentieux, dominante individuelle s, etc.):
GUIDE D'ENTRETIEN DE GROUPE – AGRICULTURE & MOYENS DE SUBSISTANCE

Sujets d'investigation:
EQ 1. Réalisations du projet
EQ 2. Efficacité et pertinence des interventions
EQ 3. Durabilité des résultats
EQ 4. Conséquences inattendues

Répondants: 12 participants représentant les différentes composantes d'activités de la communauté. S'assurer que 2 membres de chacun des groupes d'activités suivants sont représentées: 1) Jardins maraîchers/agriculture, 2) Groupes d'épargne et de crédit et 3) Comités de développement du village. Le reste sera composé des bénéficiaires directs du programme dans tout autre programme d'activités liées à l'agriculture et aux moyens de subsistance (par exemple, les jeunes, Aliments/biens physiques, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ(s)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Instructions au modérateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nous aimerions vous parler de vos expériences avec [NOM DU PROJET]</td>
<td>Pour évaluer la familiarité des participants avec le programme et assurer l'utilisation de la terminologie du programme tel que connu par les participants tout au long du reste de la discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Connaissez-vous bien ce projet ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Par quel nom appelez-vous le projet dans votre village ? Pouvez-vous décrire brièvement ce qu'il a fait ici dans ce village ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discutons maintenant en détails des activités du projet et comment ces activités ont affecté vos conditions de vie et quelles sont vos impressions générales du projet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGRICULTURE ET MOYENS DE SUBSISTANCE ACTIVITÉS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>AGRAICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2. Nous allons maintenant attirer votre attention sur les activités détaillées du projet et sur la façon dont elles ont affecté votre vie et sur vos impressions générales sur tous les aspects du projet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Dans quelles activités agricoles et d'autres moyens de subsistance avez-vous participés?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MODÉRATEUR: [SE REFERER A LA LISTE DES ACTIVITÉS CONTENUES CI DESSOUS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBTENIEN LES ACTIVITES PRINCIPES SANS ENTRE DANS TROPS DE DETAIL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ(s)</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Instructions au moderateur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILISEZ DES GROUPEES CLES OU DES GRAPPEES D'ACTIVITES DANS LA LISTE DES ACTIVITES CI-DESSOUS POUR OBTENIR UN BREF APERCU SUR CE QUI A PARTICIPPE A QUOI.</td>
<td>Des exemples d'activités liées à l'agriculture offertes par les programmes incluent: <strong>Crop Production et commercialisation de cultures maraichères:</strong> - Formation sur la restauration de parcelles improdutives et la gestion de la fertilité des sols - Développement de jardins maraichers pour les femmes. - Essais et introduction de nouvelles variétés de cultures et de nouvelles approches de lutte antiparasitaires - Provision de semences and de plantes a repiquer (a travers une distribution directe, ticket-vouchers et/ou un programme communautaire de multiplication de semences) et/ou d'engrais. - Accès à de nouvelles sources d'eau (nouveaux puits ou puits réhabilités) et méthodes d'irrigation des cultures - Formation sur les jardins maraichers (utilisation d'engrais, irrigation), transformation, ou commercialisation de produits (Exemples incluent selection des varietes, gestion de la fertilite des sols, promotion de l'agri-business, Farmer Field School, gestion pour le controle des ennemis des cultures. - Provision of crop storage bags (e.g. PICS) and storage facilities (granaries, silos) to protect against pests, or postpone sale while prices are low. Fourniture de sacs de stockage de cultures (p. Ex. PICS) et d'installations de moyens d'stockage (greniers, silos) pour protéger contre les ennemis de culture ou pour différer la vente au moment où les prix sont bas. <strong>Elevage and Animaux a la ferme:</strong> - Livestock Field Schools - Provision of small ruminants to vulnerable population (mostly women) and training on animal husbandry - Facilitation and development of Habbanaye for adolescent girls or sheep fattening practices - Training on processing crop residues to produce animal feed - Promotion of fodder crop production and conservation as animal feed - Training of community animal health workers - Promotion of animal vaccination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Livelihood Activities:
- Development and support of village or community savings and internal lending programs (non-agricultural activities)
- Adult literacy classes at literacy centers ((non-agricultural related literacy training)
- Commercial activities relating to women’s labor saving on energy-related technologies (e.g. cook stoves)
- Vocational skills training of girls in income-generating activities (e.g., sewing, cosmetics, incense, food processing) and entrepreneurship
- Financial and business management training (for non-agricultural commercial activities)

**MAINTENANT, NOUS ALLONS DISCOUTERS LES SUJETS DIFFERENTS DE PROJET. POUR CHAQUE SUJET NOUS VOULONS VOTRE AVIS SUR QUELLES ACTIVITES DU PROJET ONT LES PLUS AIDE LE MENAGE, ET QUELS EN SONT LES RAISONS.**

3. Pour chaque sujet, lesquelles des activités du projet ont le plus aidé les menages ? Quelles en sont les raisons ?
   - Produire les cultures ou les légumes
   - Obtenir, nourrir et s'occuper du bétail et d'autres animaux de ferme (p. Ex. poulets)
   - Stocker et préserver de façon sûre les cultures
   - Commercialiser les produits agricoles (légumes, bétail, oeufs et lait, etc.)
   - Avoir accès au crédit pour l'agriculture et l'élevage
   - Ameliorer la production agricole et l'accès aux marchés des menages

4. Certains menages ont-ils pu bénéficier plus que d'autres? Pourquoi?

5. Pour chaque sujet, y at-il des activités qui n'ait vraiment pas aidé les menages? Quelles activités? Quelles sont les raisons? Donnez-nous des exemples précis.

**NOTE SUR LA PRODUCTION INDIVIDUELLE ET MÉNAGER:**
Dans le ménage, il existe deux types de terres: (1) gandu - géré par la mai gida (chef masculin du ménage) en utilisant le travail de tous les membres du ménage; & (2) gamana - parcelles cultivées par des membres individuels de la HH, souvent des femmes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ(s)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Instructions au moderateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2, 2.3, (indirectly 1.2) | **6.** En matière de production des cultures ou des légumes, quels défis avez-vous été confronté au début du projet?  
  a. Ces défis persistent toujours?  
  b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future? | |
| 2, 2.3, (indirectly 1.2) | **7.** En matière d’obtenir, nourrir et s’occuper du bétail et d’autres animaux de ferme (p. Ex. poulets), quels défis avez-vous été confronté au début du projet?  
  a. Ces défis persistent toujours?  
  b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future? | |
| 2, 2.3, (indirectly 1.2) | **8.** En matière de stocker et préserver de façon sûre les cultures, quels défis avez-vous été confronté au début du projet?  
  a. Ces défis persistent toujours?  
  b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future? | |
| 1, 2, 2.3 | **9.** En matière de commercialiser les produits agricoles (légumes, bétail, oeufs et lait, etc.), quels défis avez-vous été confronté au début du projet?  
  a. Ces défis persistent toujours?  
  b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future? | |
| 1, 2, 2.3 | **10.** En matière d’avoir accès au crédit pour l’agriculture et l’élevage, quels défis avez-vous été confronté au début du projet?  
  a. Ces défis persistent toujours?  
  b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future? | |
| 1, 2, 2.3 | **11.** En matière d’améliorer la production agricole et l’accès aux marchés des ménages, quels défis avez-vous été confronté au début du projet?  
  a. Ces défis persistent toujours?  
  b. Quels autres défis devrait être pris en considération pour la future? | |
| 1, 2, 2.3 | **12.** Y a-t-il eu des changements dans la communauté concernant l’attitude des hommes pour aider les femmes à mener des activités agricoles ou autres activités de subsistance?  
  12.1 De quelle manière, et pourquoi? (positif ou négatif) | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ(s)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Instructions au modérateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 2.3, 4</td>
<td>12.2 Quelles activités ont eu le plus grand effet dans le changement d'attitude des hommes pour soutenir les femmes dans leurs tâches agricoles ou d'autres activités de subsistance et pourquoi?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(indirectly 1.2)</td>
<td>13. Y-a-t-il d'autres contraintes que les femmes rencontrent qui les empêchent d'avoir plus de soutien des hommes dans cette communauté? Pouvez-vous donner quelques exemples?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ(s)</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2, 1.1</td>
<td>14. Quelles catégories de menages ont bénéficié le moins des activités agricoles et de moyens de subsistance dans votre communauté? 14.1 Pourquoi ces ménages ont le moins profité? 14.1 Quelles suggestions faites-vous pour que ces ménages bénéficient davantage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15. Quoi d'autres le projet aurait pu faire pour mieux travailler avec les membres de cette communauté pour aider à améliorer la production agricole et le revenu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLES:**
- trop cher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ(s)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Instructions au moderateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>[SI OUI] Lesquels?</td>
<td>- le prix a augmenté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Pourquoi avez-vous décidé de payer pour ces services ou produits?</td>
<td>- produit non disponible ou accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Continuez-vous à payer pour ces services ou produits à l'avenir?</td>
<td>- Il n'est plus efficace ou ne fonctionne pas bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>[SI NON] Pourquoipas? [VOIR LES EXEMPLES À DROITE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Seriez-vous disposé à payer un peu plus pour certains de ces produits/services? [SI OUI] Le (s) quel (s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>Y a-t-il autre chose qui vous inciterait à payer pour l'un de ces produits et/ou services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRODUITS ET SERVICES MOYENS DE SUBSISTENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>18. Les personnes de cette communauté qui ont été formées par le projet dans les activités de subsistance pratiquent-elles encore ces activités? [LISTE À DROIT]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 3.2</td>
<td>18.1 Qu'est-ce encouragerait les membres de la communauté à continuer à utiliser ces méthodes à l'avenir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2 Pensez-vous que d'autres personnes dans la communauté ont également appris à utiliser ces méthodes? Comment ont-ils appris?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.3 Ces méthodes sont-elles répandues dans d'autres communautés en dehors de la zone d'intervention du projet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.4 [SI OUI] Comment cela s'est-il passé?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIST OF LIVELIHOOD ACTIVITIES**

Livelihood Activities:
- Development and support of village or community savings and internal lending programs (non-agricultural activities)
- Adult literacy classes at literacy centers (non-agricultural related literacy training)
- Commercial activities relating to women’s labor saving on energy-related technologies (e.g. cook stoves)
- Vocational skills training of girls in income-generating activities (e.g., sewing, cosmetics, incense, food processing) and entrepreneurship
- Financial and business management training (for non-agricultural commercial activities)

**EXAMPLES:**
- trop cher
- le prix a augmenté
- produit non disponible ou accessible
- Il n'est plus efficace ou ne fonctionne pas bien

**FERMETURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20.</th>
<th>Y a-t-il autre chose que vous voudriez ajouter au sujet du projet que nous n'avons pas évoqué?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Merci. Avez-vous des questions pour nous?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDE DE DISCUSSION DES PETITES GROUPES - PROFIL DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ

Description: un questionnaire semi-structuré avec le chef du village et 3-5 dirigeants communautaires ou anciens. À l'arrivée dans le village, l'équipe (avec l'aide de l'IP si possible) accueillera le chef du village et les aînés / dirigeants de la communauté et leur demandera de se réunir pendant plus de 60 minutes avant de commencer les sessions GD. Dans la mesure du possible, ces questions seront posées aux anciens et aux chefs du village qui resteront ensuite séparés des discussions des groupes de discussion (FGD) et de toutes les entrevues avec les informateurs clés (KII) et permettent ainsi aux FGD et aux KII de rester plus indépendants des leaders Points de vue personnels et influence.

Objectifs:

• Pour présenter le chef et les anciens / leaders à l'évaluation, obtenir leur approbation pour procéder à des discussions de groupe et des entretiens, et établir un rapport de confiance avant de commencer la collecte de données;
• Comprendre le contexte de la communauté et obtenir des informations sur les principales caractéristiques socio-culturelles, démographiques, environnementales, d'infrastructure et de moyens de subsistance de la communauté;
• Pour mieux comprendre les principaux défis pour la sécurité des aliments et des moyens de subsistance, et des menaces naturelles et humaines pour la communauté.

INTRODUCTION ET CONSENTEMENT

[POUR DEBUTER, LE MODÉRATEUR DOIT LIRE LE SCRIPTE DE CONSENTEMENT QUI SUIT]:

Bonjour et merci d’accepter de Avoir me Speaking. Je m'appelle (nom d'intervieweur / intervieweuse) ____ et voici mon collègue ____ qui prendra des notes pendant la conversation et ____ qui lui servira d’interprète. Nous travaillons pour le compte d'un groupe d'organisations de recherches aux Etats-Unis qui comprennent Mendez Angleterre et Associés (ME & A) et NORC à l’Université de Chicago. USAID Food for Peace nous a chargés de mener une étude pour évaluer les performances de trois programmes visant à améliorer les niveaux d’aide alimentaire et de malnutrition dans les régions rurales de Maradi et Zinder au Niger.

Votre participation est entièrement libre et vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à une question ou d’interrompre votre participation à tout moment si vous trouvez les discussions gênantes ou vous sentez mal à l’aise. Néanmoins, votre contribution est très importante pour aider USAID à rendre leurs programmes de nutrition et sécurité alimentaire plus efficace et mieux adapté aux besoins de la population du Niger.

Les informations qui vont être collectées à travers cette discussion seront conserver en sécurité et sont considérées comme confidentielles, elles ne seront partagées avec USAID que de façon anonyme. Aucun nom ne sera motionné et toute information qui pourraient vous identifier (e.g., région, département, commune, position) seront exclu des rapports et autres documents produits par l’équipe et partagés avec USAID.

Si vous avez des questions sur l’étude, vous pouvez nous les poser maintenant, ou contacter Mr. John Magistro par téléphone: 92 08 56 30.

Etre-vous d'accord de participer à la discussion d'aujourd'hui? NON OUI

[SI LES INTERVIEWÉS DISENT OUI, CONTINUEZ LA DISCUSSION]
INFORMATIONS RÉPONDANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFSA Nom Activité</th>
<th>Facilitateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enregistreur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Département _____________________________
Commune ________________________________
Village _________________________________
Date _____________________________________
Heure de début ____________
Heure de fin ____________

Nombre de Respondents et Sex Male _____ Female _____

Titre des répondants

QUESTIONS POUR LES LEADERS DE VILLAGE

A. Démographique et projet Caractéristiques

1. Quel et la population totale de ce village? Combien de menage vivre dans le village?

2. Quels sont les groupes ethniques de ce village et leur proportion générale de la population du village (par exemple, 75percent de Haoussa, 20percent de Zarma, 5percent de Peul, etc.)? (Defined by where people come from; not the language that they speak)

B. Infrastructure

5. Y a-t-il une école primaire dans le village?

6. Quelle est la distance de l'école secondaire la plus proche?

7. Existe-t-il u centre de sante?

7.1 [SI NON] Quelle est la distance au centre le plus proche, et le nom du village?

7.2 Existe-il une sage-femme dans le village?

7.3 Existe-il une matronne dans le village?

8. Existe-t-il une banque de céréales dans le village? Si oui, depuis quand? Qui a financé ça?

9. Le village dispose-t-il de l'électricité? Si oui, depuis quand et quelle est la source (p. Ex., Grille, générateur, énergie solaire)?

9.1 Combien de compteurs de l'électricité existe-il dans le village?

9.2 Pour les ménages qui n'ont pas de compteur d'électricité, quelle est leur source primaire d'électricité (p. Ex., Grille, générateur, énergie solaire, utilisation de compteur du voisin)?
10. Quelle est la source d'eau principale pour ce village? Quelles sont les autres sources d'eau? Et combien existent-ils? (puits ouverts, forages, eau courante, rivières / cours d'eau, étangs, autres)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.0 Type de sources</th>
<th>10.1 Disponibilité durant l'année ? (Oui / Non)</th>
<th>10.2 Combien de mois l'eau est-elle disponible?</th>
<th>10.3 Raisons de ne pas être disponibles toute l'année (dérglement de la technologie, manque de pluie, tarissements, autre)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Existe-t-il une couverture de téléphone cellulaire dans le village? Si oui, depuis quand?

12. A quelle distance est la route bitumée la plus proche?

13. Disposez vous d'un marché dans le village? [SI NON] A quelle distance se trouve le marché hebdomadaire le plus proche?

C. Moyens de Subsistance

14. Quels sont les principaux moyens de subsistance dans le village, pour la majorité de ménages vivant dans ce village (agriculture, élevage, pêche, agroforesterie, petit commerce, autres)?

14.1 Lequel de ces moyens de subsistance est pratiqué principalement par les hommes?

14.2 Lequel de ces moyens de subsistance est pratiqué principalement par les femmes?

14.3 Lequel de ces moyens de subsistance est pratiqué principalement par les adolescentes?

14.4 Lequel de ces moyens de subsistance est pratiqué principalement par les adolescents?

15. Y a-t-il eu des changements majeurs dans ces moyens de subsistance au cours de ces 5 à 10 dernières années? [Donnez 1-2 exemples pour mieux expliquer la question]

15.1 [SI OUI] Pourquoi ces changements ont-ils eu lieu?

16. Certains membres de cette communauté pratiquent la migration saisonnière ou a long-terme?
16. **Type de la migration ?**  
   (saisonnière ou à long-term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16.1 Qui migre ? (Jeunes hommes, familles entières, etc)</th>
<th>16.2 Raisons de la migration</th>
<th>16.3 Combien de temps est consacré par chaque groupe?</th>
<th>16.4 Principales destination de l'émigration pour chaque groupe?</th>
<th>16.5 A quel moment chaque groupe retourne-t-il?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Groupes de Développement Communautaire/ Institutions**

17. **Au cours des 5 dernières années quels sont les 3 plus grande chocs ou catastrophes, naturelles ou autres, que votre communauté a vécus, qui a affecté un grand nombre de ménages?** (P. Ex., sécheresses, inondations, grandes pertes de cultures et/ou d'animaux en raison de conditions météorologiques, maladie / maladie, insécurité)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17. Type de choc ou catastrophes</th>
<th>16.1 Quelles en sont les raisons ?</th>
<th>16.2 Comment cela a-t-il affecté les gens dans cette communauté?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Quels types d’activités le <nom du projet> a-t-il fait dans cette communauté et comment cela a-t-il fonctionné?**

19. **Comment les bénéficiaires ont-ils été sélectionnés pour participer aux activités suivantes du <project name>?**

- MCHN/WASH
- Agriculture
- Moyens de Subsistence
20. Si certains catégories de ménage ne participent pas aux activités de projet, quelles en sont les raisons?

21. Y a-t-il d'autres projets d’urgence et/ou développement opérant dans ce village au cours des 5 dernières années?

- Veuillez énumérer chaque projet, les activités menées, les périodes d’intervention et l’organisation qui s’en charge (gouvernement du Niger, ONG, autres) [remplissez la table ci-dessous]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services ou Soutien d’organisations Extérieures</th>
<th>Nom de Organisation Extérieure</th>
<th>Service Fourni</th>
<th>Dates de service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentaires:
4. KII Guide - Regional and Local Government - Agriculture and Livelihoods

**Questionnaire Interview Informateurs Clés**

Gouvernement Regional et Communal – Agriculture et Moyens de Subsistance

**Introduction et Consentement**

*Pour débuter, l’interviewer doit lire le scripte de consentement qui suit:*

Bonjour et merci d’avoir accepté de me parler. Je m’appelle (nom d’intervieweur/intervieweuse) ____ et voici mon collègue ___ qui prendra des notes pendant la conversation et _____ qui lui servira d’interprète. Nous travaillons pour le compte d’un groupe d’organisations de recherches basé aux Etats Unis qui comprend Mendez England & Associates (ME&A) et NORC à l’Université de Chicago. USAID Food for Peace nous a chargés de mener une étude pour évaluer les performances de trois programmes visant à remédier aux niveaux élevés d’insécurité alimentaire et de malnutrition présents dans les communautés rurales des régions de Maradi et Zinder au Niger.

Dans le cadre de cette étude, nous voudrions parler avec vous de la mise en œuvre et des résultats de <program name(s)> . La discussion dura environ 1 heure.

Votre participation est entièrement libre et vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à une question ou d’interrompre votre participation à tout moment si vous trouvez les discussions gênantes ou vous vous sentez mal à l’aise. Néanmoins, votre contribution est très importante pour aider USAID à rendre leurs programmes de nutrition et sécurité alimentaire plus efficace et mieux adapté aux besoins de la population du Niger.

Les informations qui vont être collectées à travers cette discussion seront conserver en sécurité et sont considérées comme confidentielles, elles ne seront partagées avec USAID que de façon anonyme. Aucun nom ne sera mentionné et toute information qui pourraient vous identifier (e.g., région, département, commune, position) seront exclu des rapports et autres documents produits par l’équipe et partagés avec USAID.

Si vous avez des questions sur l’étude, vous pouvez nous les poser maintenant, ou contacter Mr. John Magistro par téléphone: 1 520 909 5094.

Etre-vous d’accord de participer à la discussion d’aujourd’hui? **OUI**  **NON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION SUR L’INTERVIEW</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Désignation de l’Activité DFSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partenaire de mise en Œuvre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom de l’interviewé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employeur ou structure affilié</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titre du Poste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitateur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enregistreur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heure de début d’interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heure de fin d’interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions Introductives

1. SVP, pourriez-vous brièvement présenter votre Organisation ?

2. Pourriez-vous donner un aperçu de la nature de la relation entre votre organisation et le projet <nom de projet> ?
   - Comment et dans quelle mesure les activités de <nom de projet> sont-elles alignées avec la mission de votre organisation et ses projets et initiatives en cours ?
   - Quand votre organisation s’est-elle impliquée dans le projet <nom de projet> pour la première fois ?

3. Quelles étaient les circonstances qui ont amenées votre organisation à travailler dans le cadre de ce projet (désigné ou invité par une tierce personne ou expression d’intérêt personnel à travailler pour le projet) ?

4. Est-ce-que votre organisation avait participé ou contribué de quelque façon à la conception du projet ?

Ciblage et répartition des avantages pour les bénéficiaires du Projet

5. Quels sont les groupes qui sont principalement ciblés par les activités sur l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance dans les communautés où <nom de projet> est mis en œuvre ?
   - Pensez-vous que les groupes ciblés sont ceux qui conduisent à un meilleur impact du projet ?
   - Y aurait-il d’autres groupes qui ne sont pas touchés par le projet mais qui aurait amélioré l’impact actuel du projet s’ils étaient bénéficiaires ?
   - Avez-vous constaté une différence dans les groupes cibles entre les trois organisations de mise en œuvre – CRS, Save the Children, et Mercy Corps ?
   - À votre avis, quels sont les avantages et les désavantages associés avec l’approche de chacune des organisations de mise en œuvre en matière de ciblage ?
   - Selon vous, quelle approche de ciblage est supérieure aux autres ou la plus efficace ? Pourquoi ?

Efficacité des interventions agriculture et moyens de subsistance du projet

6. Parmi les différentes activités <donnez quelques exemples d’activités> mises en œuvre par le projet <nom du projet >, pensez-vous que certaines était particulièrement efficace pour améliorer l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance ? Si oui, lesquelles ?
   - Si ces activités ont été mises en œuvre par plus d’un des trois consortiums financés pas USAID, avez-vous constaté une différence dans l’efficacité de leurs approches respectives ? Si oui, quelle approche considérez-vous comme la plus efficace et pourquoi ?
   - A votre avis, y a-t-il eu des activités qui ont été inefficace ou qui ont eu moins d’effet pour améliorer l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance ? Si oui, lesquelles ?
   - D’après vous, quelles sont les facteurs ou les contraintes qui ont contribué à une faible efficacité ou performance de ces activités ?
7. Avez-vous identifié des leçons particulières à tirer et ou découvert des effets inattendus liés aux actions de <Nom du projet> axées sur l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance ? Si oui, lesquelles?

**Contribution to Program Outcomes**

8. À votre avis, a-t-il eu des changements dans la malnutrition et la santé globale parmi :
   - Les membres les plus vulnérables des communautés qui ont bénéficié des activités de <nom de projet> axées sur l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance ?
   - La population générale de ces communautés ?

**Possibilités d’amélioration**

9. Y aurait-il des défis ou contraintes spécifiques qui limitent le potentiel des activités axées sur l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance mises en œuvre dans le cadre du projet <Nom du projet> à produire des meilleurs résultats ? Si oui, lesquelles ?

