Food Assistance Indicators and Definitions

Foreign Agricultural Service – Food Assistance Division
United States Department of Agriculture

FEBRUARY 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) places a high level of importance on managing for results. Performance monitoring is a key part of the agency's implementation of results-oriented management. According to the FAS *Monitoring and Evaluation Policy* for the Food Assistance Division (FAD), all grant agreements must include a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) that identifies indicators for monitoring progress in achieving results and presents a strategy for collecting performance data. The plan should include applicable standard indicators and custom (project-specific) indicators (see the explanation and definitions below).

FAS uses two types of performance indicators: standard and custom. FAS defines those terms as follows:

- **Standard Indicators:** a common set of required (mandatory) indicators identified by FAS that must be used by all recipients, if applicable to the project. A standard indicator is applicable to a project if it addresses a result in the project's results framework, and if planned activities target that result.
- **Custom Indicators:** additional project-specific performance indicators not included in the FAS list of standard indicators.

This document includes guidance on the Food for Progress (FFPr), McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition (MGD), and Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement (LRP) standard indicators only. FAS uses standard indicators to measure progress in achieving FFPr, MGD, and LRP program results, established in each program's results frameworks. The FFPr, MGD, and LRP standard indicators will allow FAS to report progress on all of its projects across result areas (i.e. literacy, good health, nutrition and dietary practices, agricultural productivity, and trade) and countries. FAS will use these data for meeting requirements under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), 1999, and the GPRA Modernization Act, 2010. Standard indicators will also be used for reporting program accomplishments in the USDA and FAS Strategic Plans, Congressional Budget Justifications, and for reporting on USDA's contribution to whole-of-government initiatives such as Feed the Future[1] and the Reinforcing Education Accountability in Development (READ) Act.[2] In order for USDA to meet these reporting requirements, projects are required to include standard indicators in their PMPs when they are relevant to the project's results.

Standard indicators are classified as either output or outcome. Applicants may also propose custom, project-specific input, output, outcome, or impact-level indicators. FAS defines these terms as follows:

Input Indicators: Indicators that measure or quantify the financial, human, and material resources used to implement project activities or interventions.

[1] For more information about the Feed the Future Initiative see: http://feedthefuture.gov/
[2] For more information on the READ Act see: https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/601

Output Indicators: Indicators that measure or quantify the products, goods, or services which directly result from the implementation of project activities.
Outcome Indicators: Indicators that measure the intermediate effects of a project's activity or set of activities and are directly related to the output indicators.
Impact Indicators: Indicators that measure longer-term effects produced by a project's activities or set of activities.

Applicants must use all applicable standard indicators in their PMPs. Each standard indicator measures one or more results in the FFPr, MGD, or LRP program results frameworks. If a project includes the result in its project-level results framework, the corresponding standard indicator must be included in the project's PMP. During the agreement negotiation stage, FAS may provide further guidance on which indicators are considered relevant. The standard indicator definitions provided in this document should be used to inform the PMP. It is not necessary for an applicant to reproduce the entire indicator definition in its PMP document, but reference to the standard indicator definition must be included (*i.e*. the definitions section of a PMP may include: "please see FFPr or MGD Indicator #X").

FAS requires PMPs to include performance indicators for all of the identified results in the project results frameworks. However, in some cases, applicants may need to develop custom (project-specific) indicators because the FAS standard indicators alone may not adequately measure all of a project's planned activities or intended results. Custom indicators may include organizational or stakeholder-relevant indicators that are key to monitoring project performance and accountability. See the FAD *Monitoring and Evaluation Policy* for additional information on using standard and custom indicators in PMPs.[3]

Once applicants have identified all relevant standard and custom indicators, they should establish numbers for their baselines and targets, and input those numbers into the FAS Food Aid Information System (FAIS)[4]. If a proposal is selected for an award, the list of applicable indicators will be finalized in consultation with FAS staff during the agreement negotiation phase. After an agreement has been signed, recipients will be required to report on their actual progress toward meeting their indicator targets in FAIS.

BASELINES AND TARGETS

Food assistance projects must establish indicator baselines and targets, which will be used to regularly measure performance. Initially, indicator baselines and targets are established in the project proposal. They are then finalized, according to the FAD *Monitoring and Evaluation Policy,* following the approval of the PMP, Evaluation Plan and submission of the baseline survey report. Recipients must seek an

[3] http://www.fas.usda.gov/programs/resources/monitoring-and-evaluation-policy
[4] https://www.fas.usda.gov/fais/public

amendment to their agreement in order to (a) finalize baselines and targets during the first year of the project, or (b) amend indicators and targets at any other time during the life of the project.