10. Avez-vous des recommandations pour améliorer la mise en œuvre des activités du projet <Nom du projet> auxquelles votre organisation a pris part ou qui s’alignes avec ses projets et initiatives en cours ? Si oui, lesquelles ?

**Pérennité des acquis du projet**

11. Quelles concepts et notions en particulier pensez-vous ont la meilleure chance d’être pratiquées de façon durable ? Pourquoi?
   - [Si oui] Pensez-vous que les bénéficiaires sont en mesure de partager certaines de ces pratiques avec d’autres qui n’ont pas participés au projet ? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
   - [Si non] Pourquoi pas ? Quelles sont les principales raisons qui empêchent les bénéficiaires de maintenir durablement ces pratiques ? Y a-t-il des exceptions selon vous ?

12. Pensez-vous que les organisations qui mettent en œuvre les activités axées sur l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance du projet <Nom du projet> sont motivées et intéressées à continuer d’offrir certaines ou la totalité de ces activités, une fois le projet terminée ?
   - [Si oui] Y a-t-il des exceptions notables ?
   - [Si non] Quelles sont les principaux obstacles qui les en empêchent ?

13. À votre avis, est-ce-que certains ou la totalité des activités <nom de projet> axées sur l’agriculture et les moyens de subsistance pourraient être continuées indépendamment du financement de USAID ? Si oui, lesquelles et de quel manière ?
   - Y a-t-il des exceptions à votre réponse, et pourquoi considérez-vous ces activités comme des exceptions ?

14. Quels sont les éléments de soutien clés (p. ex., des fonds, un soutien en nature, rendre les services payants, la formation et le renforcement des capacités, ou la promotion) qui seraient nécessaires pour que votre organisation continue d’offrir certaines des activités agricoles et de moyens de subsistance de <nom de projet> ?
15. Savez-vous s’il y a d’autres sources de financement de la part de l’État du Niger, des donateurs internationaux, d’ONGs, ou d’autres institutions qui pourraient contribuer à pérenniser les activités d’agriculture et de moyens de subsistance? Si oui, lesquelles?

*Question de clôture*

16. Auriez-vous d’autres commentaires que vous voudriez bien ajoutés?
Questionnaire Interview Informateurs clés

**Autorités Régionales et Communales – SNMI & WASH**

**Introduction et Consentement**
*Pour débuter, l’interviewer doit lire le scripte de consentement qui suit:*

Bonjour et merci d’avoir accepté de me parler. Je m’appelle (nom d’intervieweur/intervieweuse) ____ et voici mon collègue ____ qui prendra des notes pendant la conversation et ____ qui lui servira d’interprète. Nous travaillons pour le compte d’un groupe d’organisations de recherches basé aux Etats Unis qui comprend Mendez England & Associates (ME&A) et NORC à l’Université de Chicago. USAID Food for Peace nous a chargés de mener une étude pour évaluer les performances de trois programmes visant à remédier aux niveaux élevés d’insécurité alimentaire et de malnutrition présents dans les communautés rurales des régions de Maradi et Zinder au Niger.

Dans le cadre de cette étude, nous voudrions parler avec vous la mise en œuvre et des résultats de <program name(s)> . La discussion dura environ 1 heure.

Votre participation est entièrement libre et vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à une question ou d’interrompre votre participation à tout moment si vous trouvez les discussions gênantes ou vous vous sentez mal à l’aise. Néanmoins, votre contribution est très importante pour aider USAID à rendre leurs programmes de nutrition et sécurité alimentaire plus efficace et mieux adapté aux besoins de la population du Niger.

Les informations qui vont être collectées à travers cette discussion seront conserver en sécurité et sont considérées comme confidentielles, elles ne seront partagées avec USAID que de façon anonyme. Aucun nom ne sera motionné et toute information qui pourraient vous identifier (e.g. région, département, commune, position) seront exclu des rapports et autres documents produits par l’équipe et partagés avec USAID.

Si vous avez des questions sur l’étude, vous pouvez nous les poser maintenant, ou contacter Mr. John Magistro par téléphone: 1 520 909 5094.

**INFORMATION DU REPONDANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation de l’Activité DFSA</th>
<th>Facilitateur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partenaire de mise en Oeuvre</td>
<td>Enregistreur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employeur ou structure affilié</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titre du Poste</td>
<td>Heure de début interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heure de fin interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etre-vous d’accord de participer à la discussion d’aujourd’hui?  
OUI  
NON
Questions Introductives
1. SVP, pourriez-vous brièvement présenter votre Organisation?
2. Pourriez-vous donner quelques détails sur la nature des relations que votre organisation avec le projet <Nom du Projet>?
   o Comment les activités de(s) < Noms de projet(s)> s’alignent avec la mission de votre organisation ou le porte folio en cours de vos projets actuels et d’autres initiatives?
   o Quand est-ce votre Organisation a pris part la première fois aux projets < Noms de projet(s)>?
3. Quelles étaient les circonstances qui vous ont amenées à travailler dans le cadre de ce projet (par exemple, désigné ou invité par une tierce personne ou expression d’intérêt personnel à travailler pour le projet ?
4. Aviez-vous participé ou contribué de quelque façon dans la conception du projet ?

Ciblage et répartition des avantages pour les bénéficiaires du Projet
5. Quels sont les groupes de bénéficiaires qui sont initialement ciblés par les activités sur la Santé et la Nutrition Maternelle Infantile (SNMI) et WASH dans votre communauté ou les communautés apparentées à la vôtre ?
   o Pensez-vous que les groupes de bénéficiaires ciblées sont celles qui conduiraient à un meilleur impact du projet ?
   o Y auraient-ils d’autres groupes qui ne sont pas touchés par le projet et que s’ils étaient bénéficiaires aurait amélioré l’impact actuel du projet?
   o Aviez remarqué une différence dans le ciblage des groupes entre les 3 ONG : CRS, Save the Children, and Mercy Corps?
   o Quelles sont les forces et faiblesses des approches utilisées par chaque organisation?
   o Selon vous, Quelle est l’approche qui vous semble la plus efficace ? Pourquoi?

Effectiveness of Various MCHN & WASH Activities
6. Parmi les différentes activités mises en œuvre par le projet <Nom du Projet>, pensez-vous que certaines étaient particulièrement efficaces pour améliorer la SNMI et l’assainissement, particulièrement pour les femmes enceintes et les enfants? Si oui, lesquelles ?
   o Si ces activités sont mises en œuvre par plus d’un partenaire des 3 consortiums finance par USAID, aviez-vous constaté une différence dans l’efficacité de leurs approches respectives ? Si oui, quelle est l’approche la plus efficace ?
   o A votre avis, y a-t-il eu des activités mises en œuvre qui ont été inefficace ou qui ont eu moins d’effet pour améliorer la SNMI et l’assainissement? Si oui, lesquelles ?
   o D’après vous, quelles sont les facteurs ou les contraintes qui ont contribué à une faible efficacité ou performance de ces activités?
7. Avez-vous identifié des leçons particulières à tirées et ou découvert des effets inattendus liés aux actions axées sur la SNMI et WASH du projet < Nom du projet> ? Si oui, lesquelles?

Contribution à l’atteinte des objectifs du projet
8. Selon vous, y a-t-il eu des changements sur le niveau de malnutrition et l’état de santé général parmi :
   - Les groupes le plus vulnérables des communautés qui ont bénéficié des interventions SNMI et WASH du projet <Nom du Projet>?
   - La population de ces communautés plus généralement ?

Possibilités d’amélioration
9. Y aurait-il des défis ou contraintes spécifiques qui limitent le potentiel des activités SNMI et WASH mises en œuvre dans le cadre du projet <Nom du projet> relevant de votre Organisation à produire des meilleurs résultats ? Si oui, lesquelles?

10. Avez-vous des recommandations pour améliorer la mise en œuvre des activités du projet <Nom du projet> auxquelles vous avez pris part ou que vous avez contribué à réaliser ? Si oui, lesquelles ?

Pérennité des acquis du projet
11. Selon vous, est-ce que les bénéficiaires des actions SNMI et WASH du projet <Nom du projet> ont reçu les formations et ressources nécessaires et ont acquis des connaissances suffisantes pour pérenniser certaines ou la totalité des pratiques en matière de SNMI et WASH par eux-mêmes ?
   - [Si oui] Pensez-vous que les bénéficiaires sont en mesure de partager certaines de ces pratiques avec d’autres qui n’ont pas participé au projet ? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
   - [Si non] Pourquoi pas ? Quelles sont les principales raisons qui empêchent les bénéficiaires de maintenir durablement ces pratiques ? Y a-t-il des exceptions selon vous ?

12. A votre avis, est-ce que les organisations qui ont fourni les services SNMI et WASH peuvent être motivées et intéressées à continuer à offrir une partie ou la totalité des services une fois le projet est terminé ?
   - Y a-t-il des exceptions notables ?
   - [Si non] Quelles sont les principaux obstacles qui les en empêchent ?

13. A votre avis, est-ce que certaines ou la totalité des activités SMNI et WASH du projet <Nom du projet> peuvent être poursuivies par votre communauté sans le financement actuel de USAID/FFP ? Si oui, la ou lesquelles et comment ?
   - Y a-t-il des exceptions dans votre réponse et pourquoi ces activités sont considérées comme des exceptions ?

14. Quelles sont les appuis essentiels (e.g., financement, contributions en nature, gratifications, formations et renforcement des capacités ou la promotion) qui seraient nécessaires à votre organisation de continuer à offrir certains services SNMI ?

15. Savez-vous si il y a d’autres sources de financement de la part de l’Etat du Niger, des donateurs internationaux, des ONG, ou d’autres institutions qui pourraient contribuer à pérenner les activités SMNI et WASH dans votre communauté ? Si oui, lesquelles ?

Question de clôture
Auriez-vous d’autres commentaires que vous voudriez bien ajoutés ?
AGENTS DU PROJET ET RELAIS – SNMI & WASH

Introduction et Consentement

Pour débuter, l’interviewer doit lire le scripte de consentement qui suit:

Bonjour et merci d’avoir accepté de me parler. Je m’appelle (nom d’intervieweur/intervieweuse) ____ et voici mon collègue ____ qui prendra des notes pendant la conversation et _____ qui lui servira d’interprète. Nous travaillons pour le compte d’un groupe d’organisations de recherches basé aux Etats Unis qui comprend Mendez England & Associates (ME&A) et NORC à l’Université de Chicago. USAID Food for Peace nous a chargés de mener une étude pour évaluer les performances de trois programmes visant à remédier aux niveaux élevés d’insécurité alimentaire et de malnutrition présents dans les communautés rurales des régions de Maradi et Zinder au Niger.

Dans le cadre de cette étude, nous voudrions parler avec vous la mise en œuvre et des résultats de <program name>. La discussion dura environ 1 heure.

Votre participation est entièrement libre et vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à une question ou d’interrompre votre participation à tout moment si vous trouvez les discussions gênantes ou vous vous sentez mal à l’aise. Néanmoins, votre contribution est très importante pour aider USAID à rendre leurs programmes de nutrition et sécurité alimentaire plus efficace et mieux adapté aux besoins de la population du Niger.

Les informations qui vont être collectées à travers cette discussion seront conserver en sécurité et sont considérées comme confidentielles, elles ne seront partagées avec USAID que de façon anonyme. Aucun nom ne sera motionné et toute information qui pourraient vous identifier (e.g., région, département, commune, position) seront exclu des rapports et autres documents produits par l’équipe et partagés avec USAID.

Si vous avez des questions sur l’étude, vous pouvez nous les poser maintenant, ou contacter Mr. John Magistro par téléphone: 1 520 909 5094.

Etre-vous d’accord de participer à la discussion d’aujourd’hui? OUI NON

Questions Introductives

1. Pourriez-vous donner un aperçu de votre fonction dans le cadre du projet <Nom du Projet>?
   o Quand avez-vous commencé à travailler sur le projet <Nom du Projet>?
Ciblage et répartition des avantages pour les bénéficiaires du Projet
2. Quels sont les groupes de bénéficiaires qui sont principalement ciblés par les activités sur la Santé et la Nutrition Maternelle Infantile (SNMI) et WASH dans votre communauté ou les autres communautés avec lesquelles vous avez interagi ?
   o Pensez-vous que les groupes de bénéficiaires ciblés sont ceux qui conduisent à un meilleur impact du projet ?
   o Y aurait-il d’autres groupes qui ne sont pas touchés par le projet mais qui aurait amélioré l’impact actuel du projet s’ils étaient bénéficiaires?

3. Dans les communautés ciblées (la vôtre et celles avec lesquelles vous travaillez), quels groupes ont bénéficié le plus du volet SNMI et WASH du projet < Nom du projet> ?
   o Quels groupes ont bénéficié le moins du volet SNMI et WASH des actions du projet ?

Efficacité des interventions SNMI et WASH du projet
4. Parmi les différentes activités mises en œuvre par le projet <Nom du Projet>, pensez-vous que certaines était particulièrement efficace pour améliorer la SNMI & le WASH? Si oui, lesquelles ?
   o A votre avis, y a-t-il eu des activités mises en œuvre qui ont été inefficace ou qui ont eu moins d’effet pour améliorer la SNMI & le WASH? Si oui, lesquelles ? Quels en sont les raisons ?

5. Avez-vous identifié des leçons particulières à tirées et ou découvert des effets inattendus liés aux actions axées sur la SNMI et WASH du projet < Nom du projet> ? Si oui, lesquelles?

Contribution à l’atteinte des objectifs du projet
6. Selon vous, y a-t-il eu des changements sur le niveau de malnutrition et l’état de santé général parmi :
   o Les groupes le plus vulnérables dans votre communauté et d’autres que vous connaissez qui ont bénéficié des interventions SNMI et WASH du projet < Nom du Projet>?
   o La population de ces communautés plus généralement ?

Possibilités d’amélioration
7. Y aurait-il des défis ou contraintes spécifiques qui limitent le potentiel des activités SNMI et WASH mises en œuvre dans le cadre du projet <Nom du projet> à produire des meilleurs résultats ? Si oui, lesquelles ?

8. Avez-vous des recommandations pour améliorer la mise en œuvre des activités du projet <Nom du projet> auxquelles vous avez pris part ou que vous avez contribué à réaliser ? Si oui, lesquelles ?

Pérennité des acquis du projet
9. Selon vous, est-ce que les bénéficiaires des actions SNMI et WASH du projet <Nom du projet> ont reçu les formations et ressources nécessaires et ont acquis des connaissances suffisantes pour pérenniser certaines ou la totalité des pratiques en matière de SNMI et WASH par eux-mêmes ?
   o [Si oui] Pensez-vous que les bénéficiaires sont en mesure de partager certaines de ces pratiques avec d’autres qui n’ont pas participé au projet? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
   o [Si non] Pourquoi pas? Quelles sont les principales raisons qui empêchent les bénéficiaires de maintenir durablement ces pratiques ? Y a-t-il des exceptions selon vous ?

10. Pensez-vous que les bénéficiaires vont continuer à demander certains ou la totalité des services SNMI et WASH et, le cas échéant, pensez-vous qu’ils soient assez intéressés et à même de supporter en partie les couts associés à ces services ?
   o [Si non] Quelles sont les principaux obstacles qui les en empêchent ?

11. Selon vous, est-ce que certaines ou la totalité des activités SMNI et WASH du projet <Nom du projet> peuvent être poursuivies par votre communauté et d’autres que vous connaissez qui sont aussi bénéficiaires du projet <Nom du projet> ? Si oui, la ou lesquelles et comment ?
   o Y a-t-il des exceptions dans votre réponse et pourquoi ces activités sont considérées comme des exceptions ?

12. Que considérez-vous être les défis les plus important pour que les activités SNMI et WASH du projet <Nom du projet> soient pérennisables ?

Question de clôture
Auriez-vous d’autres commentaires que vous voudriez bien ajoutés?
VI. SUPPORTING PBS METHODOLOGY, RESULTS TABLES, AND SUPPLEMENTAL STATISTICAL RESULTS

FFP EVELYN NIGER 2017

Background

This document presents a synthesis of the results of the analysis of the baseline and endline indicator estimates for three FY 2012 Food for Peace (FFP) development food assistance projects (DFAPs) in Niger: 1) the LAHIA project, implemented by Save the Children, 2) the PASAM-TAI project, implemented by Catholic Relief Services; and 3) the Sawki project, implemented by Mercy Corps. Data was collected to monitor and evaluate change over time in key outcome and impact indicators in the sectors of food security, poverty, agriculture, women and children’s health and nutrition. This synthesis of results is intended to help guide the interpretation of the quantitative results and their integration with the qualitative study results for the Niger DFAP performance evaluations.

Introduction

Population-based household surveys (PBS) were used to collect baseline data in 2013 and endline data in 2017 for performance evaluations of the three DFAPs in Niger. Indicators estimates from the baseline and endline surveys are compared to assess change over time. This pre-post design allows for the measurement of change in indicators between the baseline and endline surveys; the design does not allow statements to be made about attribution or causation relating to project impact.

To rule out whether changes in the indicators are a result of shifts in the underlying characteristics of households that are correlated with the indicators, such as the age, sex, or level of education of the household head, analyses are conducted to compare household characteristics between the baseline and endline. The objective of these analyses is to document whether there are significant differences between baseline and endline household characteristics, which can be taken into consideration when interpreting indicator results.

Because the DFAPs scaled back their project areas after the baseline survey, all of the villages sampled at baseline did not receive the DFAP interventions. Therefore, baseline household characteristics and indicator estimates are compared between villages that received the DFAP interventions and those that did not, to identify whether significant differences exist. If no differences are found, then the baseline samples, which includes villages that eventually did not receive the DFAPs, can be considered representative of the target DFAP populations at baseline. For each project, indicator results and tests of differences in indicators between baseline and endline are examined separately for direct and indirect beneficiaries to evaluate if the effects of the project interventions “spilled over” from direct to indirect beneficiaries – as is desired. The designation of respondents and households as direct versus indirect beneficiaries is based on household respondents’ answers to a set of questions about exposure to the project interventions. One respondent per household was asked “Have you or someone from your household participated in LAHIA/PASAM-TAI/Sawki project activities?” Respondents who answered “Yes” are considered to be direct beneficiaries. Respondents who answered “No” are considered to be indirect beneficiaries. Respondents who reported they or someone in their household participated in the project are asked about the type of assistance. Program assistance includes food rations, nutrition training or meetings, agriculture-related training or meetings, or other types of assistance. The responses are not validated by the projects, so it is not possible to determine definitively that the respondents know the source of the program assistance. For this reason, among other factors, causality cannot be attributed to any of the projects. Additionally, respondents or households are likely to be recipients of more than one type of assistance, so it is not possible to disentangle the effects of different types of program interventions.

Additional analyses of the PBS data are conducted to explore the effectiveness of the projects in reaching target populations – namely, the “poorest of the poor,” children under two, and pregnant and lactating women (PLWs). The baseline and endline estimates of the indicators are compared for the poor and non-poor separately to empirically test whether the two groups experienced improvement over time. Additionally, the indicator estimates...
at baseline and endline are compared between the poor and non-poor to explore differences between the two
groups. The prevalence of underweight and wasting for children under two is compared between the baseline and
endline. Because stunting is a measure of chronic malnutrition, the baseline and endline estimates of the prevalence
of stunting are compared for children over two, since children over two in the endline sample will have had longer
exposure to the project interventions and it is more likely to detect changes in the prevalence of stunting for these
older cohorts. Women’s dietary diversity score (WDDS) is compared at baseline and endline for PLWs and non-
PLWs. Comparison of WDDS between PLWs and non-PLWs at baseline and endline are also conducted to
determine if the two groups of women differ.

This document includes a summary of the overall changes in indicator estimates between baseline and endline and
spillover effects (comparison of change over time between direct and indirect beneficiaries) as well as the analyses
of changes or differences in the indicators for key target populations and by village DFAP status.

Table 1 summarizes the results of the analysis of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline
and endline. It is based off of Table 2 and synthesizes the results from the three project areas by sector.

Table 2 summarizes the results of the analysis of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline
and endline by indicator and project. It is a synthesis of findings from three analyses: (1) baseline-endline indicator
estimate comparison, (2) comparison between direct and indirect beneficiaries at endline, and (3) comparisons of
baseline estimates with endline estimates of direct and indirect beneficiaries separately.

Summary of indicator changes over time and spillover effects observed across all project areas by sector (Tables
6.1 & Tables 6.5–6.7)

- Improvements are observed in intermediate steps in the theory of change – namely, in household dietary
diversity (HDDS), WDDS, and agriculture across all project areas for both direct and indirect
beneficiaries.
- Some change in impact-level indicators. Children’s nutrition and health show mixed results by project area
and indicator. In some project areas, we see improvements in the prevalence of underweight, stunting,
and wasting, as well as improvements in the prevalence of minimum acceptable diet (MAD).
- Generally, both direct and indirect beneficiaries experienced improvements in the indicators. In few cases,
the improvement for beneficiaries was greater than for indirect beneficiaries and it may be expected that
direct beneficiaries do better. We can itemize which indicators.
- Some explanation is required to put in context the magnitude of the improvements in the CHN
indicators, and this would require comparing the improvement to the program targets and the range of
change usually observed for those indicators from past experience. For example, stunting is very
challenging to move and the improvement observed is commendable.
- Some explanation is required to provide insights in cases where generally no change is observed, such as
the poverty indicators, WASH indicators, prevalence of women’s underweight, prevalence of exclusive
breastfeeding, and diarrhea indicators. For example, WDDS provides insights into the diversity of food
consumed by women but not the frequency or the composition of those groups, which could also affect
women’s weight
- A deep dive into the project design and roll out of activities may provide insights into program-level
factors that may have facilitated improvements. There may be differences in program-level intervention, as
well as socio-demographic characteristics between the projects, that should be further explored.
- Some explanation is required to put in context why the endline estimate for the prevalence of diarrhea in
LAHIA and PASAM-TAI are higher than the baseline. This may have to do with the two-week reference
period used to assess the prevalence of diarrhea. What happened in the two weeks prior to the survey?
Any differences in the timing of the baseline and endline surveys that could help explain this?
Summary of comparison of indicators at baseline and endline and between baseline and endline by household poverty status (Table 6.8-6.11)

- Generally, no differences were found in indicator estimates between the poor (defined as living below the $1.25 daily per capita threshold in constant 2010 USD) and non-poor at baseline, with a few exceptions (Table 6.8):
  - LAHI: At baseline, poor households compared to non-poor households had a lower HDDS, higher prevalence of hunger, lower percentage of households with a handwashing station with water and soap, lower WDDS, and lower use of oral rehydration therapy (ORT) among children with diarrhea.
  - PASAM-TAI: At baseline, poor households compared to non-poor households had lower HDDS and lower WDDS.
  - Sawki: At baseline, poor households compared to non-poor households had lower HDDS, higher prevalence of hunger, lower percentage of households with improved sanitation, lower percentage of households with a handwashing station with water and soap, and lower WDDS.

- Generally, more indicator estimates differ between the poor and non-poor at endline than at baseline (Table 6.9):
  - LAHI: At endline, poor households compared to non-poor households had a lower HDDS, higher prevalence of hunger, lower percentage of households with a handwashing station with water and soap, lower percentage of farmers using a value chain activity, lower percentage of farmers using at least three sustainable agriculture practices, lower prevalence of a MAD for children 6-23 months, and lower percentage of women and men with knowledge of the importance of health access for children under five and women of childbearing age.
  - PASAM-TAI: At endline, poor households compared to non-poor households had a lower HDDS, higher prevalence of hunger, lower percentage of farmers using financial services, value chain activities, sustainable agriculture practices, improved storage or micronutrient rich foods planted, higher prevalence of women's underweight, lower WDDS, lower prevalence of a MAD, and lower percentage of women with knowledge of the importance of health access for children under five and women of childbearing age.
  - Sawki: At endline, poor households compared to non-poor households had lower HDDS, higher prevalence of hunger, lower percentage of households with a handwashing station with water and soap, lower WDDS, lower prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding, lower prevalence of a MAD, and lower percentage of women with knowledge of the importance of health access for children under five and women of childbearing age. However, at endline, women living in poor households had a higher percent of births receiving at least four antenatal care visits (ANC) than women living in non-poor households.

- Generally, the poor experienced improvements between baseline and endline across most indicators (Table 6.10):
  - LAHI: The poor experienced improvements in HDDS, HHS, sanitation, handwashing stations with soap and water present, all agriculture indicators (females and males), WDDS, children’s malnutrition (stunting, underweight, wasting for males and females), exclusive breastfeeding (females), and MAD (males).
  - PASAM-TAI: The poor experienced improvements in HDDS, all agriculture indicators (generally for males and females), WDDS, children’s stunting and underweight, girls’ MAD, percent of births receiving at least four ANC visits and men’s knowledge of importance of healthcare access.
  - Sawki: Poor experienced an increase in diarrhea since baseline.

- Sawki: The poor experienced improvements in HDDS (adult male and female HH; not evident in overall estimate), handwashing station with soap and water present, knowledge of
critical times for handwashing, all agriculture indicators (generally for males and females), WDDS, children’s underweight (females), and wasting (females), exclusive breastfeeding, percent of births receiving at least four ANC visits, men’s knowledge of health access importance
- Poor experienced an increase in diarrhea since baseline.

- Generally, the non-poor experienced improvements between baseline and endline across most of the same indicators that the poor experienced improvements (Table 6.11):
  - **LAHIA:**
    - The non-poor experienced improvements in HDDS, HHS, all agriculture indicators (females and males), WDDS, children’s malnutrition (stunting, underweight, wasting but generally for females only), MAD (males), and critical moments of handwashing
  - **PASAM-TAI:**
    - The non-poor experienced improvements in HDDS, all agriculture indicators (generally for males and females), WDDS, girls’ MAD, and men’s knowledge of importance of healthcare access
    - Non-poor also experienced an increase in diarrhea from baseline.
  - **Sawiki:**
    - The non-poor experienced improvements in HDDS, handwashing station with soap and water present, all agriculture indicators (generally for males and females), WDDS, children’s underweight (females), stunting (females), wasting (males), MAD (males and females), men’s knowledge of health access importance
    - Non-poor experienced an increase in diarrhea since baseline.

- **TAKEAWAY:** Although the non-poor are better off at endline than the poor on several indicators, the poor experienced significant improvements in food security, agriculture, women’s WDDS, and children’s malnutrition since the baseline.

**Summary of children’s malnutrition select age groups (Table 6.14)**

- Improvements in the prevalence of stunting for children over two since the baseline are observed in all three project areas.
- Consistent improvement in all three measures of children’s malnutrition in LAHIA
- Improvement in the prevalence of underweight children under two since the baseline are observed in LAHIA
- Improvements in the prevalence of wasting of children under two are observed in LAHIA and Sawiki
- **TAKEAWAY:** Children over two at endline have multiple years of exposure to project interventions, and the results of the comparison of stunting for this age group between baseline and endline indicates improvements over the course of the project.

**Summary of analysis of WDDS by PLW status (Table 6.12 & 6.13)**

- **LAHIA:** There was no difference in WDDS between PLW and non-PLWs at baseline or endline but both groups of women experienced improvements in WDDS since baseline.
- **PASAM-TAI:** At baseline, WDDS of PLWs was higher than that of non-PLWs. There was no difference in WDDS between PLW and non-PLWs endline. Both groups of women experienced improvements in WDDS since baseline.
- **Sawiki:** There was no difference in WDDS between PLW and non-PLWs at baseline, but at endline WDDS of PLWs was higher than that of non-PLWs. Both groups of women experienced improvements in WDDS since baseline.

**TAKEAWAY:** In all three project areas, WDDS of both pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) and non-PLWs improved since baseline.
Summary of demographic characteristics of baseline villages with those of endline villages (Table 6.2)

- Villages sampled for the baseline and endline surveys have similar demographic characteristics, but there are a few differences to note:
  - Age of household head is lower in the endline compared to the baseline in all three project areas
  - Average age of the primary caregiver is lower in the endline compared to the baseline in all three project areas
  - Percent of household headed by females is higher in the endline compared to the baseline in PASAM-TAI
  - Percent of households with currently married women age 15-49 is lower at endline in LAHIA
  - Percent of households with children 0-5 months is higher at endline in LAHIA and PASAM-TAI
  - Level of education of the household head is higher in the endline compared to the baseline – LAHIA
  - Level of education of the primary caregiver head is higher in the endline compared to the baseline in all three project areas
  - Level of education of female household members is higher in the endline compared to the baseline in LAHIA
  - Level of education of male household members is higher in the endline compared to the baseline in LAHIA

TAKEAWAY: Villages sampled for the baseline and endline surveys have similar demographic characteristics but there are a few differences. Possible reasons for differences could be sampling bias, results of project activities, or external factors.

Summary of comparison of baseline household characteristics by endline status (Table 6.3)

- In general, households that eventually received the DFAP and those that did not receive the DFAP are similar with respect to household characteristics at baseline (average HH size, average age of HH head, average age of primary caretakers for children under 5, percent of HH with women 15-49 years, percent of HH with currently married women 15-49 years, percent of HH with children 0-59 months, percent of HH with children 6-23 months, percent of HH with children 0-5 months)
- A few differences were observed in the PASAM-TAI project only, none in the LAHIA or Sawki projects
  - Difference seen in highest level of education by female HH members – those that did not receive DFAPs have more education than those that did receive DFAPs
  - Difference seen in average HH size – larger HH for those that did not receive DFAP (7.1 members) than for those that did receive DFAP (6.1 members)

TAKEAWAY: Although some villages sampled at baseline never received the DFAP interventions, the results of the comparisons of household characteristics confirm that these villages are similar to those villages that did receive the DFAPs.

Summary of comparison of baseline indicator estimates by endline status (Table 6.4)

- In general, there were very few significant differences between indicator estimates at baseline for those villages that received the DFAP compared to those that did not
- Summary of indicator differences:
  - HHS – Higher rates of hunger in DFAP villages compared to non-DFAP villages for the Sawki project only, no other differences observed
  - Poverty – No differences for any indicators for any project
  - WASH – More households in DFAP villages use an improved water source and have soap and water at a handwashing station compared to non-DFAP villages for the PASAM-TAI project only, no other differences observed
• **TAKEAWAY:** Although some baseline villages never received the DFAP interventions, the results of the comparisons of indicators at baseline confirm that the baseline indicators for these villages were generally the same as those villages that did receive the DFAP interventions.

- **Agriculture** – No differences for any indicators for any project for all farmers, a few differences for male or female farmers, overall more farmers in DFAP villages use improved storage practices compared to non-DFAP villages
- **Women’s Health and Nutrition** – No differences observed for any indicators for any project
- **Children’s Health and Nutrition** – Prevalence of wasting lower in DFAP villages compared to non-DFAP villages for PASAM- TAI project only, no other differences observed
- **Project-specific** – fewer farmers in DFAP villages used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in most recent season compared to non-DFAP villages in PASAM-TAI project area only, no other differences observed
### Table 1: Summary of overall change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by sector, Niger 2017

*(Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Food security and poverty      | • In all three project areas, both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries experienced improvements in HDDS since the baseline  
• Generally, no change in prevalence of hunger between baseline and endline in any of the project areas except in LAHIA (experienced by both direct and indirect beneficiaries)  
• Generally, no change in poverty indicators since the baseline except in the LAHIA project area, where both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries experienced increase in daily per capita consumption expenditures and declines in poverty and mean depth of poverty since the baseline |
| WASH                           | • In all project areas, there was no change in use of improved sanitation facility for direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance or indirect beneficiaries with the exception of LAHIA  
• Change in use of improved drinking water source could not be assessed in any of the project areas  
• Improvements in the percentage of HHs with a handwashing station with water and soap only in Sawki project area, and this was observed for both direct beneficiaries of any type of assistance and indirect beneficiaries  
• Improvements in knowledge of 3 of the 5 critical moments for handwashing in LAHIA and Sawki project areas. This improvement occurred for both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries. No change in PASAM-TAI (baseline and endline both low at about 8.6 percent and 6.8 percent respectively) |
| Agriculture                    | In all three project areas, both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries area experienced improvements in all agriculture indicators |
| Women’s Health and Nutrition   | • No change in the prevalence of underweight women except in the Sawki project area, and this decline is observed for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance  
• In all three project areas, both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries experienced improvements in WDDS  
• Improvements in percent of births receiving at least four ANC visits occurred in the PASAM-TAI and Sawki project areas, and this improvement is observed for both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries |
Table 1. Summary of overall change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by sector, Niger 2017
(Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s Health and Nutrition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Children’s nutrition and health indicators show mixed results by project area and indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In LAHIA, all children’s health and nutrition indicators with the exception of the diarrhea indicators improved for both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In Sawki, prevalence of underweight and wasting declined since the baseline for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding improved in LAHIA and Sawki. In Sawki, the improvement is observed only among direct beneficiaries of any program assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevalence of MAD increased for direct beneficiaries in all three project areas. In LAHIA and Sawki, improvements are also observed for indirect project beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed results on trend in men and women’s ability to identify at least two reasons why visiting a health services center is important for CU5 and adolescents, but baseline levels are relatively high for men and women at 76.7 percent and 84.9 percent, respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Summary of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by indicator and project (Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food security and poverty</td>
<td>• Significant improvements observed in food security and poverty indicators between baseline and endline</td>
<td>• Household dietary diversity score improved between baseline and endline</td>
<td>• Household dietary diversity score improved between baseline and endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimates of food security and poverty indicators between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries, with the exception of HHS, which was higher for direct beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance had higher HDDS at endline compared to endline estimate of indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance had higher HDDS at endline compared to endline estimate of indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimates of food security and poverty indicators of direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance show improvement from the baseline</td>
<td>• HDDS of direct beneficiaries at endline is higher than the baseline estimate</td>
<td>• HDDS of direct beneficiaries at endline is higher than the baseline estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimates of food security and poverty indicators of indirect beneficiaries show improvement from the baseline</td>
<td>• HDDS of indirect beneficiaries at endline is higher than the baseline estimate</td>
<td>• HDDS of indirect beneficiaries at endline is higher than the baseline estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevalence of Hunger:**
- No change in household hunger between baseline and endline
- No difference in endline estimates for prevalence of hunger between direct and indirect beneficiaries
- Prevalence of hunger for direct beneficiaries at endline does not differ from the baseline
- Prevalence of hunger for indirect beneficiaries at endline does not differ from the baseline

**Poverty**
- No change in poverty indicators between baseline and endline
- No difference in endline estimates of poverty indicators between direct and indirect beneficiaries

**TAKE AWAY:** Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the LAHIA project area experienced improvements in food security and poverty since the baseline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline poverty indicators of direct beneficiaries do not differ from baseline estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of daily per capita consumption for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline poverty indicators of indirect beneficiaries do not differ from baseline estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of daily per capita consumption for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty</td>
<td>• No change in prevalence of poverty between baseline and endline</td>
<td>• Endline estimate of prevalence of poverty for direct beneficiaries was lower than the baseline</td>
<td>• No change in the prevalence of hunger for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of prevalence of poverty for indirect beneficiaries did not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No change in any of the poverty indicators for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>• No change in mean depth of poverty between the baseline and endline</td>
<td>• No difference in the endline estimate for the mean depth of poverty between direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>• ENDLINE poverty indicators of direct beneficiaries do not differ from baseline estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of mean depth of poverty for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td>• Endline estimate of mean depth of poverty for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td>• Endline poverty indicators of indirect beneficiaries do not differ from baseline estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of mean depth of poverty for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKEAWAY:</strong></td>
<td>• Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAKEAWAY:**
- Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the Sawki project area experienced improvements in HDDS since the baseline
- No change in the prevalence of hunger for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries
- No change in any of the poverty indicators for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project area experienced improvements in HDDS since the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change in the prevalence of hunger for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change in daily per capita consumption expenditures or mean depth of poverty for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prevalence of poverty declined from direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance since the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Sanitation facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of an improved sanitation facility improved from baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percentage of HHs with improved sanitation is higher for indirect beneficiaries compared to direct beneficiaries at endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of direct beneficiaries of any program assistance does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate for improved sanitation for indirect beneficiaries shows improvement from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handwashing facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change since baseline in the percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference at endline in the percentage of HH with a handwashing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change in use of an improved sanitation facility between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimate of use of an improved sanitation facility between direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of use of an improved sanitation facility for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of use of an improved sanitation facility for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handwashing facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change in percent of households with soap and water at a handwashing station between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimate of the percent of households with soap and water at a handwashing station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change over time in access to an improved sanitation facility between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimate of use of an improved sanitation facility between direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of use of an improved sanitation facility for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of use of an improved sanitation facility for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handwashing facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station improved between baseline and endline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimate of the percent of households with soap and water at a handwashing station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Summary of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by indicator and project (Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| station between direct and indirect beneficiaries  
- Endline estimate for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance does not differ from the baseline  
- Endline estimate for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline | water at a handwashing station between direct and indirect beneficiaries  
- Endline estimate of percent of HH with soap and water at a handwashing facility for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline  
- Endline estimate of percent of HH with soap and water at a handwashing facility for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline | water at a handwashing station between direct and indirect beneficiaries  
- Endline estimate of percent of HH with soap and water at a handwashing facility for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline  
- Endline estimate of percent of HH with soap and water at a handwashing facility for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline |

**Knowledge of critical moments for handwashing**  
- Knowledge of 3 of the 5 critical moments for handwashing increased since baseline  
- No difference in endline estimate between direct and indirect beneficiaries  
- Knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing of direct beneficiaries at endline is higher than the baseline estimate  
- Knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing of indirect beneficiaries at endline is higher than the baseline estimate  
- Endline estimate of knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline  
- Endline estimate of knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline |

**TAKEAWAY**  
- No change in use of improved sanitation facility for direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance but improvements for indirect beneficiaries  
- No change in percentage of HH with a handwashing station with water and soup for direct  

## Knowledge of critical moments for handwashing  
- No change in knowledge of 3 of the 5 critical moments for handwashing between baseline and endline  
- No difference at endline in knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing between direct and indirect beneficiaries between direct and indirect beneficiaries.  
- Endline estimate of knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline.  
- Endline estimate of knowledge of the 3 of 5 critical moments of handwashing for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline. |

## TAKEAWAY  
- No change in any of the WASH indicators for direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance or indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI project area  

**TAKEAWAY**  
- No change in use of improved sanitation facility for direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance or indirect beneficiaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **beneficiaries of any type of assistance or indirect beneficiaries** | • Knowledge of 3 of the 5 critical moments for handwashing improved for both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries  
• Unable to assess change in use of improved drinking water source | • Unable to assess change in use of improved drinking water source  
• No change in knowledge of 3 of the 5 critical moments for handwashing between baseline and endline | • Percentage of HH with a handwashing station with water and soup improved both for direct beneficiaries of any type of assistance and indirect beneficiaries  
• Knowledge of 3 of the 5 critical moments for handwashing improved for both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries  
• Unable to assess change in use of improved drinking water source |
| **Agriculture**               | • Substantial improvements for all agricultural indicators between baseline and endline  
• No difference in endline estimates of agriculture indicators between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries with the exception of use of financial services which was higher for direct beneficiaries  
• Endline estimates of all agriculture indicators for direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance are higher than the baseline estimates  
• Endline estimates of all agriculture indicators for indirect beneficiaries are higher than the baseline estimates | • Use of financial services, value chain activities, sustainable agriculture practices improved storage practices, and at least one micro-nutrient dense food in the most recent season all increased between baseline and endline  
• At endline, direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance had higher use of financial services, sustainable agriculture practices and improved storage methods compared to indirect beneficiaries but did not differ in use of value chain activities or micro-nutrient dense foods  
• Endline estimates of the use of financial services, value chain activities, three sustainable agriculture practices, improved storage practices, and micro-nutrient dense foods of direct beneficiaries are higher than the baseline estimates  
• Endline estimates of the use of financial services, value chain activities, three sustainable agriculture practices, improved storage practices, and micro-nutrient dense foods of direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline estimates | • Use of financial services, value chain activities, sustainable agriculture practices improved storage practices, and at least one micro-nutrient dense food in the most recent season all increased between baseline and endline  
• At endline, direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance had higher use of financial services, sustainable agriculture practices and micro-nutrient dense foods compared to indirect beneficiaries but did not differ in use of value chain activities or improved storage practices  
• Endline estimates of the use of financial services, value chain activities, three sustainable agriculture practices, improved storage practices, and micro-nutrient dense foods of direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline estimates  
• Endline estimates of the use of financial services, value chain activities, three sustainable agriculture practices, improved storage practices, and micro-nutrient dense foods |

**TAKE AWAY:** Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the LAHIA project area experienced improvements in all agriculture indicators
### Table 2. Summary of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by indicator and project (Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s Health and Nutrition</th>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No change in the prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No change in the prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No difference in endline estimate of prevalence of underweight women between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimate of prevalence of underweight women between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimate of the prevalence of underweight women for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of the prevalence of underweight women for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimate of the prevalence of underweight women for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of the prevalence of underweight women for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WDDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement in WDDS between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvement in WDDS between baseline and endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimate of WDDS was higher for direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of WDDS was higher for direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimate of WDDS for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of WDDS for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimate of WDDS for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of WDDS for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAKE AWAY:** Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI project area experienced improvements in all agriculture indicators.

**TAKE AWAY:** Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the Sawki project area experienced improvements in all agriculture indicators.

---

**Women’s Health and Nutrition**

**Prevalence of underweight**

- No change in the prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years between baseline and endline.
- No difference in endline estimate of prevalence of underweight women between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries.
- Endline estimate of the prevalence of underweight women for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline.
- Endline estimate of the prevalence of underweight women for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline.

**WDDS**

- Improvement in WDDS between baseline and endline.
- Endline estimate of WDDS was higher for direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries.
- Endline estimate of WDDS for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline.
- Endline estimate of WDDS for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline.
Table 2. Summary of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by indicator and project (Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of WDDS for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Increase in percent of births in past 24 months receiving at least ANC visits between baseline and endline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Increase in percent of births in past 24 months receiving at least ANC visits between baseline and endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No change in the percent of births in past 24 months receiving at least ANC visits between baseline and endline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No difference in endline estimate of the percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC visits between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No difference in endline estimate of the percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC visits between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No difference in endline estimate between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Endline estimate of percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No difference in endline estimate of the percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC visits between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>ANC visits</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No difference in endline estimate of the percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC visits between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No change in the prevalence of underweight women for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance or indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Decline in the prevalence of underweight women is observed for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance in the Sawki project area</td>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Decline in the prevalence of underweight women is observed for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance in the Sawki project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the LAHIA project area experienced improvements in WDDS</td>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI project area experienced improvements in WDDS</td>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI project area experienced improvements in WDDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • No change in percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC visits for both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the LAHIA project area experienced improvements in WDDS</td>
<td><strong>TAKE AWAY:</strong>&lt;br&gt; • Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI project area experienced improvements in percent of births receiving at least 4 ANC visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Summary of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by indicator and project (Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s Health and Nutrition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nutritional status</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nutritional status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All children’s indicators show significant improvement from baseline to endline with the exception of diarrhea indicators</td>
<td>• Nutritional status (stunting, underweight and wasting) of children under 5 years of age improved between baseline and endline</td>
<td>• Decline in underweight and wasting between baseline and endline. The prevalence of underweight decreased for girls only. The prevalence of wasting decreased for boys and girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No difference at endline in children’s health and nutrition indicators between direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>• No difference at endline in prevalence of underweight and wasting between direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Decrease in the prevalence of stunting between baseline and endline was experienced only by girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimates of all children’s indicators for direct beneficiaries of any type of program assistance show improvements compared to the baseline estimates with the exception of the diarrhea indicators</td>
<td>• Prevalence of stunting at endline is higher for direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>• No difference in endline estimates of stunting, underweight, and wasting between direct and indirect beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimates of all children’s indicators for indirect beneficiaries show improvements compared to the baseline estimates with the exception of exclusive breastfeeding and diarrhea indicators</td>
<td>• Endline estimates of the prevalence of underweight, stunting and wasting for direct beneficiaries do not differ from baseline estimates</td>
<td>• Endline estimates of the prevalence of underweight and wasting of children under five among direct beneficiaries are lower than the baseline estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of CHN</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diarrhea Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No difference between baseline and endline estimates in ability of adult males and females to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health services is important for CUS and adolescents</td>
<td><strong>Prevalence of Diarrhea</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimates of the ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health services is important for CUS and adolescents for direct beneficiaries did not differ from the baseline estimate</td>
<td>• Prevalence of diarrhea increased between baseline and endline</td>
<td>• No difference between the baseline estimate and endline estimate of direct beneficiaries in the prevalence of stunting but the endline estimate of stunting for girls is lower than the baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endline estimates of the ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health services is important for CUS and adolescents for indirect beneficiaries did not differ from the baseline estimate</td>
<td>• No difference at endline in prevalence of diarrhea between direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>Diarrhea Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diarrhea Indicators</strong></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of the prevalence of diarrhea for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td><strong>Prevalence of Diarrhea</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimate of the prevalence of diarrhea for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline</td>
<td>• Prevalence of diarrhea increased between baseline and endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Endline estimates of diarrhea do not differ between direct and indirect beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAKE AWAY:
- Both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries in the LAHIA project area experienced improvements in all children’s health and nutrition indicators with the exception of the diarrhea indicators.
- No change in ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CU5 and adolescents for direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries but the baseline estimates are relatively high for men and women at 76.7 percent and 84.9 percent respectively.

Feeding practices and dietary diversity

Exclusive breastfeeding
- No change in the prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding between baseline and endline.
- Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding at endline was higher for direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries.
- Endline estimate of the prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline.
- Endline estimate of the prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding for indirect beneficiaries is lower than the baseline.

MAD
- Improvement in the prevalence of MAD between baseline and endline.