Baseline information for all indicators must be measured and reported prior to the start of project activities. For output indicators that count the number of services or goods provided, the baseline will be zero. For example, the *Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance* (FFPr Standard Indicator 21) has a baseline of zero because that activity or service was not provided previously. Outcomes that measure an anticipated change in condition such as the *Average student attendance in USDA supported classrooms/schools* (MGD Standard Indicator 2) require measuring the status of the condition, in this case, the level of attendance, at baseline. Baselines for such indicators should always be greater than zero. For these types of measures, projects should establish a baseline that is as close to the condition prior to the start of project implementation as possible. For example, for projects funded in FY2018, the baseline should be for the condition in FY2018, with activity implementation taking place in FY2019. Where secondary data are being used to establish baselines (i.e. literacy tests) the baseline timeframe may differ if data collection occurs at established intervals.

Annual and "life of project" (or "total for the agreement") targets must be established for all standard and custom indicators. Projects must follow guidance contained in this handbook for the disaggregation required under each standard indicator, and establish disaggregation as necessary across custom indicators. Annual targets must be established on a fiscal year basis (October 1 – September 30) unless otherwise specified or negotiated. Established targets for planned activities should be ambitious, but also realistic.

All standard indicators and their disaggregation, as specified in this guidance, including baselines and targets, must be established and reported to FAS in FAIS. All standard indicators must be included in the PMP and entered into FAIS using the exact wording of the standard indicator and its definition as it appears in this guidance document. PMPs may include more detailed standard indicator definitions such as project-specific information (i.e. data sources and measurement notes) as needed.

REPORTING

Food assistance projects are required to establish annual targets; however, projects are required to report to FAS on a semi-annual basis. Projects must submit semi-annual reports based on the following schedule:

Period covering	Report due date
October 1 – March 31	April 30
April 1 – September 30	October 30

Semi-annual reports are created and submitted through the "Compliance" tab at the top of the FAIS page, and under "Agreement-level Reports" in the drop-down menu. If a disaggregation (such as "Male/Female" or "New/Continuing") is applicable to the project, projects must set and report on targets. However, projects are not required to set targets for indicator disaggregation sub-types that do not apply to the project. For example, if a project is introducing integrated pest management and improved seeds, then *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance* (FFPr Standard Indicator 4) should include disaggregation related to crop genetics and pest and disease management relevant to the management practice or technology type; however, the project would not include irrigation, livestock management, or wild-caught fisheries management disaggregation since these are not management practices or technology types applicable to the project.

The project should specify in the PMP which disaggregation(s) is relevant to the project, and recipients will be expected to report actual data on each relevant disaggregation in their semi-annual reports to FAS. Selecting appropriate indicators and disaggregations for each agreement is a collaborative effort between award recipients and Food Assistance Division (FAD) staff during agreement negotiation. Indicators are chosen, and all parties must ensure indicators are precisely entered in FAIS' Performance Reporting section. While the project's activities are a key factor in indicator selection, the individual agreement's structure and indicator type may also play a role.

Where the data collection for a standard or custom indicator is expected to be too costly, infeasible, or unrealistic given the nature of the indicator or existing data collection plans and resources, recipients may propose an alternative data collection schedule. Projects must also include a narrative in the "comments" section of the semi-annual performance report describing trends in the data, reasons for significant differences between the actual data and targets, any data discrepancies or nuances in the data, reasons for not reporting data or reporting zero, or any other explanations of project performance, as appropriate.