ORT
- No change in use of ORT between baseline and endline.
- Endline estimates of use of ORT do not differ between direct and indirect beneficiaries.
- No difference between the baseline estimate and endline estimate of direct beneficiaries in the percent of children with diarrhea who are treated with ORT.
- No difference between the baseline estimate and endline estimate of direct beneficiaries in the percent of children with diarrhea who are treated with ORT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adolescents for indirect beneficiaries did not differ from the baseline estimate.</td>
<td>No change in percent of children with diarrhea who were treated with ORT between baseline and endline.</td>
<td>No difference between the baseline estimate and endline estimate of direct beneficiaries in prevalence diarrhea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At endline the percentage of children with diarrhea treated with ORT is higher for direct beneficiaries compared to indirect beneficiaries.</td>
<td>Endline estimate of percentage of children with diarrhea treated with ORT for direct beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline.</td>
<td>Endline estimate of diarrhea for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline estimate of percentage of children with diarrhea treated with ORT for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding practices and dietary diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive breastfeeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding for children under 6 months increased between baseline and endline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding between direct and indirect beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline estimates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td>PASAM-TAI</td>
<td>Sawki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • No difference at endline in MAD between direct and indirect beneficiaries  
• Endline estimate of the prevalence of MAD for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline estimate  
• Endline estimate of the prevalence of MAD for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from the baseline estimate  
**Knowledge of CHN**  
• Improvement in men’s ability to identify at least 2 reasons why access to health services is important for children under 5 years of age and adolescents between baseline and endline  
• Women's ability to identify at least 2 reasons why access to health services is important for CUS5 of age and adolescents did not change between baseline and endline although the baseline estimate was relatively high at 82.1 percent.  
• No difference at endline between direct and indirect beneficiaries in ability of adult males or adult females to give at least 2 reasons why health service visits are important for CUS5 and adolescents  
• Endline estimate of adult male's ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CUS5 and adolescents is higher than the baseline estimate for both direct and indirect beneficiaries  
• Endline estimate of adult female's ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CUS5 and adolescents does not differ from the baseline estimate  
• Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from baseline estimates  
**MAD**  
• Prevalence of MAD increased between baseline and endline.  
• No difference in endline estimates of MAD between direct and indirect beneficiaries.  
• Prevalence of MAD at endline for direct beneficiaries is higher than the baseline estimates  
• Prevalence of MAD at endline for indirect beneficiaries is higher than the baseline estimates  
**Knowledge of CHN**  
• Ability to identify at least 2 reasons why access to health services is important for children improved for both adult males and females between baseline and endline.  
• Endline estimates of direct beneficiaries for adult males and adult females’ ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CUS5 and adolescents are higher than that of indirect beneficiaries  
• Endline estimates of direct beneficiaries for both adult males and adult females’ ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CUS5 and adolescents are higher than the baseline estimates  
• Endline estimates of indirect beneficiaries for adult males’ ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CUS5 and adolescents does not differ from the baseline estimates | • Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding for indirect beneficiaries does not differ from baseline estimates |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baseline estimate for both direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>important for CUS and adolescents is higher than the baseline estimates. There is no difference between the baseline and endline estimate for adult females but the baseline is relatively high at 73.2 percent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAKE AWAY:**
- Direct beneficiaries of any program assistance in the PASAM-TAI project area did not experience any change in the nutritional status of children but the nutritional status of children living in households that were indirect beneficiaries was better than the baseline estimates.
- Prevalence of diarrhea in the PASAM-TAI project areas increased between baseline and endline but this is based on a two-week reference period and may not be representative.
- No change in use of ORT for direct beneficiaries of any type of assistance or indirect beneficiaries in the PASAM-TAI project area.
- No change in exclusive breastfeeding since the baseline.
- Direct beneficiaries of any program assistance in the PASAM-TAI project area experienced improvements in MAD.
- Improvement in men’s ability to identify at least 2 reasons why access to health services is important for children under 5 years of age and adolescents.
- No change in women’s ability to identify at least 2 reasons why access to health services is important for CUS and adolescents.
- Improvements in MAD were experienced by both direct beneficiaries of any program assistance and indirect beneficiaries.
- Improvements in men and women’s ability to identify at least 2 reasons why visiting a health service is important for CUS and adolescents for direct beneficiaries. Improvements for men only among indirect beneficiaries but the baseline is relatively high for women.
Table 2. Summary of change in FFP indicators and spillover effects between baseline and endline by indicator and project (Tables 6.1 & Tables 6.5-6.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>PASAM-TAI</th>
<th>Sawki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to health services is important for CUS of age and adolescents but the baseline estimate was relatively high at 82.1 percent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,123 4,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,970 5,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,337 4,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>352 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>276 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POVERTY INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>49,656 37,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>47,321 34,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>-$0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,543 1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>-$0.22</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>784 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day²</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>49,656 37,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>47,321 34,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,543 1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>784 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty (expressed as percent of poverty line)</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49,656 37,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>47,321 34,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,543 1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>784 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASH INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,310 5,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,309 5,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>6,518 5,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,288 4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,562 3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>729 1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,282 4,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.1a. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>End-line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>7,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>7,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>10,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with ORT (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under six months of age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.1a. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level$^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

$^2$ NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Expressed in constant 2010 USD

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,040 1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>-18.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,428 1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>-18.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,275 1,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>75 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>78 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>19,592 14,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>18,957 13,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>403 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.76</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>232 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day²</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>19,592 14,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>18,957 13,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>-22.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>403 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>232 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty (expressed as percent of poverty line)</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>19,592 14,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>18,957 13,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>403 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>232 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,442 1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,439 1,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,212 1,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,797 1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,539 1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>256 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,794 1,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs**

**Table 6.1b. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>4,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1b. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations Baseline</th>
<th>Number of observations End-line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

<sup>2</sup> NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

<sup>3</sup> Expressed in constant 2010 USD

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133, 1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,398, 1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139, 1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>15,844, 11,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>14,962, 10,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>-$0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>524, 838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>-$0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>354, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day²</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>15,844, 11,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>14,962, 10,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>524, 838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>354, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty (expressed as percent of poverty line)</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>15,844, 11,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>14,962, 10,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>524, 838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>354, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457, 1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453, 1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300, 1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883, 1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660, 1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222, 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,880, 1,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1c. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>End-line</td>
<td>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,443 1,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083 1,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,844 1,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>238 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>605 860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,483 1,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,642 1,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
3 Expressed in constant 2010 USD
NA : Not available
NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,950 1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,144 1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,923 1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>150 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>$-0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>14,220 11,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$-0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>13,402 10,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$-0.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>616 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
<td>$-0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>198 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day²</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>14,220 11,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>13,402 10,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>616 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>198 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty (expressed as percent of poverty line)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>14,220 11,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>13,402 10,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>616 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>198 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,411 1,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,417 1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,006 1,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,618 1,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,363 1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>251 404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,608 1,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1d. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-line</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-line</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS | Prevalence of underweight women | 23.6% | 18.3% |
|---|---|---|
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.6 | 4.7 |

| CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS | Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 44.2% | 38.6% |
|---|---|---|
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 53.8% | 50.7% |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.3% | 11.4% |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.8% | 22.0% |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 76.6% | 77.5% |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 36.1% | 34.7% |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.1% | 9.5% |
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1d. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Indicators - SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End-line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (End-line - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
3 Expressed in constant 2010 USD

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.

---

**FINAL REPORT - SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF NIGER FFP PROJECTS**
## Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4,677</td>
<td>80,989</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5,278</td>
<td>87,927</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>72,498</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>9,672</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>5,218</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>37,551</td>
<td>613,783</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>34,869</td>
<td>555,895</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.12</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>42,446</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$1.88</td>
<td>$2.34</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>14,449</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>37,551</td>
<td>613,783</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>34,869</td>
<td>555,895</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>42,446</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>14,449</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>37,551</td>
<td>613,783</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>34,869</td>
<td>555,895</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>42,446</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>14,449</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>88,207</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td>88,360</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>5,235</td>
<td>87,176</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>147,373</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>107,334</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>40,039</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>147,712</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.1e. FFP Endline Indicators - Combined Project Areas

*Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>63.6 68.0</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>147,712</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>69.2 75.4</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>107,627</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>43.2 53.5</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>40,084</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>45.4 53.6</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>147,712</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>50.2 59.3</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>107,627</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.5 40.4</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>40,084</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.1e. FFP Endline Indicators - Combined Project Areas

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Indicator Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower, Upper)</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.3 - 22.7</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>88,758</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0 - 4.4</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>115,947</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40.0 - 44.4</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>136,886</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>41.1 - 46.2</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>68,568</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>37.7 - 43.7</td>
<td>4,013</td>
<td>68,319</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>51.8 - 56.2</td>
<td>7,983</td>
<td>135,692</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>54.3 - 59.5</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>67,963</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.1 - 54.0</td>
<td>3,967</td>
<td>67,729</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.2 - 15.2</td>
<td>8,062</td>
<td>136,940</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.7 - 18.2</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>68,698</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.1 - 13.0</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>68,242</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.5 - 27.8</td>
<td>8,231</td>
<td>140,719</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.1 - 30.2</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>70,533</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.2 - 26.2</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>70,186</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>71.9 - 79.8</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>35,093</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>72.1 - 81.0</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>18,992</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>70.3 - 79.7</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>16,101</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>35.9 - 47.6</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>15,337</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>32.2 - 45.0</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>8,128</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>37.3 - 53.4</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.1 - 20.2</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>37,360</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.3 - 17.7</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>18,364</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>15.3 - 24.2</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>18,996</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.4 - 10.2</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>88,304</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>19.8 - 26.3</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>147,506</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>23.1 - 31.2</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>107,435</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.3 - 14.8</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>40,071</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>58.9 - 67.8</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>64,911</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1e. FFP Endline Indicators - Combined Project Areas

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower, Upper)</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>75.5 80.2</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>65,581</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>81.7 85.9</td>
<td>5,053</td>
<td>84,129</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA: Not available
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9 - 4.6</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.0 - 27.4</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>9,314</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.3 - 27.7</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>15.1 - 38.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.9 - 26.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td>$1.18 - $1.34</td>
<td>14,114</td>
<td>73,672</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.16 - $1.33</td>
<td>13,590</td>
<td>70,752</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$1.22 - $1.75</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.77</td>
<td>$1.48 - $2.05</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>60.8 - 69.3</td>
<td>14,114</td>
<td>73,672</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>61.4 - 69.8</td>
<td>13,590</td>
<td>70,752</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>35.7 - 70.3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>38.2 - 63.9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>23.9 - 30.5</td>
<td>14,114</td>
<td>73,672</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.2 - 30.8</td>
<td>13,590</td>
<td>70,752</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.8 - 28.1</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>14.7 - 28.1</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>43.9 - 55.5</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>9,257</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.8 - 22.5</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.7 - 16.1</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.6 - 29.9</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>16,588</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.3 - 30.6</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>16.6 - 29.1</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>28.9 - 37.4</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Male Value</td>
<td>Male Confidence Interval</td>
<td>Male Number of Records</td>
<td>Male Weighted Population</td>
<td>Male Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Male Standard Error</td>
<td>Male DEFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>30.2 - 39.3</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>13,257</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>20.0 - 33.3</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>41.5 - 56.3</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>52.8 - 63.5</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>13,257</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>54.9 - 66.1</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>13,257</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>41.5 - 56.3</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>55.1 - 61.7</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>56.9 - 63.9</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>13,257</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>43.0 - 58.4</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.1f. FFP Endline Indicators - LAHIA
Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.2 - 19.8</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>9,463</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7 - 4.2</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>12,590</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>34.8 - 39.5</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>15,547</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>36.0 - 41.5</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>32.0 - 39.0</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>7,661</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>47.4 - 53.0</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>15,385</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>50.2 - 57.1</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>7,812</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>43.3 - 49.9</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.2 - 13.0</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>15,510</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.3 - 14.7</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>7,882</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.1 - 12.3</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>7,627</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.9 - 20.4</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>15,552</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.4 - 21.6</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>7,938</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.2 - 20.3</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>65.8 - 77.5</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>67.3 - 80.9</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>60.4 - 77.4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>49.9 - 63.6</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>44.2 - 61.4</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>51.0 - 69.8</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.1 - 16.2</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.5 - 18.6</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.7 - 15.6</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.5 - 18.2</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>9,298</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>32.1 - 42.5</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>32.8 - 43.7</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>13,257</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>25.1 - 42.0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>67.0 - 76.1</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.1f. FFP Endline Indicators - LAHIA

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>75.5 83.1</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>7,566</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>82.9 88.8</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA : Not available
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower, Upper)</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4 - 4.8</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>63,488</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>16.3 - 26.2</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>68,026</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.6 - 25.2</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>55,117</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>20.0 - 42.4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8,415</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.1 - 16.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower, Upper)</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.30 - $1.50</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>469,373</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.30 - $1.49</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td>420,416</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$1.06 - $1.50</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>36,931</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1.80 - $2.40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11,132</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>52.3 - 63.4</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>469,373</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>52.6 - 63.5</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td>420,416</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>52.9 - 75.2</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>36,931</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>17.5 - 43.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11,132</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.3 - 24.3</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>469,373</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.4 - 23.9</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td>420,416</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>17.2 - 36.3</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>36,931</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.7 - 10.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11,132</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower, Upper)</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>16.1 - 29.2</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>68,290</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.9 - 10.0</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>68,351</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.3 - 20.5</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>67,459</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower, Upper)</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.6 - 21.0</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>112,358</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.7 - 22.0</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>79,844</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11.4 - 20.8</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>32,514</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>36.7 - 47.3</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>112,621</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1g. FFP Endline Indicators - PASAM-TAI

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval Lower</th>
<th>Confidence Interval Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>80,082</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>80,082</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>80,082</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.1g. FFP Endline Indicators - PASAM-TAI**

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.5 - 24.1</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>69,361</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9 - 4.4</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>89,805</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>40.5 - 46.3</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>106,106</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>41.6 - 48.1</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>53,147</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.1 - 45.9</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>52,959</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>52.2 - 57.9</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>105,279</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>54.5 - 61.2</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>52,724</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>48.4 - 56.0</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>52,556</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.5 - 16.3</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>106,307</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.3 - 19.8</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>53,334</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.7 - 13.7</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>52,973</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24.4 - 30.1</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>109,750</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>26.3 - 32.8</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>54,890</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>21.7 - 28.2</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>54,860</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>71.3 - 80.8</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>29,060</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>71.1 - 81.7</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>15,839</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>70.1 - 81.4</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>31.8 - 46.0</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>12,391</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>28.2 - 43.3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6,752</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>32.5 - 52.9</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5,639</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8 - 20.5</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>29,255</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.2 - 17.2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>14,209</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.2 - 25.4</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>15,046</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.4 - 9.2</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>68,304</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.7 - 25.2</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>112,429</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>20.1 - 31.0</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>79,890</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.4 - 12.8</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>56.4 - 67.8</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>51,273</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.1g. FFP Endline Indicators - PASAM-TAI

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>50,139</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>65,036</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA : Not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2 - 5.7</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>20.5 - 29.9</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>10,588</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>21.3 - 31.1</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>14.2 - 32.6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8.0 - 23.9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>$1.44 - $1.63</td>
<td>11,440</td>
<td>70,738</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$1.41 - $1.60</td>
<td>10,448</td>
<td>64,726</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.32 - $1.68</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
<td>$2.18 - $2.65</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.5 - 57.6</td>
<td>11,440</td>
<td>70,738</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>48.6 - 59.1</td>
<td>10,448</td>
<td>64,726</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>37.2 - 58.2</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.1 - 29.1</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.9 - 21.9</td>
<td>11,440</td>
<td>70,738</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>16.4 - 22.4</td>
<td>10,448</td>
<td>64,726</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.1 - 25.6</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.2 - 8.2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA - NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>42.6 - 53.7</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.4 - 16.7</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>10,682</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>30.9 - 40.9</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>10,616</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.8 - 21.0</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>18,427</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13.7 - 22.1</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>14,270</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.1 - 20.0</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>35.7 - 44.9</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>18,454</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.1h. FFP Endline Indicators - SAWKI

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>73.2 (69.6, 76.9)</td>
<td>56.9 (49.9, 64.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.0 (73.5, 82.5)</td>
<td>59.0 (52.8, 65.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.9 (49.9, 64.0)</td>
<td>45.5 (38.5, 52.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Population</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>4,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error DEFT</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Number of Records</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Weighted Population</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Standard Error DEFT</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>55.9 (50.8, 61.1)</td>
<td>55.9 (50.8, 61.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.0 (52.8, 65.2)</td>
<td>59.0 (52.8, 65.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.5 (38.5, 52.4)</td>
<td>45.5 (38.5, 52.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Population</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>4,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error DEFT</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Number of Records</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Weighted Population</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval Standard Error DEFT</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.1h. FFP Endline Indicators - SAWKI

Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>9,934</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>13,552</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>15,234</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>7,535</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>7,698</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>15,027</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>7,427</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>15,124</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>7,482</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>7,642</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>15,417</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diet (MAD)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>10,702</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwashing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>18,440</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>4,153</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>7,199</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.1h. FFP Endline Indicators - SAWKI
Indicators, 95% Confidence Intervals and Base Population [Niger, 2017]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Weighted Population</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>DEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>72.1 - 81.6</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>79.5 - 86.6</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>10,167</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs
### Table 6.2a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Household Demographic Characteristics
#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Value</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Value</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Endline - Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Chi-sq test of significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level of head of the HH</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>6,524</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>529</td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education of primary care taker</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by female HH members</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>414</td>
<td>518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by male HH members</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>910</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Calculated using age data from household roster
2 Calculated using age data from child module
3 When there is more than one household members with different levels of education, only member with highest education level is considered
4 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.2b. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Household Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Value</th>
<th>Indicator Value</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Endline - Baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHS with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHS with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHS with children 0-59 months</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHS with children 0-24 months</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHS with children 0-5 months</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Chi-sq test of significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level of head of the HH</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***                                   ***   94 140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,122 1,341                           225 255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Highest level of education of primary care taker | None or pre-primary | Primary | Secondary and above |
|                                               | 92.0%               | 6.1%    | 1.9%                |
|                                               | 79.6%               | 14.5%   | 5.9%                |
|                                ***                                   ***   45 80     |
|                                1,802 1,151                           131 192  |

| Highest level of education by female HH members | None or pre-primary | Primary | Secondary and above |
|                                               | 60.3%               | 34.5%   | 5.2%                |
|                                               | 44.0%               | 42.7%   | 13.3%               |
|                                ***                                   ***   135 225  |
|                                1,436 771                           867 749  |

| Highest level of education by male HH members | None or pre-primary | Primary | Secondary and above |
|                                               | 45.5%               | 39.8%   | 14.7%                |
|                                               | 32.6%               | 42.6%   | 24.7%                |
|                                ***                                   ***   365 426  |
|                                1,061 554                           985 750  |

1. Calculated using age data from household roster
2. Calculated using age data from child module
3. When there is more than one household members with different levels of education, only member with highest education level is considered
4. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs
### Table 6.2c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Household Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Value</th>
<th>Raw Difference Endline - Baseline</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-sq test of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level of head of the HH</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education of primary care taker</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by female HH members</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by male HH members</td>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calculated using age data from household roster
2. Calculated using age data from child module
3. When there is more than one household members with different levels of education, only member with highest education level is considered
4. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.2d. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Household Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Value</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>Baseline 6.8</td>
<td>Endline 6.6</td>
<td>-0.2 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>Baseline 45.5</td>
<td>Endline 43.1</td>
<td>-2.4 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>Baseline 31.1</td>
<td>Endline 29.6</td>
<td>-1.4 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>Baseline 10.6%</td>
<td>Endline 11.3%</td>
<td>0.6 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>Baseline 87.6%</td>
<td>Endline 85.1%</td>
<td>-2.6 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>Baseline 80.0%</td>
<td>Endline 81.4%</td>
<td>1.5 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Baseline 78.5%</td>
<td>Endline 75.3%</td>
<td>-3.2 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Baseline 50.1%</td>
<td>Endline 48.4%</td>
<td>-1.7 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Baseline 12.8%</td>
<td>Endline 11.6%</td>
<td>-1.2 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Chi-sq test of significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level of head of the HH</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education of primary care taker&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education by female HH members&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education by male HH members&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Calculated using age data from household roster

<sup>2</sup> Calculated using age data from child module

<sup>3</sup> When there is more than one household members with different levels of education, only member with highest education level is considered

<sup>4</sup> NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.3a. Comparison of Baseline Household Demographic Characteristics by Endline Status

All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator value</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-sq test of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education of head of the HH</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level of head of the HH</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higest level of education of primary care taker</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by female HH members</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by male HH members</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calculated using age data from household roster
2. Calculated using age data from child module
3. When there are more than one household members with different level of education, only member with highest education level is considered
4. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
**Table 6.3b. Comparison of Baseline Household Demographic Characteristics by Endline Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator value</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,633 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,354 624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months¹</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months¹</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months²</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,634 808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Chi-sq test of significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level of head of the HH</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>1,407 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>169 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>57 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education of primary care taker²</td>
<td>1,237 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>91 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>26 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by female HH members²</td>
<td>988 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>565 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>78 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education by male HH members²</td>
<td>715 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>673 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>225 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Calculated using age data from household roster
² Calculated using age data from child module
³ When there are more than one household members with education data, only member with highest education level is considered
⁴ NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
## Table 6.3c. Comparison of Baseline Household Demographic Characteristics by Endline Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator value</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pearson Chi-sq test of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education of head of the HH</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education of primary care taker</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education by female HH members</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education by male HH members</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calculated using age data from household roster
2. Calculated using age data from child module
3. When there are more than one household members with different level of education, only member with highest education level is considered
4. NS not significant, t p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs
### Table 6.3d. Comparison of Baseline Household Demographic Characteristics by Endline Status

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator value</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household (HH) size</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of HH head</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of primary care takers of children 0-59 months</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH headship (% female)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with currently married woman 15-49 years</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-59 months&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-24 months&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of HHs with children 0-5 months&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Chi-sq test of significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level of head of the HH</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education of primary care taker&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education by female HH members&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education by male HH members&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>None or pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and above</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or pre-primary</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1  Calculated using age data from household roster
2  Calculated using age data from child module
3  When there are more than one household members with different level of education, only member with highest education level is considered
4  NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Not Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Baseline Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,788 2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,312 2,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>198 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>187 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Not Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Baseline Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,273 2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,888 2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>196 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.39</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>187 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>4,273 2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>3,888 2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>196 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>187 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,273 2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,888 2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>196 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>187 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Not Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Baseline Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,457 2,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4,448 2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,063 2,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Not Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Baseline Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,336 1,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,892 1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>440 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,331 1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,887 1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>440 287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.4a. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight women | 19.1% | 22.0% | 2.9 | NS | 2,981 | 1,846 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | NS | 3,737 | 2,313 |

**CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 48.4% | 44.6% | -3.8 | † | 4,897 | 2,952 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 58.3% | 56.4% | -1.9 | NS | 4,799 | 2,889 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.9% | 15.9% | -2.0 | NS | 4,897 | 2,952 |

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

| Percent of respondents who use three of five critical moments for handwashing | 8.8% | 6.3% | -2.4 | NS | 4,435 | 2,825 |
| Percent of farmers who use at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total) | 10.5% | 10.1% | -0.3 | NS | 3,817 | 2,281 |
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.4a. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 146 villages sampled at baseline were originally targeted to receive DFAP interventions, however the DFAP interventions were not implemented in these villages.
2 94 villages sampled at baseline received the DFAP interventions.
3 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

**NOTE:** Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.4b. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$1.12</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.4b. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

##### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Comparison</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,484 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,269 633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>214 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,496 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,280 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>215 96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Comparison</th>
<th>Percentage of underweight women</th>
<th>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1,484 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,280 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>1,069 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>1,010 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>1,280 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>215 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>145 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>347 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>1,466 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>1,362 677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>265 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>212 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>145 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>347 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>415 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>347 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</td>
<td>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</td>
<td>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four ANC visits</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>66.4% 0.8 NS 424 225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.4% 73.2%</td>
<td>78.4% 73.2% 0.8 NS 424 225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.7% 82.7%</td>
<td>85.7% 82.7% 3.0 NS 1,252 588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 54 villages sampled at baseline were originally targeted to receive DFAP interventions, however the DFAP interventions were not implemented in these villages.

2 26 villages sampled at baseline received the DFAP interventions.

3 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.4c. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Not received DFAPs</th>
<th>Received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.37</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.4c. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status**

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.4c. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PASAM TAI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1,667</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 72 villages sampled at baseline were originally targeted to receive DFAP interventions, however the DFAP interventions were not implemented in these villages.

2 8 villages sampled at baseline received the DFAP interventions.

3 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

**Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)**

- Not received DFAPs: 4.0
- Received DFAPs: 3.8
- Raw Difference: -0.3
- Significance Level: NS

### POVERTY INDICATORS

**Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas**

- Not received DFAPs: $1.68
- Received DFAPs: $1.62
- Raw Difference: -$0.06
- Significance Level: NS

**Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)**

- Not received DFAPs: 17.5%
- Received DFAPs: 24.7%
- Raw Difference: 7.3
- Significance Level: *NS*

**Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day**

- Not received DFAPs: 46.5%
- Received DFAPs: 47.7%
- Raw Difference: 1.2
- Significance Level: NS

**Mean depth of poverty**

- Not received DFAPs: 13.5%
- Received DFAPs: 17.8%
- Raw Difference: 4.3
- Significance Level: NS

### WASH INDICATORS

**Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water**

- Not received DFAPs: NA
- Received DFAPs: NA

**Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities**

- Not received DFAPs: 14.9%
- Received DFAPs: 12.1%
- Raw Difference: -2.8
- Significance Level: NS

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

**Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months**

- Not received DFAPs: 5.6%
- Received DFAPs: 6.6%
- Raw Difference: 1.0
- Significance Level: NS

**Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months**

- Not received DFAPs: 18.5%
- Received DFAPs: 23.4%
- Raw Difference: 4.9
- Significance Level: T

---

**Table 6.4d. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawki</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td>-$0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>-$0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>-$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2.43</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.4d. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawki</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>428 1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>371 1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>-22.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>55  208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>428 1,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>371 1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>-26.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>55  210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 23.7% | 23.4% | -0.3 | NS | 347 1,124 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.8 | 3.5 | -0.3 | NS | 462 1,408 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 43.4% | 44.8% | 1.4 | NS | 522 1,740 |
| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 42.3% | 44.5% | 2.1 | NS | 278 875 |
| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 44.6% | 45.0% | 0.4 | NS | 244 864 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 50.2% | 55.9% | 5.7 | †  | 505 1,709 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 51.2% | 56.7% | 5.5 | NS | 273 860 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 49.1% | 55.2% | 6.1 | †  | 232 849 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 16.4% | 17.8% | 1.5 | NS | 522 1,740 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 18.1% | 18.7% | 0.6 | NS | 278 875 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 14.5% | 17.0% | 2.6 | NS | 244 864 |
| Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.0% | 15.3% | 1.3 | NS | 709 2,370 |
| Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 13.4% | 14.5% | 1.0 | NS | 373 1,186 |
| Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.6% | 16.0% | 1.3 | NS | 333 1,180 |
| PREVALENCE OF EXCLUSIVE BREAST-FEEDING OF CHILDREN UNDER SIX MONTHS OF AGE | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | NS | 89 208 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 35.6% | 36.4% | 0.8 | NS | 51 104 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 38.6% | 30.1% | -8.5 | NS | 51 104 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 31.4% | 40.4% | 9.0 | NS | 38 104 |

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

| Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing | 7.2% | 6.2% | -1.0 | NS | 593 1,783 |
| Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total) | 11.8% | 8.5% | -3.3 | NS | 428 1,351 |
### Table 6.4d. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by End-line Status

#### Sawki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that did not receive DFAPs</th>
<th>Villages sampled at baseline that received DFAPs</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Received DFAPs - Not received DFAPs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 20 villages sampled at baseline were originally targeted to receive DFAP interventions, however the DFAP interventions were not implemented in these villages.
2. 60 villages sampled at baseline received the DFAP interventions.
3. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

**NOTE:** Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT) - All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.20</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)(^1)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,260 1,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls | 77.5% | 78.3% | -0.8 | NS | 2,086 1,981 |

| Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls | 85.1% | 83.0% | 2.1 | NS | 2,532 2,500 |

\(^1\) Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)$^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level$^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$1.21</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Differences are calculated as follows: (Direct - Indirect). Significance levels are indicated as follows: NS = not significant, ** = significant at the 0.01 level, † = significant at the 0.10 level.
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#### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect) ¹</th>
<th>Significance Level ²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>874 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>215 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,089 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>874 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>215 102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prevalence of underweight women | 17.0% | 17.0% | -0.1 | NS | 770 410 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 4.1 | 3.8 | 0.3 | ** | 1,008 567 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 37.6% | 36.3% | 1.3 | NS | 2,012 945 |
| Male | 38.5% | 39.4% | -0.8 | NS | 1,005 490 |
| Female | 36.6% | 33.1% | 3.6 | NS | 1,007 455 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 50.4% | 49.9% | 0.5 | NS | 1,993 938 |
| Male | 53.7% | 53.9% | -0.2 | NS | 997 487 |
| Female | 47.0% | 45.6% | 1.4 | NS | 996 451 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 11.5% | 11.8% | -0.3 | NS | 2,016 943 |
| Male | 13.0% | 13.1% | -0.1 | NS | 1,008 492 |
| Female | 10.1% | 10.5% | -0.4 | NS | 1,008 451 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 17.8% | 18.8% | -1.0 | NS | 2,044 930 |
| Male | 18.6% | 19.7% | -1.1 | NS | 1,025 488 |
| Female | 17.0% | 17.8% | -0.8 | NS | 1,019 442 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 72.0% | 70.8% | 1.2 | NS | 351 172 |
| Male | 72.7% | 76.3% | -3.6 | NS | 177 95 |
| Female | 71.2% | 64.1% | 7.1 | NS | 174 77 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 60.5% | 50.9% | 9.6 | † | 215 112 |
| Male | 57.9% | 44.9% | 12.9 | NS | 98 53 |
| Female | 63.0% | 56.1% | 6.9 | NS | 117 59 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 12.6% | 12.9% | -0.3 | NS | 505 242 |
| Male | 13.8% | 13.1% | 0.7 | NS | 270 125 |
| Female | 11.2% | 12.7% | -1.6 | NS | 235 117 |

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing | 14.0% | 16.2% | -2.2 | NS | 1,099 648 |
| Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total) | 38.6% | 35.0% | 3.6 | NS | 1,089 613 |
| Male | 39.5% | 36.0% | 3.5 | NS | 874 511 |
| Female | 35.4% | 30.4% | 5.0 | NS | 215 102 |
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Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASAM TAI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Direct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Direct - Indirect)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Significance Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>-$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>-$0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.74</td>
<td>$2.19</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>740 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>242 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>982 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>740 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>242 162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

- **Prevalence of underweight women**
  - Male: 17.7% vs 19.3% (NS, 650 vs 426)
  - Female: 54.2% vs 50.4% (NS, 242 vs 162)

**WOMEN'S DIETARY DIVERSITY SCORE (WDDS)**

- Male: 4.9 vs 4.4 (NS, 740 vs 505)
- Female: 4.9 vs 4.4 (NS, 242 vs 162)

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

- **Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)**
  - Male: 38.3% vs 38.8% (NS, 1,477 vs 944)
  - Female: 37.2% vs 36.7% (NS, 740 vs 478)

- **Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)**
  - Male: 50.9% vs 50.3% (NS, 1,462 vs 926)
  - Female: 49.6% vs 45.5% (NS, 733 vs 457)

- **Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)**
  - Male: 11.0% vs 12.2% (NS, 1,472 vs 934)
  - Female: 10.3% vs 10.9% (NS, 739 vs 472)

- **Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)**
  - Male: 22.0% vs 21.8% (NS, 1,497 vs 957)
  - Female: 22.5% vs 22.4% (NS, 752 vs 478)

- **Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)**
  - Male: 79.3% vs 74.5% (NS, 304 vs 198)
  - Female: 82.9% vs 75.9% (NS, 163 vs 99)

- **Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age**
  - Male: 54.3% vs 43.1% (NS, 122 vs 75)
  - Female: 51.2% vs 54.8% (NS, 58 vs 32)

- **Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)**
  - Male: 27.0% vs 22.8% (NS, 395 vs 261)
  - Female: 25.6% vs 22.2% (NS, 202 vs 125)

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

- **Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing**
  - Male: 11.9% vs 12.8% (NS, 1,017 vs 734)

- **Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)**
  - Male: 27.7% vs 17.1% (NS, 981 vs 667)
  - Female: 17.0% vs 10.6% (NS, 241 vs 162)
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs
### Table 6.5a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Direct Benficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Benficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)(^1)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Programs Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>984 1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,622 2,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,957 3,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight women</strong></td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</strong></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</strong></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</strong></td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</strong></td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</strong></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</strong></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</strong></td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect) (^1)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>502 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>820 617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>969 705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA: Not available
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>236 1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>237 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>261 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>237 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>261 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>237 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>261 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>237 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>261 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>260 1,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>250 1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>200 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>50 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>250 1,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>200 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>250 1,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months

| Male | 59.3%              | 45.0%                | 14.3                               | **                 | 250                  |
| Female | 61.8%              | 51.4%                | 10.5                               | †                  | 200                  |
| Female | 49.1%              | 30.6%                | 18.5                               | *                  | 50                    |

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

**Prevalence of underweight women**

- Male: 17.8% vs. 22.1%, 4.3, NS, 186 vs. 969
- Female: 59.3% vs. 45.0%, 14.3, **, 250 vs. 1339

**Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)**

- 4.5 vs. 4.1, 0.4, *, 236 vs. 1280

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

**Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)**

- Male: 46.3% vs. 43.0%, 3.3, NS, 456 vs. 2214
- Female: 47.5% vs. 40.0%, 7.5, NS, 227 vs. 1095

**Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)**

- Male: 60.6% vs. 53.9%, 6.7, †, 452 vs. 2190
- Female: 54.7% vs. 51.8%, 2.9, NS, 227 vs. 1108

**Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)**

- Male: 12.6% vs. 14.8%, 2.2, NS, 457 vs. 2218
- Female: 15.6% vs. 18.0%, 2.4, NS, 227 vs. 1126

**Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)**

- Male: 22.1% vs. 28.4%, 6.3, *, 477 vs. 2305
- Female: 23.4% vs. 30.9%, 7.5, †, 238 vs. 1165

**Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)**

- Male: 78.8% vs. 75.6%, 3.2, NS, 101 vs. 652
- Female: 82.5% vs. 75.4%, 7.1, NS, 56 vs. 350

**Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age**

- Male: 51.0% vs. 35.9%, 15.1, NS, 59 vs. 249
- Female: 45.1% vs. 33.5%, 11.6, NS, 32 vs. 137

**Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)**

- Male: 20.0% vs. 15.9%, 4.1, NS, 123 vs. 627
- Female: 20.0% vs. 11.8%, 8.2, NS, 64 vs. 307

**Percentage of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing**

- 6.1% vs. 6.9%, 0.8, NS, 261 vs. 1507

**Percentage of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)**

- Male: 23.9% vs. 20.3%, 3.7, NS, 250 vs. 1338
- Female: 28.8% vs. 24.8%, 4.0, NS, 200 vs. 959

- 4.5% vs. 10.2%, 5.7, NS, 50 vs. 379
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)¹</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</strong></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>698 887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</strong></td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>762 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>670 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>56 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</strong></td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>763 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>671 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>-$0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>56 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$2.22</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>35 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</strong></td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>763 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>671 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>56 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>-26.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean depth of poverty</strong></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>763 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>671 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>56 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WAS INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>760 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>756 976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>742 901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>563 677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>179 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>742 903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>563 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>179 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>742 903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.5b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>337 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>591 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>737 934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.19</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>3,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
## Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>732 722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>857 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>804 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>857 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>804 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>857 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>804 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>857 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>804 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>854 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>841 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>844 851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>678 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>166 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>845 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>678 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>-18.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>167 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>845 856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>678 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>167 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>845 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>678 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>167 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Health and Nutrition Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>614 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,616 1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>821 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>795 666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,601 1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>813 671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>788 658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,615 1,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>822 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>793 665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,645 1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>838 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>807 653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>281 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>140 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>141 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>174 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>81 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>93 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>398 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>219 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>179 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s Health and Nutrition Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,616 1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>821 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>795 666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,601 1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>813 671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>788 658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,615 1,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>822 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>793 665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,645 1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>838 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>807 653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>281 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>140 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>141 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>174 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>81 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>93 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>398 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>219 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>179 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project-Specific Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>856 890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>845 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>678 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>167 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiary</td>
<td>Indirect Beneficiary</td>
<td>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available
**FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Benficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Benficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>327 1,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>312 1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POVERTY INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Benficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Benficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>355 1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>312 1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASH INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Benficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Benficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>355 1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>348 1,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Benficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Benficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>328 1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>259 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>69 357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PASAM TAI*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>259 899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>328 1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>259 899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69 358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight women | 20.1% | 21.8% | -1.7 | NS | 241 910 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 4.5 | 4.1 | 0.4 | ** | 317 1,195 |

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 46.7% | 42.6% | 4.1 | NS | 601 2,065 |
| Male | 45.1% | 44.9% | 0.2 | NS | 315 1,030 |
| Female | 48.5% | 40.4% | 8.0 | * | 286 1,035 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 60.4% | 53.4% | 7.0 | * | 599 2,039 |
| Male | 63.5% | 55.9% | 7.6 | † | 315 1,017 |
| Female | 56.9% | 51.0% | 5.9 | † | 284 1,022 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 13.4% | 14.8% | -1.3 | NS | 601 2,069 |
| Male | 15.3% | 18.4% | -3.1 | NS | 312 1,038 |
| Female | 11.5% | 11.2% | 0.3 | NS | 289 1,031 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 22.5% | 28.6% | -6.1 | * | 627 2,150 |
| Male | 21.8% | 31.8% | -10.0 | ** | 326 1,074 |
| Female | 23.2% | 25.4% | -2.2 | NS | 301 1,076 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 81.4% | 74.9% | 6.5 | NS | 136 613 |
| Male | 85.8% | 74.7% | 11.1 | * | 70 333 |
| Female | 76.8% | 75.2% | 1.7 | NS | 86 280 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 55.5% | 33.1% | 22.3 | ** | 76 232 |
| Male | 51.3% | 30.1% | 21.2 | ** | 44 125 |
| Female | 60.9% | 36.6% | 24.3 | † | 32 107 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 23.0% | 15.0% | 8.0 | † | 157 590 |
| Male | 23.0% | 10.4% | 12.6 | * | 83 286 |
| Female | 23.0% | 19.1% | 3.9 | NS | 74 304 |

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

| Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing | 7.5% | 6.7% | 0.9 | NS | 355 1,409 |
| Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total) | 20.0% | 21.0% | -1.0 | NS | 328 1,256 |
| Male | 23.7% | 25.8% | -2.1 | NS | 259 898 |
| Female | 7.4% | 10.1% | -2.7 | NS | 69 358 |
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Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>-$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>-$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>-$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.29</td>
<td>$0.48</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>351 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>579 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>737 935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,449 3,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,641 3,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,484 3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>84 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>71 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,641 3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,484 3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>84 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>71 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,641 3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,484 3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>84 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>71 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,641 3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,484 3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>84 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>71 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,635 3,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,619 3,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,591 3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,252 2,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>339 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,593 3,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,253 2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>340 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,593 3,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,593 3,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,253 2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>357 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>135 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,718 5,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,754 5,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>518 1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>328 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,253 2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,593 3,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>357 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>135 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>357 728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,094 2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,451 3,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,718 5,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,691 5,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,709 5,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,754 5,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>518 1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>270 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>685 1,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,640 3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,593 3,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Significance Levels:**

- **NS** = Not Significant
- * = Significant at the 0.05 level
- ** = Significant at the 0.01 level
- *** = Significant at the 0.001 level
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE) - All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>575 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>679 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>634 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>-$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>679 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>-$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>634 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>679 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>634 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>679 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>634 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>676 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>665 1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>670 1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>542 833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>672 1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>543 836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>129 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>672 1,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** NS = Not Significant; † = Significant at 90% confidence level; ‡ = Significant at 95% confidence level; ** = Significant at 99% confidence level.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>238 1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>255 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>221 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>255 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>221 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>255 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>221 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>255 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>221 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>255 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>251 1,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>230 1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>183 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>47 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>230 1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>183 974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>47 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>230 1,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls | 82.4% | 77.0% | 5.4 | NS | 211 | 1,117 |

| Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls | 84.2% | 83.5% | 0.7 | NS | 246 | 1,428 |

---

1. Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

---
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect) $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>636 949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>707 1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>40 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>37 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>$-0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>707 1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$-0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>629 839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>40 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>37 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>707 1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>629 839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>40 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>37 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>707 1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>629 839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>40 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>37 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>704 1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>703 1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>691 952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>527 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>164 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>691 954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>527 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>164 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>691 954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5d. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiary</td>
<td>Indirect Beneficiary</td>
<td>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA: Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (OTHER)</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,037 3,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,177 4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,052 3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>75 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>49 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,177 4,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,052 3,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
<td>$2.16</td>
<td>-$0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>49 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,177 4,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,052 3,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>75 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,177 4,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,052 3,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>75 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>49 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,174 4,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,163 4,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,138 3,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>866 2,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>272 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,138 3,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>866 2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>272 870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,138 3,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls | 78.6% | 77.7% | 0.9 | NS | 931 | 3,110 |

| Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls | 83.9% | 83.7% | 0.2 | NS | 1,129 | 3,871 |

---

1. Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)**

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

- **Prevalence of underweight women**: 15.9% Direct, 17.5% Indirect, Raw Difference 1.6 NS 321 850
- **Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)**: 4.2 Direct, 3.9 Indirect, Raw Difference 0.4 ** 426 1,137

### CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

#### Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>50.6% Direct, 49.9% Indirect, Raw Difference 0.7 NS 873 2,034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>56.0% Direct, 57.9% Indirect, Raw Difference -1.9 NS 88 237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

- **Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing**: 17.0% Direct, 14.0% Indirect, Raw Difference 3.0 NS 464 1,271
- **Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>223 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>366 1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>448 1,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

---
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## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PASAM TAI**

**Number of observations**: Direct 1,410  Indirect 1,530
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)**

**PASAM TAI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS* denotes not significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>-$0.13</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>-$0.13</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5e. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.5e Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates for Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Direct Beneficiary</th>
<th>Indirect Beneficiary</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Direct - Indirect)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw difference is calculated as direct beneficiary result minus indirect beneficiary result.  
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001  
NA : Not available
## FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7***</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>2,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>-7.5**</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>-7.7*</td>
<td>6,337</td>
<td>2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>-6.9 NS</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>-7.1 NS</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$0.14*</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$0.15*</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$0.02 NS</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.20</td>
<td>-$0.13 NS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>-9.4**</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>-9.9**</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>-0.4 NS</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>4.3 NS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-5.9***</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>-6.0***</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>-4.4 NS</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.6 NS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,310 2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>1.9 NS</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6.1**</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>19.9***</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>19.1***</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>23.3***</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>18.8***</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>7,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>10,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>$0.51</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>-24.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs**

**Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)**

### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months**

| Male             | 23.6%                                  | 60.0%                   | 36.5                  |
| Female           | 17.8%                                  | 48.6%                   | 30.8                  |

**Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months**

| Male             | 27.2%                                  | 60.4%                   | 33.2                  |
| Female           | 28.5%                                  | 61.8%                   | 33.3                  |

**WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight women | 17.2%                                  | 17.0%                   | -0.2                  | NS                  |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 2.9                                    | 4.1                     | 1.2                   | ***                 |

**CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 46.8%                                  | 37.6%                   | -9.2                  | ***                 |
| Male             | 47.6%                                  | 38.5%                   | -9.0                  | ***                 |
| Female           | 46.0%                                  | 36.6%                   | -9.4                  | ***                 |

Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)

| Male             | 58.6%                                  | 53.7%                   | -4.9                  | †                   |
| Female           | 56.5%                                  | 47.0%                   | -9.5                  | ***                 |

Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)

| Male             | 16.7%                                  | 11.5%                   | -5.2                  | ***                 |
| Female           | 18.8%                                  | 13.0%                   | -5.8                  | ***                 |

Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)

| Male             | 14.5%                                  | 10.1%                   | -4.5                  | **                  |
| Female           | 13.5%                                  | 10.7%                   | -2.8                  | **                  |

Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)

| Male             | 77.6%                                  | 72.7%                   | -4.9                  | NS                  |
| Female           | 76.0%                                  | 71.2%                   | -4.8                  | NS                  |

Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age

| Male             | 44.1%                                  | 60.5%                   | 16.4                  | **                  |
| Female           | 42.4%                                  | 57.9%                   | 15.4                  | *                   |

Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

| Male             | 4.4%                                   | 13.8%                   | 9.5                   | **                  |
| Female           | 6.6%                                   | 11.2%                   | 4.5                   | NS                  |
## Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values Baseline</th>
<th>Indicator Values Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations Baseline</th>
<th>Number of observations Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,398 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>129 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,382 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>-12.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,125 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,382 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,125 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300 497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,880 468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PASAM TAI

### Indicator Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECf-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.74</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAWKI

#### Indicator Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,355 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>249 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,768 982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,501 740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of underweight women</th>
<th>23.6%</th>
<th>17.7%</th>
<th>-5.8</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>1,471 650</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,870 873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</th>
<th>44.2%</th>
<th>38.3%</th>
<th>-5.9</th>
<th>**</th>
<th>2,262 1,477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,153 737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,108 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,214 1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,133 729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,081 733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,262 1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,153 733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,108 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,090 1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,562 752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,519 745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>457 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>230 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>227 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>297 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>155 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>142 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>785 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>402 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>382 193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.6a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Level (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2. NS not significant, † \(p<0.1\), * \(p<0.05\), ** \(p<0.01\), *** \(p<0.001\)
NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

**Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)**
- Baseline: 3.4
- Endline: 5.1
- Raw Difference: 1.7
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 6,123 (Baseline), 1,792 (Endline)

**Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)**
- Baseline: 29.1%
- Endline: 20.7%
- Raw Difference: -8.4
- Significance Level: **
- Number of observations: 6,123 (Baseline), 1,792 (Endline)

### Subcategories
- **Male and female adults**: Baseline: 29.3%, Endline: 20.8%
- Raw Difference: -8.6
- Significance Level: **
- Number of observations: 6,123 (Baseline), 1,792 (Endline)
- **Adult female, no adult male**: Baseline: 34.2%, Endline: 24.3%
- Raw Difference: -10.0
- Significance Level: NS
- Number of observations: 352 (Baseline), 107 (Endline)
- **Adult male, no adult female**: Baseline: 18.0%, Endline: 13.0%
- Raw Difference: -4.9
- Significance Level: NS
- Number of observations: 276 (Baseline), 69 (Endline)
- **Child, no adults**: Baseline: NA, Endline: NA
- Raw Difference: NA
- Significance Level: NA
- Number of observations: 5 (Baseline), 3 (Endline)

## POVERTY INDICATORS

**Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas**
- Baseline: $1.33
- Endline: $1.43
- Raw Difference: $0.10
- Significance Level: †
- Number of observations: 6,860 (Baseline), 2,023 (Endline)

### Subcategories
- **Male and female adults**: Baseline: $1.31, Endline: $1.41
- Raw Difference: $0.10
- Significance Level: †
- Number of observations: 6,235 (Baseline), 1,844 (Endline)
- **Adult female, no adult male**: Baseline: $1.43, Endline: $1.71
- Raw Difference: $0.28
- Significance Level: *
- Number of observations: 345 (Baseline), 107 (Endline)
- **Adult male, no adult female**: Baseline: $2.33, Endline: $2.46
- Raw Difference: $0.13
- Significance Level: NS
- Number of observations: 277 (Baseline), 69 (Endline)
- **Child, no adults**: Baseline: NA, Endline: NA
- Raw Difference: NA
- Significance Level: NA
- Number of observations: 3 (Baseline), 3 (Endline)

**Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day**
- Baseline: 63.7%
- Endline: 54.1%
- Raw Difference: -9.7
- Significance Level: **
- Number of observations: 6,860 (Baseline), 2,023 (Endline)

### Subcategories
- **Male and female adults**: Baseline: 64.6%, Endline: 54.9%
- Raw Difference: -9.7
- Significance Level: **
- Number of observations: 6,235 (Baseline), 1,844 (Endline)
- **Adult female, no adult male**: Baseline: 56.3%, Endline: 39.9%
- Raw Difference: -16.3
- Significance Level: †
- Number of observations: 345 (Baseline), 107 (Endline)
- **Adult male, no adult female**: Baseline: 24.4%, Endline: 23.9%
- Raw Difference: -0.5
- Significance Level: NS
- Number of observations: 277 (Baseline), 69 (Endline)
- **Child, no adults**: Baseline: NA, Endline: NA
- Raw Difference: NA
- Significance Level: NA
- Number of observations: 3 (Baseline), 3 (Endline)

**Mean depth of poverty**
- Baseline: 25.8
- Endline: 20.1
- Raw Difference: -5.7
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 6,860 (Baseline), 2,023 (Endline)

### Subcategories
- **Male and female adults**: Baseline: 26.2, Endline: 20.6
- Raw Difference: -5.6
- Significance Level: **
- Number of observations: 6,235 (Baseline), 1,844 (Endline)
- **Adult female, no adult male**: Baseline: 24.8, Endline: 10.2
- Raw Difference: -14.5
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 345 (Baseline), 107 (Endline)
- **Adult male, no adult female**: Baseline: 6.8, Endline: 8.1
- Raw Difference: 1.3
- Significance Level: NS
- Number of observations: 277 (Baseline), 69 (Endline)
- **Child, no adults**: Baseline: NA, Endline: NA
- Raw Difference: NA
- Significance Level: NA
- Number of observations: 3 (Baseline), 3 (Endline)

## WASH INDICATORS

**Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water**
- Baseline: NA
- Endline: NA
- Raw Difference: NA
- Significance Level: NA
- Number of observations: 7,310 (Baseline), 2,009 (Endline)

**Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities**
- Baseline: 8.6%
- Endline: 10.8%
- Raw Difference: 2.2
- Significance Level: NS
- Number of observations: 7,309 (Baseline), 2,017 (Endline)

**Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members**
- Baseline: 15.3%
- Endline: 20.9%
- Raw Difference: 5.6
- Significance Level: *
- Number of observations: 6,518 (Baseline), 1,998 (Endline)

## AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

**Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months**
- Baseline: 5.6%
- Endline: 26.0%
- Raw Difference: 20.3
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 5,298 (Baseline), 1,980 (Endline)

### Subcategories
- **Male**: Baseline: 6.0%, Endline: 25.9%
- Raw Difference: 19.9
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 4,562 (Baseline), 1,558 (Endline)
- **Female**: Baseline: 3.4%, Endline: 26.1%
- Raw Difference: 22.7
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 729 (Baseline), 422 (Endline)

**Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months**
- Baseline: 24.7%
- Endline: 43.9%
- Raw Difference: 19.1
- Significance Level: ***
- Number of observations: 5,282 (Baseline), 1,980 (Endline)
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,548 1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>727 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,051 1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>808 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098 1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>814 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,827 1,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,050 1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7,849 3,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,977 1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,870 1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,688 3,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,907 1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,781 1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,849 3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,977 1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,870 1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>10,424 3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>5,294 1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>5,116 1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,524 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>824 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>699 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,055 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>543 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>512 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,774 892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,438 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,334 424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
² NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,040 859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,428 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>-15.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,275 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>75 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>78 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$0.47</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>-24.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>75 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,442 987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,439 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,212 982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,797 988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,539 795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>256 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,794 988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^\text{(Endline-Baseline)})</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)**