FOOD FOR PROGRESS STANDARD INDICATORS SUMMARY

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in FFPr Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
1	FFPr SO1	Increased Agricultural Productivity	outcome	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USDA assistance	Y	Total Production/ Units of Production	Annual
2	FFPr 1.1	Improved Quality of Land and Water Resources	outcome	Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies that promote improved climate risk reduction and/or natural resources management with USDA assistance	Y	Hectares	Annual
3	FFPr 1.2/ 1.3	Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies / Improved Farm Management	outcome	Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	Y	Hectares	Annual
4	FFPr 1.2/ 1.3	Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies / Improved Farm Management	outcome	Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
5	FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.1	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Number of individuals accessing agriculture-related financing as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
6	FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.1	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Number of individuals participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs with USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
7	FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.1	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Number of loans disbursed as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in FFPr Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
8	FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.1	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USDA assistance	Y	US Dollars	Annual
9	FFPr 1.2.4	Increased Knowledge of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies	output	Number of technologies, practices, and approaches under various phases of research, development, and uptake as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
10	FFPr 1.4.1 /2.4.1	Increased Capacity of Government Institutions	output	Number of individuals who have received USDA-supported degree-granting non-nutrition-related food security training	Y	Number	Annual
11	FFPr 1.4.1 /2.4.1	Increased Capacity of Government Institutions	output	Number of host government or community-derived risk management plans formally proposed, adopted, implemented or institutionalized with USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
12	FFPr 1.4.4 /2.4.4	Improved Capacity of Key Groups in the Agriculture Production Sector	outcome	Number of organizations with increased performance improvement with USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
13	FFPr 1.4.5 /2.4.5	Increased Leverage of Private Sector Resources	output	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
14	FFPr 1.4.5/2.4.5 and 2.2	Increase leverage of private sector resources / Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products	outcome	Value of new USG commitments and new public and private sector investment leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	Y	US Dollars	Annual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in FFPr Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
15	FFPr 2.2 and 2.3 /2.2.3 /2.3.1	Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products / Improved Transaction Efficiency / Improved Market and Trade Infrastructure	output	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Kilometers	Biannual
16	FFPr - 2.1.2.2	Improved Post-Harvest Infrastructure	output	Total increase in installed storage capacity (dry or cold storage) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Cubic Meters	Biannual
17	FFPr 2.4.2 and 2.1.1.1	Improved Policy & Regulatory Framework / Increased Adoption of Established Standards by Industry	output and outcome	Number of policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
18	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	outcome	Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	Y	U.S. Dollar	Annual
19	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	outcome	Volume of commodities sold by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	Y	Metric Tons	Annual
20	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	outcome	Number of jobs attributed to USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
21	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	output	Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in FFPr Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
22	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	output	Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs	Y	Number	Annual
23	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	output	Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions	N	Number	Annual
24	FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	output	Number of USDA social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets	Y	Number	Annual

FOOD FOR PROGRESS STANDARD INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity
FFPr INDICATOR 1: Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: Yield is a measure of the total output of production of an agricultural commodity (crop, fish, milk, eggs, live animal offtake[1]) divided by the total number of units in production (hectares planted of crops, area in hectares for pond aquaculture, cubic meters of cage for cage aquaculture, maximum number of animals in the herd/flock during the reporting year for live animals, maximum number of producing cows or hens during the reporting year for dairy or eggs). Yield per hectare, per animal, and per cubic meter of cage is a measure of productivity from that farm, fisheries, or livestock activity from USDA-assisted producers.

Yield is calculated from the following data points, reported as totals across all activity participants, and disaggregated by commodity, then by sex and age of the producer:

- Total Production (TP): Kg, mt, number, or other unit by participants during the reporting period;
- Total Units of Production (UP): Area planted in ha (for crops); Area in ha (for aquaculture ponds); Maximum number of animals in herd (for live animals); Maximum number of animals in production (for dairy or eggs); Cubic meters of cages (for open water aquaculture) for participants during the reporting year.

Yield per hectare, per animal, or per cubic meter of cage = TP/UP

If there is more than one production cycle in the reporting year, the data points for total production (TP) and units of production (UP) should be counted (and summed) each time the land is cultivated, animal products are produced, or the cages are used if the same commodity was produced. The sum of TP divided by the sum of UP will provide an estimate of the average yield achieved across the different production cycles.

Total production is the amount that is produced, regardless of how it was ultimately used. It also includes any postharvest loss (i.e. postharvest loss should not be subtracted from total production.)

The preferred units for TP by commodity type are:

- Crops: metric tons
- Pond aquaculture: kilograms
- Cage aquaculture: kilograms
- Dairy: liters of milk
- Eggs: number of eggs
- Livestock: weight in kilograms of entire live animals which were offtake

The required units for UP by commodity type are:

- Crops: hectare
- Tree crops: hectare is recommended[2]
- Pond aquaculture: hectare of surface area
- Cage aquaculture: cubic meter of cage
- Dairy: maximum number of producing animals during the reporting year

- Eggs: maximum number of producing hens during the reporting year
- Livestock: maximum number in herd, flock, or other group during the reporting year.