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Significant difference in standard deviation <sup>2</sup> p-value
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of underweight women</th>
<th>20.2%</th>
<th>17.8%</th>
<th>-2.4</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>1,621</th>
<th>186</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</th>
<th>48.9%</th>
<th>46.3%</th>
<th>-2.6</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>2,482</th>
<th>456</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
# Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

## Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

- **Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)**
  - Baseline: 3.9
  - Endline: 6.0
  - Raw Difference: 2.1
  - Significance Level: **
  - Number of observations: 1,950: 698

- **Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)**
  - Male and female adults: 21.0%
  - Adult female, no adult male: 32.0%
  - Adult male, no adult female: 12.7%
  - Child, no adults: 12.7%
  - Raw Difference: -0.7
  - Significance Level: **
  - Number of observations: 1,950: 762

### POVERTY INDICATORS

- **Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas**
  - Male and female adults: $1.64
  - Adult female, no adult male: $1.67
  - Adult male, no adult female: $2.76
  - Child, no adults: NA
  - Raw Difference: $0.09
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,065: 763

- **Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day**
  - Male and female adults: 48.0%
  - Adult female, no adult male: 42.9%
  - Adult male, no adult female: 12.9%
  - Child, no adults: NA
  - Raw Difference: 2.1
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,065: 763

### WASH INDICATORS

- **Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water**
  - Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas:
    - Male and female adults: 13.2%
    - Adult female, no adult male: 13.1%
    - Adult male, no adult female: 5.6%
    - Child, no adults: NA
    - Raw Difference: -0.1
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 2,417: 760

- **Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities**
  - Male and female adults: 22.3%
  - Adult female, no adult male: 16.7%
  - Adult male, no adult female: 5.6%
  - Child, no adults: NA
  - Raw Difference: 11.8
  - Significance Level: **
  - Number of observations: 2,006: 756

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

- **Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months**
  - Male: 6.9%
  - Female: 3.2%
  - Raw Difference: 16.8
  - Significance Level: **
  - Number of observations: 1,618: 742

- **Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months**
  - Male: 6.3%
  - Female: 3.2%
  - Raw Difference: 23.1
  - Significance Level: ***
  - Number of observations: 1,608: 742
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)**

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premature birth</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 23.6%  | 18.4%  | -5.1 | † | 1,471 | 491 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.6 | 5.1 | 1.5 | *** | 1,870 | 660 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 44.2%  | 38.5%  | -5.8 | * | 2,262 | 1,146 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 53.8%  | 51.8%  | -2.0 | NS | 2,214 | 1,139 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.3%  | 10.5%  | -6.8 | NS | 2,262 | 1,145 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.7%  | 21.2%  | 6.5 | ** | 3,090 | 1,160 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 76.8%  | 79.3%  | 2.5 | NS | 457   | 228  |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 36.1%  | 56.5%  | 20.5 | * | 297   | 91   |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.1%  | 28.9%  | 19.8 | *** | 785   | 305  |
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.6b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (FOOD)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6% 11.4%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,376 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7% 28.0%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,779 741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8% 30.5%</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,510 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0% 19.1%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>265 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9% 66.4%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>655 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9% 83.4%</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,282 591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2% 87.7%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,241 737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.19</td>
<td>-$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 19.9% | 19.3% | -0.6 | NS | 4,827 | 1,344 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.3 | 4.5 | 1.2 | *** | 6,050 | 1,777 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 47.3% | 43.4% | -3.9 | * | 7,849 | 3,366 |
| Male             | 48.2% | 42.7% | -5.5 | * | 3,977 | 1,704 |
| Female           | 46.4% | 44.2% | -2.2 | NS | 3,870 | 1,662 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 57.8% | 56.5% | -1.2 | NS | 7,688 | 3,338 |
| Male             | 59.2% | 59.4% | 0.2  | NS | 3,907 | 1,689 |
| Female           | 56.3% | 53.4% | -2.9 | NS | 3,781 | 1,649 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.4% | 12.7% | -4.7 | * | 7,849 | 3,362 |
| Male             | 19.1% | 14.2% | -4.9 | ** | 3,977 | 1,699 |
| Female           | 15.5% | 11.1% | -4.4 | ** | 3,870 | 1,663 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.4% | 21.7% | 7.2  | *** | 10,424 | 3,433 |
| Male             | 15.3% | 21.3% | 6.1  | ** | 5,294 | 1,742 |
| Female           | 13.5% | 22.0% | 8.6  | *** | 5,116 | 1,691 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 78.4% | 78.8% | 0.4  | NS | 1,524 | 666 |
| Male             | 78.4% | 82.4% | 4.0  | NS | 824   | 339   |
| Female           | 78.3% | 75.1% | -3.2 | NS | 699   | 327   |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 42.7% | 56.1% | 13.4 | * | 1,055 | 347 |
| Male             | 41.8% | 51.9% | 10.0 | †  | 543   | 171   |
| Female           | 43.5% | 61.1% | 17.6 | *  | 512   | 176   |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 8.2% | 22.0% | 13.9 | *** | 2,774 | 861 |
| Male             | 8.2% | 21.8% | 13.6 | *** | 1,438 | 454 |
| Female           | 8.2% | 22.3% | 14.2 | *** | 1,334 | 407 |
### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
[^2]: NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,040 732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,428 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,275 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>78 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,442 848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,439 854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,212 841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,797 844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,539 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>256 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,794 845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,398 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,139 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>129 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,382 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,125 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,382 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>-14.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,125 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,382 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,125 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300 348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,880 328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASAM TAI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 20.2% | 20.1% | -0.1 | NS | 1,621 | 241 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.4 | 4.5 | 1.1 | *** | 2,018 | 317 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 48.9% | 46.7% | -2.2 | NS | 2,482 | 601 |
| Male             | 50.4%    | 45.1%               | -5.3                   | NS | 1,242 | 315 |
| Female           | 47.3%    | 48.5%               | 1.2                    | NS | 1,239 | 286 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 59.5% | 60.4% | 0.8 | NS | 2,445 | 599 |
| Male             | 61.5%    | 63.5%               | 2.0                    | NS | 1,231 | 315 |
| Female           | 57.5%    | 56.9%               | -0.6                   | NS | 1,214 | 284 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.8% | 13.4% | -4.4 | * | 2,482 | 601 |
| Male             | 19.6%    | 15.3%               | -4.3                   | † | 1,242 | 312 |
| Female           | 15.8%    | 11.5%               | -4.4                   | † | 1,239 | 289 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.0% | 22.5% | 8.5 | ** | 3,140 | 627 |
| Male             | 15.1%    | 21.8%               | 6.7                    | † | 1,584 | 326 |
| Female           | 12.5%    | 23.2%               | 10.7                   | ** | 1,553 | 301 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 80.2% | 81.4% | 1.2 | NS | 416 | 136 |
| Male             | 80.8%    | 85.8%               | 5.0                    | NS | 231 | 70 |
| Female           | 79.5%    | 76.8%               | -2.7                   | NS | 185 | 66 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 44.3% | 55.5% | 11.1 | NS | 338 | 76 |
| Male             | 44.1%    | 51.3%               | 7.2                    | NS | 163 | 44 |
| Female           | 44.5%    | 60.9%               | 16.4                   | NS | 175 | 32 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.6% | 23.0% | 13.4 | ** | 887 | 157 |
| Male             | 10.2%    | 23.0%               | 12.7                   | * | 457 | 83 |
| Female           | 8.9%     | 23.0%               | 14.1                   | * | 430 | 74 |
### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA: Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevalence of Moderate or Severe Hunger (HHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Depth of Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Farmers Using Financial Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Farmers Practicing Value Chain Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline 22.3%</td>
<td>Endline 44.5%</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline 18.1%</td>
<td>Endline 29.7%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male Baseline 32.1%</td>
<td>Endline 83.6%</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 31.6%</td>
<td>Endline 90.1%</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 33.9%</td>
<td>Endline 62.5%</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 34.1%</td>
<td>Endline 59.9%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male Baseline 33.1%</td>
<td>Endline 64.9%</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 38.2%</td>
<td>Endline 43.6%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>Baseline 23.6%</td>
<td>Endline 18.8%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>Baseline 3.6</td>
<td>Endline 4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>Baseline 44.2%</td>
<td>Endline 38.8%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 43.6%</td>
<td>Endline 38.8%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 44.9%</td>
<td>Endline 38.8%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>Baseline 53.8%</td>
<td>Endline 51.3%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 54.5%</td>
<td>Endline 52.3%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 53.2%</td>
<td>Endline 50.4%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>Baseline 17.3%</td>
<td>Endline 11.0%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 18.4%</td>
<td>Endline 11.2%</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 16.2%</td>
<td>Endline 10.9%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>Baseline 14.7%</td>
<td>Endline 23.4%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 14.1%</td>
<td>Endline 23.4%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 15.4%</td>
<td>Endline 23.4%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>Baseline 76.6%</td>
<td>Endline 78.1%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 73.7%</td>
<td>Endline 81.7%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 79.3%</td>
<td>Endline 74.6%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>Baseline 36.1%</td>
<td>Endline 52.7%</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 34.7%</td>
<td>Endline 46.5%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 37.3%</td>
<td>Endline 57.6%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>Baseline 9.1%</td>
<td>Endline 28.0%</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Baseline 9.5%</td>
<td>Endline 25.8%</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Baseline 8.7%</td>
<td>Endline 30.3%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.

---

**Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs**

**SAWKI**
## FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,123 1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,970 1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,337 1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>352 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>276 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,860 1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,235 1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,860 1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,235 1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,860 1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,235 1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,310 1,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,309 1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,518 1,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,298 1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,562 1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>729 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,282 1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>All Programs Combined</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDMREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>All Programs Combined</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,688</td>
<td>2,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>1,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>2,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>1,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>10,424</td>
<td>2,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>1,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^1 \) Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

\( ^2 \) NS not significant, † \( p<0.1 \), * \( p<0.05 \), ** \( p<0.01 \), *** \( p<0.001 \)

NA: Not available

**NOTE:** Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>-14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.6d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 17.2% | 16.6% | -0.6 | NS | 1,735 | 481     |

| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 2.9 | 4.1 | 1.3 | *** | 2,162 | 620     |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</th>
<th>46.8%</th>
<th>39.5%</th>
<th>-7.3</th>
<th>***</th>
<th>3,105</th>
<th>1,263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
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### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PASAM TAI

#### Indicator Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 20.2% | 19.3% | -0.9 | NS | 1,621 | 173 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.4 | 4.6 | 1.2 | *** | 2,018 | 228 |

#### CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 48.9% | 51.3% | 2.4 | NS | 2,482 | 421 |
| Male             | 50.4%    | 48.7%   | -1.7 | NS | 1,242 | 221 |
| Female           | 47.3%    | 54.1%   | 6.8  | NS | 1,239 | 200 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 59.5% | 66.2% | 6.7 | † | 2,445 | 417 |
| Male             | 61.5%    | 67.3%   | 5.8  | NS | 1,231 | 220 |
| Female           | 57.5%    | 65.0%   | 7.5  | NS | 1,214 | 197 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.8% | 13.5% | -4.4 | * | 2,482 | 417 |
| Male             | 19.6%    | 15.4%   | -4.2 | NS | 1,242 | 216 |
| Female           | 15.8%    | 11.3%   | -4.5 | NS | 1,239 | 201 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.0% | 21.6% | 7.5 | * | 3,140 | 436 |
| Male             | 15.1%    | 20.8%   | 5.6  | NS | 1,584 | 226 |
| Female           | 12.5%    | 22.4%   | 9.9  | * | 1,553 | 210 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 80.2% | 82.9% | 2.6 | NS | 416 | 97 |
| Male             | 80.8%    | 84.2%   | 3.4  | NS | 231 | 50 |
| Female           | 79.5%    | 81.6%   | 2.0  | NS | 185 | 47 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 44.3% | 54.3% | 10.0 | NS | 338 | 51 |
| Male             | 44.1%    | 47.1%   | 3.0  | NS | 163 | 34 |
| Female           | 44.5%    | 0.0     | *** | 175 | 17 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.6% | 22.6% | 13.0 | * | 887 | 110 |
| Male             | 10.2%    | 23.7%   | 13.5 | NS | 457 | 52 |
| Female           | 8.9%     | 21.7%   | 12.7 | * | 430 | 58 |
### Table 6.6d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,950 636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,144 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,923 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>150 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>-$0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>-$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>-$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,411 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,417 704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,006 703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,618 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,363 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>251 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,608 691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference Recovery</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value Baseline</th>
<th>Value Endline</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value Baseline</th>
<th>Value Endline</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,123 1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,970 1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,337 1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>352 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>276 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,860 1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,235 1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
<td>-$0.50</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>277 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,860 1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,235 1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>277 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,860 1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,235 1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>345 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>277 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,310 1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,309 1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,518 1,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,298 1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,562 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>729 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,282 1,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level$^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 19.9% | 20.5% | 0.6 | NS | 4,827 | 795 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.3 | 4.7 | 1.4 | *** | 6,050 | 1,048 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 47.3% | 43.3% | -4.0 | * | 7,849 | 2,007 |
| Male | 48.2% | 42.2% | -6.0 | * | 3,977 | 1,027 |
| Female | 46.4% | 44.6% | -1.7 | NS | 3,870 | 980 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 57.8% | 57.7% | -0.1 | NS | 7,688 | 1,987 |
| Male | 59.2% | 59.9% | 0.7 | NS | 3,907 | 1,017 |
| Female | 56.3% | 55.1% | -1.2 | NS | 3,781 | 970 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.4% | 11.5% | -5.8 | *** | 7,849 | 1,995 |
| Male | 19.1% | 13.1% | -6.0 | *** | 3,977 | 1,016 |
| Female | 15.5% | 9.7% | -5.8 | *** | 3,870 | 979 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.4% | 21.0% | 6.5 | ** | 10,424 | 2,032 |
| Male | 15.3% | 21.6% | 6.3 | * | 5,294 | 1,045 |
| Female | 13.5% | 20.2% | 6.8 | ** | 5,116 | 987 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 78.4% | 82.3% | 3.9 | NS | 1,524 | 391 |
| Male | 78.4% | 83.5% | 5.1 | NS | 824 | 209 |
| Female | 78.3% | 80.9% | 2.5 | NS | 699 | 182 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 42.7% | 46.4% | 3.8 | NS | 1,055 | 199 |
| Male | 41.8% | 43.5% | 1.7 | NS | 543 | 101 |
| Female | 43.5% | 51.9% | 8.4 | NS | 512 | 98 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 8.2% | 25.9% | 17.7 | *** | 2,774 | 505 |
| Male | 8.2% | 24.1% | 15.9 | ** | 1,438 | 272 |
| Female | 8.2% | 27.9% | 19.7 | *** | 1,334 | 233 |
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,040 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,428 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,275 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>78 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,259 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,259 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,442 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,439 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,212 459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,797 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,539 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>256 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,794 459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)**

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference$^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level$^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference$^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level$^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight women</strong></td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference$^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level$^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</strong></td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</strong></td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</strong></td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</strong></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,441 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>649 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,610 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,840 448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,398 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,139 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>129 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,382 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,125 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,382 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,125 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,382 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,125 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>127 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,300 223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>222 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,880 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
<td>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)

**PASAM TAI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,443/228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,083/205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,844/165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>238/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>605/110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,483/191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,642/216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference ¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of observations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

## Table 6.6e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Direct Beneficiaries (OTHER)

### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td><em>(Endline-Baseline)</em></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</strong></th>
<th><strong>Baseline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Endline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Raw Difference</strong></th>
<th><strong>Significance Level</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of observations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>6,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</strong></th>
<th><strong>Baseline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Endline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Significance Level</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of observations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</strong></th>
<th><strong>Baseline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Endline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Significance Level</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of observations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance (^2) Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight women | | | |
| 19.9\% | 21.2\% | 1.3 | NS | 4,827 | 1,642 |

| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | *** | 6,050 | 2,226 |

**CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 47.3\% | 41.6\% | -5.7 | ** | 7,849 | 3,718 |
| Male | 48.2\% | 43.6\% | -4.5 | * | 3,977 | 1,876 |
| Female | 46.4\% | 39.5\% | -6.8 | ** | 3,870 | 1,842 |

| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 57.8\% | 52.4\% | -5.4 | ** | 7,688 | 3,670 |
| Male | 59.2\% | 54.9\% | -4.3 | † | 3,907 | 1,853 |
| Female | 56.3\% | 49.9\% | -6.4 | ** | 3,781 | 1,817 |

| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.4\% | 14.2\% | -3.2 | ** | 7,849 | 3,708 |
| Male | 19.1\% | 17.5\% | -1.6 | NS | 3,977 | 1,881 |
| Female | 15.5\% | 10.9\% | -4.6 | ** | 3,870 | 1,827 |

| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.4\% | 27.4\% | 13.0 | *** | 10,424 | 3,796 |
| Male | 15.3\% | 30.3\% | 15.1 | *** | 5,294 | 1,925 |
| Female | 13.5\% | 24.5\% | 11.1 | *** | 5,130 | 1,871 |

| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 78.4\% | 73.6\% | -4.8 | NS | 824 | 490 |
| Male | 78.4\% | 73.6\% | -4.8 | NS | 824 | 490 |
| Female | 78.3\% | 73.0\% | -5.4 | NS | 699 | 423 |

| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | | | |
| 42.7\% | 34.0\% | -8.7 | * | 1,055 | 386 |
| Male | 41.8\% | 30.9\% | -10.9 | * | 543 | 191 |
| Female | 43.5\% | 37.3\% | -6.2 | NS | 512 | 195 |

| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 8.2\% | 15.1\% | 6.9 | ** | 2,774 | 1,035 |
| Male | 8.2\% | 11.0\% | 2.8 | NS | 1,438 | 510 |
| Female | 8.2\% | 18.8\% | 10.7 | *** | 1,334 | 525 |
### Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

$^2$ NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>-23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>-23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.21</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>-$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 17.2% | 17.0% | -0.1 | NS | 1,735 | 410 |
| Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 2.9 | 3.8 | 0.9 | *** | 2,162 | 567 |

#### CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 46.8% | 36.3% | -10.5 | *** | 3,105 | 945 |
| Male | 47.6% | 39.4% | -8.2 | * | 1,582 | 490 |
| Female | 46.0% | 33.1% | -12.9 | *** | 1,523 | 455 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 57.6% | 49.9% | -7.7 | ** | 3,029 | 938 |
| Male | 58.6% | 53.9% | -4.7 | NS | 1,543 | 487 |
| Female | 56.5% | 45.6% | -10.9 | ** | 1,486 | 451 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 16.7% | 11.8% | -4.9 | ** | 3,105 | 943 |
| Male | 18.8% | 13.1% | -5.6 | ** | 1,582 | 492 |
| Female | 14.5% | 10.5% | -4.1 | † | 1,523 | 451 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.9% | 18.8% | 3.9 | NS | 4,194 | 930 |
| Male | 16.2% | 19.7% | 3.5 | NS | 2,148 | 488 |
| Female | 13.5% | 17.8% | 4.4 | NS | 2,044 | 442 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 76.9% | 70.8% | -6.1 | NS | 651 | 172 |
| Male | 77.6% | 76.3% | -1.3 | NS | 363 | 95 |
| Female | 76.0% | 64.1% | -11.9 | NS | 287 | 77 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 44.1% | 50.9% | 6.8 | NS | 420 | 112 |
| Male | 42.4% | 44.9% | 2.5 | NS | 225 | 53 |
| Female | 45.9% | 56.1% | 10.2 | NS | 195 | 59 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 5.4% | 12.9% | 7.5 | * | 1,102 | 242 |
| Male | 4.4% | 13.1% | 8.7 | † | 579 | 125 |
| Female | 6.6% | 12.7% | 6.1 | NS | 522 | 117 |
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,441 648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>649 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,610 533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,840 612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1," p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133 1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139 1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457 1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453 1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300 1,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883 1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,880 1,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 20.2% | 21.6% | 1.4 | NS | 1,621 | 806 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.4 | 4.0 | 0.6 | *** | 2,018 | 1,068 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 48.9% | 42.2% | -6.7 | ** | 2,482 | 1,829 |
| Male             | 50.4%    | 44.1%   | -6.3              | *   | 1,242  | 920  |
| Female           | 47.3%    | 40.2%   | -7.0              | *   | 1,239  | 909  |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 59.5% | 52.8% | -6.8 | ** | 2,445 | 1,806 |
| Male             | 61.5%    | 55.0%   | -6.5              | *   | 1,231  | 909  |
| Female           | 57.5%    | 50.6%   | -6.9              | **  | 1,214  | 897  |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.8% | 14.5% | -3.3 | *   | 2,482 | 1,831 |
| Male             | 19.6%    | 18.1%   | -1.5              | NS  | 1,242  | 927  |
| Female           | 15.8%    | 10.9%   | -4.9              | *   | 1,239  | 904  |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.0% | 28.4% | 14.4 | *** | 3,140 | 1,909 |
| Male             | 15.1%    | 31.7%   | 16.6              | *** | 1,584  | 959  |
| Female           | 12.5%    | 25.2%   | 12.7              | *** | 1,553  | 950  |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 80.2% | 73.3% | -6.9 | †   | 416   | 543  |
| Male             | 80.8%    | 73.3%   | -7.5              | †   | 231    | 296  |
| Female           | 79.5%    | 73.4%   | -6.2              | NS  | 185    | 247  |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 44.3% | 32.2% | -12.1 | *   | 338   | 199  |
| Male             | 44.1%    | 28.7%   | -15.4             | *   | 163    | 106  |
| Female           | 44.5%    | 36.0%   | -8.5              | NS  | 175    | 93   |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.6%  | 14.6% | 5.0 | †   | 887   | 532  |
| Male             | 10.2%    | 10.0%   | -0.2              | NS  | 457    | 260  |
| Female           | 8.9%     | 18.9%   | 9.9               | *   | 430    | 272  |

*Final Report - Summative Performance Evaluation of Niger FFP Projects*
**Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs**

**Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Line</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

<sup>2</sup> NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9 5.1 1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,950 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8% 25.8% 4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,144 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0% 27.6% 6.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,923 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0% 18.3% -13.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>150 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7% 19.9% 7.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64 $1.54 -$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63 $1.51 -$0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67 $1.54 -$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76 $2.19 -$0.57</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>70 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>47.3% 53.7% 6.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0% 55.4% 7.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,851 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9% 46.3% 3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9% 31.8% 19.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>70 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1 20.2 4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2 20.9 4.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,851 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7 18.4 1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6 9.2 3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,411 729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2% 11.7% -1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,417 734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6% 34.8% 12.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,006 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3% 10.8% 4.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,618 665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9% 10.5% 3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,363 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2% 12.1% 8.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>251 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.6% 37.4% 15.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,608 667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7a. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (ANY BENEFIT)

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</strong></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</strong></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</strong></td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</strong></td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</strong></td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

**NOTE:** Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>-$0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.06</td>
<td>-$0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- **Baseline** values refer to the start of the project.
- **Endline** values refer to the end of the project.
- **Raw Difference** indicates the difference between baseline and endline values.
- **Significance Level** indicates the level of significance of the change from baseline to endline, with ***, **, * indicating statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

**Sources:**

1. Final Report - Summative Performance Evaluation of Niger FFP Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.9% (Baseline)</td>
<td>21.4% (Endline)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.3 (Baseline)</td>
<td>4.1 (Endline)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>3,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>10,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

**All Programs Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>-22.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>-16.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.77</td>
<td>-$0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

- **Prevalence of underweight women**
  - Male: 17.2% | Female: 16.0%
  - Raw Difference: -1.2
  - Significance: NS
  - Number of observations: 1,735 | 476

- **Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)**
  - Male: 2.9 | Female: 3.8
  - Raw Difference: 1.0
  - Significance: ***
  - Number of observations: 2,162 | 650

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

- **Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)**
  - Male: 46.8% | Female: 47.6%
  - Raw Difference: -9.8
  - Significance: ***
  - Number of observations: 3,105 | 1,090

- **Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)**
  - Male: 57.6% | Female: 56.5%
  - Raw Difference: -6.9
  - Significance: **
  - Number of observations: 3,029 | 1,082

- **Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)**
  - Male: 58.6% | Female: 56.5%
  - Raw Difference: -10.2
  - Significance: **
  - Number of observations: 1,486 | 527

- **Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)**
  - Male: 14.5% | Female: 18.8%
  - Raw Difference: -4.9
  - Significance: NS
  - Number of observations: 4,194 | 1,079

- **Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)**
  - Male: 13.5% | Female: 15.4%
  - Raw Difference: 1.0
  - Significance: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,044 | 524

- **Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age**
  - Male: 44.1% | Female: 42.4%
  - Raw Difference: 8.7
  - Significance: NS
  - Number of observations: 420 | 126

- **Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)**
  - Male: 5.4% | Female: 4.4%
  - Raw Difference: 1.0
  - Significance: NS
  - Number of observations: 1,102 | 283

- **Percentage of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)**
  - Male: 6.6% | Female: 6.6%
  - Raw Difference: 0.0
  - Significance: NS
  - Number of observations: 522 | 139
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133 1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,398 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457 1,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453 1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300 1,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883 1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,880 1,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7% 63.1%</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1% 70.9%</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.2% 45.6%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0% 45.0%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.3% 51.4%</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5% 30.6%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight women | 20.2% 22.1% | 1.9 | NS | 1,621 969 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.4 4.1 | 0.7 | *** | 2,018 1,280 |

**CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 48.9% 43.0% | -5.9 | * | 2,482 2,214 |
| Male             | 50.4% 44.9% | -5.5 | † | 1,242 1,119 |
| Female           | 47.3% 41.0% | -6.2 | * | 1,239 1,095 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 59.5% 53.9% | -5.6 | ** | 2,445 2,190 |
| Male             | 61.5% 56.0% | -5.5 | * | 1,231 1,108 |
| Female           | 57.5% 51.8% | -5.7 | * | 1,214 1,082 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.8% 14.8% | -3.0 | † | 2,482 2,218 |
| Male             | 19.6% 18.0% | -1.6 | NS | 1,242 1,126 |
| Female           | 15.8% 11.6% | -4.3 | * | 1,239 1,092 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.0% 28.4% | 14.4 | *** | 3,140 2,305 |
| Male             | 15.1% 30.9% | 15.8 | *** | 1,584 1,165 |
| Female           | 12.5% 25.8% | 13.3 | *** | 1,553 1,140 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 80.2% 75.6% | -4.7 | NS | 416 652 |
| Male             | 80.8% 75.4% | -5.4 | NS | 231 350 |
| Female           | 79.5% 75.8% | -3.8 | NS | 185 302 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 44.3% 35.9% | -8.5 | NS | 338 249 |
| Male             | 44.1% 33.5% | -10.6 | NS | 163 137 |
| Female           | 44.5% 38.7% | -5.8 | NS | 175 112 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.6% 15.9% | 6.3 | * | 887 627 |
| Male             | 10.2% 11.8% | 1.5 | NS | 457 307 |
| Female           | 8.9% 19.8% | 10.9 | ** | 430 320 |
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)**

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

**NOTE:** Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,950 887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,144 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,923 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>150 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>69 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
<td>-$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,065 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>-$0.14</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,851 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>-$0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.22</td>
<td>-$0.54</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>70 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>2,065 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,851 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>70 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,065 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,851 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>143 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>70 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,411 980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,417 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,006 976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,618 901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,363 677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>251 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,608 903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

#### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$ ((\text{Endline-Baseline}))</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 22.3%</td>
<td>Endline: 38.8%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 18.1%</td>
<td>Endline: 29.9%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 31.6%</td>
<td>Endline: 69.9%</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 33.9%</td>
<td>Endline: 50.1%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 33.1%</td>
<td>Endline: 55.2%</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 38.2%</td>
<td>Endline: 42.3%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 43.6%</td>
<td>Endline: 40.5%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 44.9%</td>
<td>Endline: 36.9%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 54.5%</td>
<td>Endline: 54.0%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 53.2%</td>
<td>Endline: 45.5%</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 18.4%</td>
<td>Endline: 13.1%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 16.2%</td>
<td>Endline: 11.6%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 14.1%</td>
<td>Endline: 23.3%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 15.4%</td>
<td>Endline: 21.8%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 73.7%</td>
<td>Endline: 79.1%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 79.3%</td>
<td>Endline: 72.1%</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 34.7%</td>
<td>Endline: 50.3%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 37.3%</td>
<td>Endline: 40.2%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baseline: 9.5%</td>
<td>Endline: 21.9%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline: 8.7%</td>
<td>Endline: 22.4%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7b. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (FOOD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

<sup>2</sup> NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,123 2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,970 3,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,337 2,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>352 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>276 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860 3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,235 2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>-$0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>-$0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860 3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,235 2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>6,860 3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,235 2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,310 3,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,309 3,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,518 3,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,298 3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,562 2,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>729 722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,282 3,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Programs Combined</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 19.9% | 21.1% | 1.3 | NS | 4,827 | 2,059 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.3 | 4.1 | 0.8 | *** | 6,050 | 2,770 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 47.3% | 41.8% | -5.5 | ** | 7,849 | 4,670 |
| Male | 48.2% | 44.1% | -4.1 | †  | 3,977 | 2,337 |
| Female | 46.4% | 39.5% | -6.8 | ** | 3,870 | 2,333 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 57.8% | 52.9% | -4.8 | ** | 7,688 | 4,611 |
| Male | 59.2% | 55.7% | -3.5 | †  | 3,907 | 2,311 |
| Female | 56.3% | 50.2% | -6.1 | ** | 3,781 | 2,300 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.4% | 14.3% | -3.1 | ** | 7,849 | 4,666 |
| Male | 19.1% | 17.5% | -1.6 | NS | 3,977 | 2,344 |
| Female | 15.5% | 11.1% | -4.5 | ** | 3,870 | 2,322 |
| Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.4% | 27.2% | 12.7 | *** | 10,424 | 4,765 |
| Male | 15.3% | 30.1% | 14.8 | *** | 5,294 | 2,399 |
| Female | 13.5% | 24.3% | 10.9 | *** | 5,116 | 2,366 |
| Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 78.4% | 75.0% | -3.4 | NS | 1,524 | 1,106 |
| Male | 78.4% | 75.1% | -3.3 | NS | 824 | 597 |
| Female | 78.3% | 74.8% | -3.5 | NS | 699 | 509 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 42.7% | 35.5% | -7.1 | †  | 1,055 | 484 |
| Male | 41.8% | 32.9% | -9.0 | †  | 543 | 239 |
| Female | 43.5% | 38.5% | -5.0 | NS | 512 | 245 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 8.2% | 15.4% | 7.2 | *** | 2,774 | 1,286 |
| Male | 8.2% | 11.6% | 3.3 | NS | 1,438 | 636 |
| Female | 8.2% | 18.8% | 10.7 | *** | 1,334 | 650 |
### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)  
#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1% 8.0%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,260 3,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4% 21.9%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,098 3,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3% 26.2%</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,277 2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7% 11.3%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>814 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1% 60.5%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,909 1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5% 78.2%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,375 2,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3% 83.2%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,723 3,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.  
\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001  
NA : Not available  
NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference $^1$</th>
<th>Significance Level $^2$</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>-21.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-21.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>-15.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
<td>-$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

#### LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>14.2% - 8.2% = 6.0%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,441 - 890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>35.2% - 13.5% = 21.7%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236 - 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.7% - 14.4% = 22.3%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923 - 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.2% - 9.6% = 19.6%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311 - 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>69.3% - 65.9% = 3.4%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>649 - 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.7% - 76.7% = 5.0%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,610 - 731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>87.1% - 84.9% = 2.2%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,840 - 846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>-$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>-$0.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>-$0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Raw Difference: Endline - Baseline

<sup>2</sup> Significance Level: *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05, NS = Not Significant
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### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASAM TAI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7% 63.3%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0% 45.0%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.2% 21.8%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4 4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>48.9% 42.6%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.5% 53.4%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.8% 14.8%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0% 28.6%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2% 74.9%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.3% 33.1%</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.6% 15.0%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL REPORT - SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF NIGER FFP PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs
### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA: Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

- **Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)**
  - Baseline: 3.9
  - Endline: 5.2
  - Raw Difference: 1.3
  - Significance Level: ***
  - Number of observations: 1,950

- **Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)**
  - Baseline: 21.8%
  - Endline: 25.4%
  - Raw Difference: 3.6
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,144

  - **Male and female adults**
    - Baseline: 21.0%
    - Endline: 27.1%
    - Raw Difference: 6.2
    - Significance Level: †
    - Number of observations: 1,923

  - **Adult female, no adult male**
    - Baseline: 32.0%
    - Endline: 18.0%
    - Raw Difference: -14.0
    - Significance Level: *
    - Number of observations: 150

  - **Adult male, no adult female**
    - Baseline: 12.7%
    - Endline: 18.4%
    - Raw Difference: 5.7
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 69

- **Child, no adults**
  - Baseline: NA
  - Endline: NA
  - Raw Difference: NA
  - Number of observations: 2

### POVERTY INDICATORS

- **Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas**
  - Baseline: $1.64
  - Endline: $1.54
  - Raw Difference: -$0.10
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,065

  - **Male and female adults**
    - Baseline: $1.63
    - Endline: $1.51
    - Raw Difference: -$0.12
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 1,851

  - **Adult female, no adult male**
    - Baseline: $1.67
    - Endline: $1.51
    - Raw Difference: -$0.16
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 143

  - **Adult male, no adult female**
    - Baseline: $2.76
    - Endline: $2.29
    - Raw Difference: -$0.47
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 70

  - **Child, no adults**
    - Baseline: NA
    - Endline: NA
    - Raw Difference: NA
    - Number of observations: 1

- **Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day**
  - Baseline: 47.3%
  - Endline: 53.2%
  - Raw Difference: 6.0
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,065

  - **Male and female adults**
    - Baseline: 48.0%
    - Endline: 54.7%
    - Raw Difference: 6.7
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 1,851

  - **Adult female, no adult male**
    - Baseline: 42.9%
    - Endline: 48.3%
    - Raw Difference: 5.3
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 143

  - **Adult male, no adult female**
    - Baseline: 12.9%
    - Endline: 26.0%
    - Raw Difference: 13.1
    - Significance Level: †
    - Number of observations: 70

  - **Child, no adults**
    - Baseline: NA
    - Endline: NA
    - Raw Difference: NA
    - Number of observations: 1

- **Mean depth of poverty**
  - Baseline: 16.1
  - Endline: 19.2
  - Raw Difference: 3.0
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,065

  - **Male and female adults**
    - Baseline: 16.2
    - Endline: 19.6
    - Raw Difference: 3.3
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 1,851

  - **Adult female, no adult male**
    - Baseline: 16.7
    - Endline: 20.1
    - Raw Difference: 3.4
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 143

  - **Adult male, no adult female**
    - Baseline: 5.6
    - Endline: 7.5
    - Raw Difference: 2.0
    - Significance Level: NS
    - Number of observations: 70

  - **Child, no adults**
    - Baseline: NA
    - Endline: NA
    - Raw Difference: NA
    - Number of observations: 1

### WASH INDICATORS

- **Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water**
  - Baseline: NA
  - Endline: NA
  - Raw Difference: NA
  - Number of observations: 2,411

- **Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities**
  - Baseline: 13.2%
  - Endline: 12.5%
  - Raw Difference: -0.7
  - Significance Level: NS
  - Number of observations: 2,417

- **Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members**
  - Baseline: 22.6%
  - Endline: 36.2%
  - Raw Difference: 13.6
  - Significance Level: **
  - Number of observations: 2,006

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

- **Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months**
  - Baseline: 6.3%
  - Endline: 12.3%
  - Raw Difference: 6.1
  - Significance Level: **
  - Number of observations: 1,618

  - **Male**
    - Baseline: 6.9%
    - Endline: 12.6%
    - Raw Difference: 5.7
    - Significance Level: *
    - Number of observations: 1,363

  - **Female**
    - Baseline: 3.2%
    - Endline: 11.3%
    - Raw Difference: 8.1
    - Significance Level: *
    - Number of observations: 251

- **Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months**
  - Baseline: 21.6%
  - Endline: 39.6%
  - Raw Difference: 18.0
  - Significance Level: ***
  - Number of observations: 1,608
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months**
  - Male: 32.1% to 65.3%, Significance Level: ***, Number of observations: 1,768/913
  - Female: 33.9% to 52.4%, Significance Level: *, Number of observations: 263/218

- **Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months**
  - Male: 34.1% to 52.8%, Significance Level: ***, Number of observations: 1,779/913
  - Female: 33.1% to 54.4%, Significance Level: **, Number of observations: 265/218

**WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.6% to 18.0%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.6 to 4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>44.2% to 38.4%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>53.8% to 50.0%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.3% to 11.9%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.7% to 20.7%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.6% to 76.5%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>36.1% to 47.2%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.1% to 23.1%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7c. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (NUTRITION)

**SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6% 14.6%</td>
<td>8.0 ***</td>
<td>2,376 992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7% 18.7%</td>
<td>9.0 ***</td>
<td>1,779 912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8% 20.4%</td>
<td>11.6 ***</td>
<td>1,510 695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0% 12.5%</td>
<td>-0.5 NS</td>
<td>265 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9% 62.4%</td>
<td>21.5 ***</td>
<td>655 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9% 73.4%</td>
<td>20.4 ***</td>
<td>1,282 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2% 79.3%</td>
<td>6.1 NS</td>
<td>1,241 935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,123 3,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,970 3,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,337 3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>352 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>276 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860 3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,235 3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>-$0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>-$0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860 3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>6,235 3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,860 3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,235 3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,310 3,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,309 3,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,518 3,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,298 3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4,562 2,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>729 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5,282 3,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,040, 873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>-21.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,428, 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>-21.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,275, 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>75, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>78, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413, 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,259, 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$0.38</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>75, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>79, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413, 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,259, 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>-26.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>79, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,413, 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,259, 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>79, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,442, 1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,439, 1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,212, 1,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,797, 1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,539, 833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>256, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,794, 1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
<td>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Significance Level²</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAHIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.0% 36.0%</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,536 836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5% 34.2%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>256 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.6% 55.8%</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,212 1,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.8% 58.1%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,902 836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.2% 57.4%</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236 1,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.5% 60.8%</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923 836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.2% 17.4%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,735 692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.9 3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,162 945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.8% 35.6%</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105 1,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.6% 37.6%</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,582 857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.0% 33.5%</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,523 818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6% 48.8%</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,029 1,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.6% 52.6%</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,543 853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.5% 44.9%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,486 810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7% 11.0%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105 1,679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8% 12.1%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,582 861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5% 9.9%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,523 818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9% 18.7%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>4,194 1,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.2% 19.7%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,148 867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.5% 17.6%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,044 811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.9% 73.4%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>651 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.6% 77.0%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>363 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0% 69.2%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>287 144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1% 52.0%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>421 191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4% 46.7%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>225 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.9% 56.9%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>195 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4% 12.3%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,102 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.4% 13.0%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>579 226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.6% 11.7%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>522 209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

\(^2\) NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA: Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133 1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,398 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>-$0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.07</td>
<td>-$0.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125 1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457 1,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453 1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300 1,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (^1) (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level (^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883 1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,880 1,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PASAM TAI

#### Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>-$0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>-$0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>-$0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>-$0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs  
## Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

### SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 23.6% | 18.2% | -5.4 | † | 1,471 | 632 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 3.6 | 4.5 | 0.9 | *** | 1,870 | 857 |

### CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total) | 44.2% | 38.2% | -6.0 | ** | 2,262 | 1,378 |
| Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 53.8% | 49.7% | -4.1 | † | 2,214 | 1,354 |
| Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total) | 17.3% | 11.8% | -5.5 | *** | 2,262 | 1,366 |
| Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total) | 14.7% | 21.4% | 6.6 | ** | 3,090 | 1,406 |
| Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 76.6% | 76.2% | -0.4 | NS | 457 | 288 |
| Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age | 36.1% | 47.9% | 11.8 | NS | 297 | 111 |
| Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) | 9.1% | 21.8% | 12.7 | *** | 785 | 383 |
| Prevalence of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 73.7% | 81.0% | 7.4 | NS | 230 | 146 |
| Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total) | 79.3% | 71.1% | -8.2 | NS | 227 | 142 |

---

**Note:**<sup>1</sup> Raw difference indicates the change from baseline to endline. <sup>2</sup> Significance levels: **p < 0.01**, ***p < 0.001**, *p < 0.05*, †p < 0.1.
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7d. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (AGRICULTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations Baseline</th>
<th>Number of observations Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

<sup>2</sup> NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

**NOTE:** Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS

Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>6,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male and female adults</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult female, no adult male</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult male, no adult female</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child, no adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POVERTY INDICATORS

Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male and female adults</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>4,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult male, no adult female</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.33</td>
<td>$2.16</td>
<td>-$0.17</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child, no adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male and female adults</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>3,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult male, no adult female</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child, no adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean depth of poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male and female adults</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>3,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult male, no adult female</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child, no adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WASH INDICATORS

Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>4,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>4,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

#### All Programs Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</th>
<th>POVERTY INDICATORS</th>
<th>WASH INDICATORS</th>
<th>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-20.6</td>
<td>-20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>-20.9</td>
<td>-20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>-$0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,536, 1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>256, 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,212, 1,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHIA</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923, 1,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,735, 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,162, 1,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,105, 2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,466, 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,582, 1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,494, 1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,494, 1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>420, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,102, 520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project-Specific Indicators

### Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
2. NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
3. NA : Not available

**NOTE:** Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Food Security Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>-$0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.17</td>
<td>-$0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASH Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agricultural Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Significance Level&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference(^1) ((Endline-Baseline))</th>
<th>Significance Level(^2)</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASAM TAI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Report - Summative Performance Evaluation of Niger FFP Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

**Table 6.7e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)**

## PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.

² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

**NOTE:** Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.7e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAWKI</th>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>(Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POVERTY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG-assisted areas</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>-$0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>-$0.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>-$0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>-$0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean depth of poverty</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Values</td>
<td>Raw Difference(^1) (Endline-Baseline)</td>
<td>Significance Level(^2)</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td><strong>SAWKI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.3% 38.9%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td><strong>1,355 884</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.1% 37.9%</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td><strong>249 282</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>32.1% 68.6%</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,768 1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.6% 72.8%</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>*** 1,501 884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.9% 54.1%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>* 263 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>34.1% 53.4%</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,779 1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.1% 56.3%</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>*** 1,510 884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.2% 43.8%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>NS 265 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.6% 18.6%</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>1,471 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.6 4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,870 1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>44.2% 37.8%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,262 1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.6% 39.2%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>NS 1,153 816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.9% 36.4%</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>** 1,108 837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>53.8% 50.3%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2,214 1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.5% 53.3%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>NS 1,133 804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.2% 47.4%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>* 1,081 825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.3% 11.8%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,262 1,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.4% 12.6%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>* 1,153 811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2% 11.0%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>** 1,108 831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.7% 21.3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3,090 1,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.1% 22.2%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>** 1,562 841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.4% 20.4%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>* 1,519 831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>76.6% 78.1%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>457 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.7% 80.6%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NS 230 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79.3% 75.3%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>NS 227 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>36.1% 47.7%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>297 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.7% 50.3%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>† 155 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.3% 45.6%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>NS 142 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>9.1% 22.9%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>785 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.5% 22.3%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>** 402 218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.7% 23.5%</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>*** 382 229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.7e. Change from Baseline to Endline for Indirect Beneficiaries (OTHER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Values</th>
<th>Raw Difference¹ (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Raw change is calculated as endline result minus baseline result.
² NS not significant, † p<0.1, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
NA: Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.8a. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by Baseline Household Poverty Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.8a. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by Baseline Household Poverty Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</strong></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</strong></td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</strong></td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</strong></td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</strong></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. On or above the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is on or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
2. Below the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
3. NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.8b. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by Baseline Household Poverty Status

#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>995 1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,128 1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>960 1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>65 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>101 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASH INDICATORS</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,128 1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,089 1,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>861 1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>768 892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>92 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>860 1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>767 890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>92 130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>729 891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>910 1,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>958 1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>478 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>480 756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>946 1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>477 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On or above the poverty line</td>
<td>Below the poverty line</td>
<td>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On or above the poverty line2</td>
<td>Below the poverty line2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On or above the poverty line2</td>
<td>Below the poverty line2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. On or above the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is on or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
2. Below the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
3. NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Table 6.8c. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by Baseline Household Poverty Status

### Sawki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>-22.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.8c. Comparison of Baseline Indicator Estimates by Baseline Household Poverty Status

**Sawiki**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Difference</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under 6 months of age</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (On or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 On or above the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is on or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 Below the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

3 NS not significant, p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>-26.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.9a. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates by Endline Household Poverty Status

**LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line¹</th>
<th>Below the poverty line²</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level ³</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line¹</th>
<th>Below the poverty line²</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level ³</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ At or above the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is at or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

² Below the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

³ NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs
### Table 6.9b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates by Endline Household Poverty Status
#### PASAM TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.9b. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates by Endline Household Poverty Status

**PASAM TAI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At or above the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is at or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
2. Below the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
3. NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
# Table 6.9c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates by Endline Household Poverty Status

**Sawki**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>-22.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>-29.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.9c. Comparison of Endline Indicator Estimates by Endline Household Poverty Status

**Sawki**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>2,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>2,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>-33.7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diet (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Raw Difference (At or above the poverty line - Below the poverty line)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>At or above the poverty line</th>
<th>Below the poverty line</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwashing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of micro-nutrient</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health services is important to children under five and for women of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At or above the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is at or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
2. Below the poverty line households are defined as households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.
3. NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.10a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline (%)</th>
<th>Endline (%)</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,462 838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,716 1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,634 955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>51 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>31 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,716 1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,570 1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,270 992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,074 794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>194 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,268 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,072 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>194 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,571 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,336 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>233 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,586 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,349 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>235 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,277 711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,570 937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,445 1,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,246 983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,199 966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,395 1,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,218 976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.10a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>3,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under six months of age</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-specific indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The poor are defined as households or individuals living in households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 NS not significant, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.10b. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,094 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,162 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>62 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>27 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,251 859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,210 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,022 753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>892 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>130 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,020 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>890 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>130 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,114 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>975 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>139 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,122 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>982 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>140 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>891 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,103 772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,517 1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>761 774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>756 759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,494 1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>751 769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.10b. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for the Poor

#### PASAM-TAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The poor are defined as households or individuals living in households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 NS not significant, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.10c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for the Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawki</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>820 672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>960 734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>891 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>-11.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>55 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>13 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>958 737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>923 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>766 689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>639 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>127 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>759 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>633 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>126 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>841 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>710 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>131 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>845 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>712 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>133 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>685 480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>831 636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,102 1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>591 634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>511 642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,079 1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>581 627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.10c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for the Poor

#### Sawki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The poor are defined as households or individuals living in households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is below $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 NS not significant, p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.11a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for Households and Individuals At or Above the Poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAHIA</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline -Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>563 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>-19.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>690 729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>-19.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>619 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>24 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>-20.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>47 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>694 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>634 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>522 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>460 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>62 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>521 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>459 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>62 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>634 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>559 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>75 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>643 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>567 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>76 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>453 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>582 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>650 1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>330 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>320 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>624 1,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.11a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for Households and Individuals At or Above the Poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diet (MAD)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This includes households or individuals living in households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is at or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children’s anthropometry and women’s underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.11b. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for Households and Individuals At or Above the Poverty line</th>
<th>PASAM TAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight women</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.11b. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for Households and Individuals At or Above the Poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline - Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASAM TAI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>477/569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>469/562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>958/1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>478/578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>480/568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,180/1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>586/604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>594/596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>169/332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>98/177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>71/155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>133/139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>62/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>71/64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>332/314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>173/158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>159/156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,129/919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>961/839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>862/642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>98/197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>274/391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>674/729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>749/864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This includes households or individuals living in households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is at or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
## Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

### Table 6.11c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for Households and Individuals At or Above the Poverty line

#### Sawki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD SECURITY INDICATORS</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline -Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>932 918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,098 1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female adults</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>956 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult female, no adult male</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>-11.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>87 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult male, no adult female</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>55 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, no adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A 5 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WASH INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of households using an improved source of drinking water</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households using improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,097 1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,065 1,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AGRICULTURAL INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of farmers who used financial services in the past 12 months</th>
<th>6.3%</th>
<th>16.7%</th>
<th>10.4</th>
<th>***</th>
<th>844 967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>719 738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>121 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who practiced value chain activities promoted by the project in the past 12 months</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>841 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>717 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>120 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used three sustainable agricultural practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>919 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>786 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>129 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers who used improved storage practices in the past 12 months</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>926 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>793 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>129 229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

| Prevalence of underweight women | 23.3% | 17.7% | -5.6 | ns | 697 598 |
| Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) | 4.0 | 5.4 | 1.4 | *** | 889 831 |

#### CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND NUTRITION INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age (Total)</th>
<th>43.2%</th>
<th>36.2%</th>
<th>-6.9</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>985 1,149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>473 572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>512 577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>968 1,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>466 562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

## Table 6.11c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Indicator Estimates for Households and Individuals At or Above the Poverty line

### Sawiki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline -Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age (Total)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea in the last two weeks (Total)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of children under age 5 with diarrhea treated with ORT (Total)</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children 6-23 months of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Specifc Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline -Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who know three of five critical moments for handwashing</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farmers who used at least one improved variety of macro-nutrient dense foods in the most recent season (Total)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of births within the last 24 months receiving at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT MALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of ADULT FEMALES that can give at least two reasons why access to health services is important to children under five and for women of child bearing age, including adolescent girls</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This includes households or individuals living in households with a daily per capita consumption expenditure that is at or above $1.25 in constant 2010 USD.

2 NS not significant, † p<0.1,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available

NOTE: Children's anthropometry and women's underweight indicators at baseline were recalculated using current DHS methodology which resulted in very small changes in the baseline estimates.
### Table 6.12a. Comparison of Women’s Dietary Diversity Score between Pregnant and Lactating Women and Non-Pregnant and Non-Lactating Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Pregnant and Non-Lactating Women</th>
<th>Pregnant and non-Lactating Women (PLWs)</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Non-PLWs - PLWs)</th>
<th>Significance Level ²</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pregnant and lactating women are defined as women who reported being pregnant at the time of the survey or women who had a birth in the last 24 months.

² NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
Table 6.12b. Comparison of Women's Dietary Diversity Score between Pregnant and Lactating Women and Non-Pregnant and Non-Lactating Women¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Pregnant and Non-Lactating Women (Non-PLWs)</th>
<th>Pregnant and non-Lactating Women (PLWs)</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Non-PLWs - PLWs)</th>
<th>Significance Level ²</th>
<th>Number of observations Non-PLWs</th>
<th>Number of observations PLWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pregnant and lactating women are defined as women who reported being pregnant at the time of the survey or women who had a birth in the last 24 months.

² NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.12c. Comparison of Women’s Dietary Diversity Score between Pregnant and Lactating Women and Non-Pregnant and Non-Lactating Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawki</th>
<th>1 Non-Pregnant and Non-Lactating Women</th>
<th>Pregnant and non-Lactating Women (PLWs)</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Non-PLWs - PLWs)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pregnant and lactating women are defined as women who reported being pregnant at the time of the survey or women who had a birth in the last 24 months.

2. NS not significant,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### Table 6.13a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Estimates of Women’s Dietary Diversity Score for Pregnant and Lactating Women (PLWs) and Non-PLWs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLWs</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PLWs</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) are defined as women who reported being pregnant at the time of the survey or who have children under 2.

2. NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA: Not available
### Table 6.13b. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Estimates of Women’s Dietary Diversity Score for Pregnant and Lactating Women (PLWs) and Non-PLWs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PLWs</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) are defined as women who reported being pregnant at the time of the survey or who have children under 2.

2. NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### Table 6.13c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Estimates of Women's Dietary Diversity Score for Pregnant and Lactating Women (PLWs) and Non-PLWs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level ¹</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWs</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PLWs</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) are defined as women who reported being pregnant at the time of the survey or who have children under 2.

² NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
## Table 6.14a. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Estimates of Children’s Malnutrition Indicators for Select Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of stunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children over 2</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>-10.0**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,029 2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 2</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>-7.0**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,248 1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of wasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 2</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>-7.9***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,362 1,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) NS not significant, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of stunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children over 2</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 2</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of wasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 2</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ NS not significant,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

NA : Not available
### Niger FY 2012 FFP Development Food Assistance Programs

#### Table 6.14c. Comparison of Baseline and Endline Estimates of Children’s Malnutrition Indicators for Select Age Groups

**Sawki**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Raw Difference (Endline-Baseline)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of stunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children over 2</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 2</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of wasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 2</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS not significant,* *p<0.05,* **p<0.01,* ***p<0.001

NA: Not available
### Table 15a. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Household Sanitation and Drinking Water

Niger Development Food Assistance Program - **Combined Project Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved, not shared sanitation facility</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved, shared sanitation facility</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-improved sanitation facility</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush to somewhere else</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush, don't know where</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without slab/Open pit</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket toilet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging toilet/hanging latrine</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility (open defecation)</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved source of drinking water</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into dwelling</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into yard/plot</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap/Standpipe</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube well or borehole</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected spring</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-improved source of drinking water</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface water (river/dam/lake/ponds)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/stream/canal/irrigation channel</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected spring</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker truck</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart with small tank</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled water</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water treatment prior to drinking</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boil</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleach/chlorine added</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain through a cloth</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar disinfection</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it stand and settle</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purification with vegetables (grapes, grains, bark, ashes)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NR</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>-24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of households                          | 7,309         | 5,318        |      |
### Table 15b. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Household Sanitation and Drinking Water
FY 2012 Niger Development Food Assistance Program - LAHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved, not shared sanitation facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved, shared sanitation facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-improved sanitation facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to somewhere else</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush, don’t know where</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without slab/Open pit</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket toilet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging toilet/hanging latrine</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility (open defeca</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved source of drinking water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into dwelling</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into yard/plot</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap/Standpipe</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube well or borehole</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected spring</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-improved source of drinking water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water (river/dam/lake/ponds/stream/canal/irrigation channel)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected spring</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker truck</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart with small tank</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled water</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water treatment prior to drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boil</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleach/chlorine added</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain through a cloth</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar disinfection</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it stand and settle</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purification with vegetables (grapes, grains, bark, ashes)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NR</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of households</strong></td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15c. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Household Sanitation and Drinking Water

**FY 2012 Niger Development Food Assistance Program - PASAM TAI**

#### 2013 Baseline 2017 Endline DIFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved, not shared sanitation facility</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved, shared sanitation facility</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-improved sanitation facility</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush to somewhere else</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush, don’t know where</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without slab/Open pit</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket toilet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging toilet/hanging latrine</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility (open defecation)</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved source of drinking water</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into dwelling</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into yard/plot</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap/Standpipe</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube well or borehole</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected spring</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-improved source of drinking water</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface water (river/dam/ lake/ponds)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/stream/canal/irrigation channel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected spring</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker truck</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart with small tank</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled water</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water treatment prior to drinking</th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boil</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleach/chlorine added</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain through a cloth</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar disinfection</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it stand and settle</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purification with vegetables (grapes, grains, bark, ashes)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NR</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>-23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of households                   | 2,453         | 1,779        |      |
### Table 15d. Comparison of Baseline and End-line Household Sanitation and Drinking Water

#### FY 2012 Niger Development Food Assistance Program - SAWKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Baseline</th>
<th>2017 Endline</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved, not shared sanitation facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved, shared sanitation facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to piped sewer system</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to septic tank</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to pit latrine</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilated improved latrine</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with slab</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosan Latrine</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-improved sanitation facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush to somewhere else</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush, don’t know where</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without slab/Open pit</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket toilet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging toilet/hanging latrine</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility (open defecation)</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved source of drinking water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into dwelling</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into yard/plot</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap/Standpipe</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube well or borehole</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected spring</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-improved source of drinking water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water (river/dam/lake/ponds/stream/canal/irrigation channel)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected spring</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker truck</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart with small tank</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled water</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water treatment prior to drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boil</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleach/chlorine added</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain through a cloth</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar disinfection</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it stand and settle</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purification with vegetables (grapes, grains, bark, ashes)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NR</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of households | 2,417 | 1,772 |
VII. QUALITATIVE FIELDWORK: COMMUNITY PROFILES SUMMARIES BY PROJECT

Each evaluation team conducted a community profile survey (CPS) in the form of a semi-structured questionnaire, administered by a subject matter expert (SME) from each team. The survey was carried out as a small group of key informant interviews (KIIs) with community elders and leaders upon arrival in each community. Participation generally involved three-to-five village leaders, most often including the village chief. Sessions were conducted on average for 45 – 60 minutes and were designed to provide contextual information on each community to complement the KII and group discussion (GD) field data and to serve as a reference point to cross-check for consistency with information obtained from the field instruments.

The profiles provide key characteristics of each community, including:
- Ethnic composition;
- Demographic features, including patterns of seasonal and long-term migration;
- Agro-ecological features and livelihood strategies, including recent changes;
- Infrastructural features, including distance to schools, health services, and markets;
- Common environmental shocks and stresses and impacts on the population;
- Inventory of DFSA activities and beneficiary selection by sector activity;
- Recent five-year history of external development assistance in each community, including vertical linkages and service provision by government, civil society, bi-/multi-lateral donor, and private sector stakeholders;
- List of community development needs and priorities.

Data summaries for each DFSA are presented below in graph and table format. The most salient findings and observations across the 28 communities sampled in the three DFSA target zones include:

- Village Size – average of 2,370 inhabitants per community, with a range from 906 to 7,000 inhabitants; average community size per DFSA is 2,515 in PASAM-TAI, 2,015 in LAHIA, and 2,506 in Sawki; (Figures 1 – 3)
- Ethnic Composition – overwhelmingly Hausa across the three zones; 84 percent in PASAM-TAI, 79 percent in LAHIA, and 97 percent in Sawki; Touareg and Peul (Fulani) equally constitute almost the remaining population, with a very small percentage of Kanuri (Bëribéri); (Figures 4 – 6)
- Infrastructure and Services – figures on community infrastructure and services such as electricity, water supply, schools, health clinics, and market access reveal the level of poverty and lack of infrastructural development across the three DFSA target zones; among these (Tables 1 – 3) include:
  - Electricity – only one out of 28 villages has electricity;
  - Water – average number of water sources for domestic use include 5.3 for PASAM-TAI, 3.3 for LAHIA, and 2 for Sawki;
  - Market Access – only three markets exist in the 28 villages; average distance to a market is 9.3 km in PASAM-TAI, 7.4 km in LAHIA, and 6.6 km in Sawki;
  - Paved Roads – average distance to a paved road is 5 km in PASAM-TAI, 11.9 km in LAHIA, and 11.6 km in Sawki;
  - Schools – all 28 villages have one primary school, only three have a secondary school; average distance to a secondary school is 4.8 km in PASAM-TAI, 4.6 km in LAHIA, and 3.4 km in Sawki;
  - Health Clinics – there are 17 clinics, or less than one on average, for the 28 villages; ten of the clinics are found in PASAM-TAI; average distance to a clinic is 1.1 km for PASAM-TAI, 2.6 km for LAHIA, and .9 km for Sawki;
Cereal Banks – there are 17 cereal banks, or less than one on average, for the 28 villages;
Mid-wives, matrons (birthing assistants) – there is less than one mid-wife and less than one matron on average in the PASAM-TAI and Sawki villages; in LAHIA, there are an average of 2.4 matrons but no mid-wives in the eight-village sample;

- Migration – Leaders in most of the sampled villages described both seasonal and longer-term migration patterns as common in their villages (Tables 4-6). Most migration involves young men and youth who leave their communities after the rainy season in search of short or long term wage labor opportunities. Lack of household income and food scarcity compels young men to seek menial labor in neighboring countries. They are generally absent 3-6 months and send back or return with remittances at the onset of the rainy season, in time to begin a new cycle of crop production. Migrant destinations mentioned both national and international destinations, and were more diversified in PASAM-TAI, involving 11 countries. The most frequent international destinations mentioned were Nigeria, Libya, and Algeria;
- Recent Development History – a summary of development activity history in the sampled villages over the past 5 years, as related by village leaders. Responses illustrate diverse engagement of development actors in the sampled communities, typically across all of the technical sectors that are also covered by the DFSAs (Tables 13-15).

Figure 1: PASAM-TAI: Number of Individuals per Village

---

146 This likely reflect greater probing on this issue in the PASAM-TAI KIIs rather than true differences across the DFSA project areas.
Figure 2: SAWKI: Number of Individuals per Village

Figure 3: LAHIA: Number of Individuals per Village
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Secondary School</th>
<th>Distance to Secondary School (Km)</th>
<th>Health Clinic</th>
<th>Distance to Health Clinic (Kms)</th>
<th>Mid-Wife</th>
<th>Health Matron</th>
<th>Cereal Bank</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Water Supply (type + number)</th>
<th>Mobile Phone Network</th>
<th>Weekly Market</th>
<th>Distance to Weekly Market (Kms)</th>
<th>Distance to Paved Road (Km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mallamawa Kaka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower</td>
<td>Water Tower, 3 functioning wells, and 1 not functioning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakoir Harouna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower, 2 functioning well, 1 borehole</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Amaria</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower, 4 wells, 1 borehole</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bako Rouani</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water tower, 2 functioning well, 1 borehole</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marekou Haoussa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2 borehole, 3 wells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>borehole, well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birji Babba</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>water tower built by AMA, 2 borehole CRS, 7 wells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traramni Haoussa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower (PASEHA), 1 borehole (govt), 2 cemented wells (govt)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angouwal Tanko</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2 borehole, 12 wells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>borehole, well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsoudou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower (CRS), 2 borehole (govt), 2 wells (govt)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>borehole, well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guodo Haoussa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Tower (PASEHA), 1 borehole (govt), 2 cemented wells (govt)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>borehole, well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maramou Haoussa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2 borehole (OIM), 2 wells and 1 of them is not functioning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower, 3 borehole (PRODEX), 1 Well (PRODEX)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tassaou Haoussa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Water Tower, 3 borehole (PRODEX), 1 Well (PRODEX)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total count</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name: LAHIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Magagi Arzitaou (Zakin Koima)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 human pump, 1 cemented well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11 and 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taka Lafia (Garin Boe)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2 human pumps, 2 cemented well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koumboula</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2 borehole (human pump), 2 cemented pumps</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawai Gou Guidan Kane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 cemented pump, 1 human pump</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karubuni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 human pump, 2 cemented well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Tangnou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 human pump, 2 cemented pumps</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Matchiawa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 human pumps</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Kiata</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 cemented well, 3 human pumps</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: SAWKI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dadi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mini AEP/ Borehole/Well</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katare Moussa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dassai</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadawan Nan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faksi Babba</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamedou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoual Gao</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droum Kaffi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Borehole/Well</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 4. Migration Patterns by Sampled Villages per DFSA Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: PASAM- TAI</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Type of Migration</th>
<th>Who Migrates</th>
<th>Reason for migration</th>
<th>Duration of seasonal migration (months)</th>
<th>Duration of long term migration (years)</th>
<th>Period of return for seasonal migration</th>
<th>Period of return for long term migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mallamawa Kaka</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>after 2 - 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dakoira Harouna</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>April - May</td>
<td>after the rainy season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Amaria</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Young men, and youn women only seasonal migration</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>April -May</td>
<td>During the rainy season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bako Rouani</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3 to 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marekou Haoussa</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birji Babba</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>5 to 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>May- June</td>
<td>After 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traramni Haoussa</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3 to 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>May- June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angouwal Tanko</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>During the rainy season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amsoudou</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3 to 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>During the rainy season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guodo Haoussa</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>April -May</td>
<td>June- July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maramou Haoussa</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tassaou Haoussa</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Young men</td>
<td>Religious studies, and small business</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>May- June</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: LAHIA</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Type of Migration</th>
<th>Who Migrates</th>
<th>Reason for migration</th>
<th>Duration of seasonal migration (months)</th>
<th>Duration of long term migration (years)</th>
<th>Period of return for seasonal migration</th>
<th>Period of return for long term migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Magagi Arzitaou (Zakin Koima)</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>food insecurity, unemployment, hardship</td>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td>2 to 10</td>
<td>anytime</td>
<td>Difficult to tell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taka Lafia (Garin Boe)</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>lack of revenue/ capital, insufficient harvest</td>
<td>2 to 5 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>start of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koumboula</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>Unemployment after harvest</td>
<td>2 to 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>start of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawarou Guidan Kane</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>insufficient harvest/ food reserves</td>
<td>1 to 2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>start of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karubuni</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>looking for revenue and food</td>
<td>4 to 5 months</td>
<td>2 to3</td>
<td>start of rainy season</td>
<td>after 2 to 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Tangnou</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>looking for revenue and food</td>
<td>2to 3 months</td>
<td>1 to2</td>
<td>before the first rain</td>
<td>Difficult to tell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Issue/Problem</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Matchiawa</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>food insecurity and lack of capital</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>start of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Kiata</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>lack of activities after wintering</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>start of rainy season after 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dadi</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Lack of activity</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katare Moussa</td>
<td>Seasonal and long term</td>
<td>Youth/men/families</td>
<td>Lack of revenue/activity</td>
<td>6-8/3-4/</td>
<td>Permanently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dassai</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadawan Nan</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Inactivity/poverty</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falki Babba</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Dry season</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamdou</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Inactivity/poverty</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoual Gao</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth/men</td>
<td>Inactivity/poverty</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droum Kaffi</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Inactivity</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Beginning of rainy season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name: SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Donor or Project Name</th>
<th>Development Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mallamawa Kaka</td>
<td>ANPER</td>
<td>Electrification in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakoira Harouna</td>
<td>NGO Goulbi, NGO Hex, NGO Taimakon Manoma</td>
<td>Hygiene and sanitation, land reclamation, hose connection at school, health unit, paved road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Amaria</td>
<td>Projand PADEL, ACF, UNICEF, PAM</td>
<td>Distribution of food, agriculture, livestock, community development, children care, screening, mosquito net, flour, oil, school stationary, cash for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bako Rouani</td>
<td>Projand SABTA, USAID, govt</td>
<td>Food safety, hygiene and latrine, cash distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marekou Haoussa</td>
<td>Save the Children, OIM</td>
<td>Screening, gardening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birji Babba</td>
<td>FAO, OIM, NGO LAFIA</td>
<td>Providing improved seeds, peanut oil transformation, hand washing and food safety kit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traramni Haoussa</td>
<td>Save the Children, OIM, ROUWAMOU, ProDAF, NGO COIKA, NGO DRAT, PASAR,</td>
<td>Adult courses for men and women, bridge school for children between 9 and 12 years, reading club for kids, school stationary, children screening, school latrines, , committee AME, COGES, providing medicine, peanut oil transformation and equipment, gardening, school field, AGR development fund, providing medicine, milk for children, grain mill, pump, cereal bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angouwal Tanko</td>
<td>SNV, UNICEF, HKI, Social Net Safety</td>
<td>Drilling repair, water committee, food safety, wash, ATPC, school stationary, providing medicine, food distribution, cash distribution, raising awareness on early marriage, financial support to buy books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsoudou</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Providing cement and iron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guodo Haoussa</td>
<td>PASER, PASEHA, project PAC, Save the Children, AFV</td>
<td>Gardening, water tower, financial support, screening, food safety, reproductive health, education of young girls, early marriage, involvement of women in community work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maramou Haoussa</td>
<td>OIM, Save the Children</td>
<td>Borehole, soap production, peanut oil transformation, financing and equipment, screening, flour and milk distribution, cash transfer, and animal fattening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tassaou Haoussa</td>
<td>Save the Children, PRODEX, PMERSA</td>
<td>Distribution of mosquito net, malaria medicine, screening, CPN, wells, shovels, water pipes, gardening, borehole, mill treatment, medicine, clothes and shoes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name: LAHIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Donor or Project Name</th>
<th>Development Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Magagi Arzitaou (Zakin Koima)</td>
<td>PASADEM, Niger Government</td>
<td>Promoting the culture of moringa, literacy, culinary demonstration, distribution of improved seeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taka Lafia (Garin Boe)</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Free distribution of rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koumboula</td>
<td>Govt Niger, Marketing social</td>
<td>Distribution of improved seeds, family planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawanou Guidan Kane</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Improved seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karubuni</td>
<td>Government; Coopération Suisse</td>
<td>Improved seeds, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Tangnou</td>
<td>Government, SAVE the Children</td>
<td>Improved seeds, school stationary, hand washing, and school latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Matchiawa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidan Kiata</td>
<td>Social safety net</td>
<td>Cash distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name: SAWKI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Donor or Project Name</th>
<th>Development Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dadi</td>
<td>Fuden/World vision/Unicef/PAM</td>
<td>Support to the sanitation center, construction of a cereal bank, education support, and taking care of children suffering from malnutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katare Moussa</td>
<td>Red Cross/MMD</td>
<td>Selling with moderate prices, medicine support. Construction of a cereal bank for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dassai</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>Construction of a cereal bank, Construction of an equipment bank, Gardening, goat distribution, spouses school, environmental training, women's literacy, Cash for work gardens for women (gombo, morings) Health equipment field schools RNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadawan Nan</td>
<td>Regis AG</td>
<td>Literacy, Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falki Babba</td>
<td>Goal Niger PPI Ruwanmu ANPIP PRODEX PRODAF</td>
<td>Goat Distribution, health support, field schools, pump and irrigation, seeds and fertilizers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamdou</td>
<td>PRODEX FAO PADESAR UNICEF PAM CARE CISB</td>
<td>Construction of wells, seeds distribution, gardening training, gardening equipment, mosquito net to women and children, goat distribution for women, food distribution to schools, mills, awareness on malnutrition, sanitation and hygiene, solar pump with CISB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoual Gao</td>
<td>REGIS AG Al Oumma</td>
<td>Agriculture training, literacy classes for men and women, niebe crops, WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droum Kaffi</td>
<td>REGIS AG REGIS ER ONG KARKARA CISB</td>
<td>Fields of values (sorghum, poultry, ) Bovine for women Nursery training Borehole construction Training in Wash / Agriculture Landscaping and site fencing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIII. ANONYMIZED LIST OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAHIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gangara</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Centre de Santé Intégré (health care center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maradi</td>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>ASUSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Guidan Tanko</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Case de santé (health care center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>SC (Departmental Division of Agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>SC (Departmental Division of Livestock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>SC (Departmental Division on Hydraulics and Sanitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maradi</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>World Vision International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maradi</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>World Vision International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dan Makiaoua</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PASAM-TAI</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malamawa</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malamawa</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Malamawa</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>SCARP-RU Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dakora Harouna</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dakora Harouna</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dakora Harouna</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Mere Modele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dan Amaria</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dan Amaria</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dan Amaria</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bako Raouni</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Direction Régionale de l’hydraulique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bako Raouni</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bako Raouni</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Health center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marekou Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Marekou Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marekou Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Birdji Baaba</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Birdji Baaba</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Birdji Baaba</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tramni Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tramni Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tramni Haoussa</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>ATPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Angoual Tanko</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Angoual Tanko</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Angoual Tanko</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Amsoudou</td>
<td>WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department/Project</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Amsoudou WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Head of Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Amsoudou WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Health center</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Guodo Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Guodo Haoussa WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Guodo Haoussa WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
<td>Pere model (Model father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Maramou Haoussa WASH/MCH</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Couple Educator (COUPLE SMART)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Maramou Haoussa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maramou Haoussa WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
<td>CVD President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tassaou Houssa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>City hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tassaou Houssa WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Village community</td>
<td>CVD President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mayahi</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dan Amarya</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Departmental Director of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>Semenciere AMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>Direction Regionale de l’Hydraulique Rurale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>Ecole Amis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>Communal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>Literacy and Informal Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov’t</td>
<td>NCBA CLUSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Project</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sawki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dan Dadi</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dan Dadi WASH/MCH</td>
<td>WASH Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Katare Moussa Agriculture</td>
<td>CVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Katare Moussa WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Comité lumiere sante (health committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dan Dassai WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dan Dassai Agriculture</td>
<td>CVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chadawanan WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Ecole des maris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chadawanan Agriculture</td>
<td>Care group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Falki Babba Agriculture</td>
<td>CVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Falki Babba WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Habbanaye committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gamdou</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gamdou WASH/MCH</td>
<td>Safe School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sector/Committee</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Angoual Gao</td>
<td>WASH/MCH WASH Committee</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Angoual Gao</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Droum Kaffi</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Droum Kaffi</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Lead mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Droum Kahi</td>
<td>Agriculture Livestock farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Secretaire Generale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Forestry Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Gov't</td>
<td>Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>