For partners working in **livestock** value chains, there is an additional disaggregation of livestock production system to support meaningful analysis of outcomes. There are four production systems: Rangeland; rural mixed crop-livestock; urban/peri-urban; and intensive commercial livestock production.

- **Rangelands** (pastoral, transhumant, agro-pastoral, sylvo-pastoral, and extensive grasslands)
- **Rural mixed crop-livestock** (ruminants, pigs and poultry and small stock such as rabbits and guinea pigs and animals kept principally for traction including oxen, buffalo and equids)
- **Urban/peri-urban** (including poultry, small scale dairy, small and large ruminants, pigs, micro-stock, small scale fattening operations)
- **Intensive, commercial livestock production** (large pig and poultry production units, also includes ruminant fattening, large dairying and large scale dry lots). Scale of operation, level of technical inputs and capital investment distinguishes from the urban/peri-urban category).

Yield targets should be entered at the commodity level and at the sex and age level under each commodity. Targets do not need to be set for the TP and UP data points.

[1] Offtake quantity includes the entire weight of all live animals that were sold, slaughtered, gifted or exchanged, including those for home consumption.

[2] For tree crops, Number of hectares is recommended as UP, however, Number of trees can also be selected for UP.

RATIONALE: Yield of farms, fisheries, and livestock is a key driver of agricultural productivity and can serve as a proxy of the overall productivity of these value chains and the impact of interventions when the trend is evaluated over a series of years, and/or appropriate covariates such as inter-annual weather conditions are included in the analysis. Improving the yield for farm commodities contributes to increasing agricultural GDP, can increase income when other components of agricultural productivity are in place (e.g., post-harvest storage, value addition and processing, markets), and can therefore contribute to increasing sustainable productivity and reducing poverty.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
See Definition for preferred units of measure by commodity type.	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually, recommended to collect close to post-harvest to optimize recall

DISAGGREGATION:

For crops:

FIRST LEVEL

Commodity: Type of crop. Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for this indicator. The overall "horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired.

SECOND LEVEL

Farm size: Smallholder, Non-smallholder

THIRD LEVEL

Sex: Male, female

Age: 15-29, 30+

For aquaculture:
FIRST LEVEL
Commodity: Type of fish – freshwater or marine.
SECOND LEVEL
Sex: Male, female
Age: 15-29, 30+

For livestock:
FIRST LEVEL
Commodity: Type of animal or animal product
SECOND LEVEL
Production system: Agro-pastoral/extensive grassland; small-holder mixed livestock-crop; urban/peri-urban; and intensive industrial
THIRD LEVEL
Sex: Male, female
Age: 15-29, 30+

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participant farmer/fisher/rancher sample surveys; data collection through producer organizations or farm records; routine activity records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
BASELINE INFO: Baselines are required. Baseline data reflects the yield of targeted commodities in the year prior to programming. If that information is not available, yield information collected during the activity's first year can serve as baseline.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [EG.3-10,-11,-12]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity	**FFPr 1.1:** Improved Quality of Land and Water Resources

FFPr INDICATOR 2: Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies that promote improved climate risk reduction and/or natural resources management with USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the area in hectares where USDA-promoted management practices or improved technologies that reduce climate risk and improve land, marine, and other natural resources management were applied during the reporting year to areas managed or cultivated by producers participating in a USDA-funded activity.

Management practices counted are agriculture-related, land- or water-based management practices and technologies in sectors such as cultivation of food or fiber, aquaculture, fisheries, and livestock management that address climate change adaptation and mitigation, specifically including those that seek to bring about benefits relating to climate change adaptation/climate risk management, climate mitigation, and improved natural resource and ecosystem management. Improved management practices or technologies are those promoted by the Recipient as a way to increase producer's productivity directly or to support stronger and better functioning systems.

This indicator reports on the unique number of hectares from a subset of three indicator disaggregates of FFPr Standard Indicator 3 *Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance* management practice category disaggregates. The examples under each category below are illustrative but not exhaustive.

- **Natural resource or ecosystem management**: e.g. biodiversity conservation; strengthening of ecosystem services, including stream bank management or restoration or re/afforestation; woodlot management.
- **Climate mitigation**: technologies selected because they minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g. drip irrigation).
- **Climate adaptation/climate risk management**: technologies promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk and minimizing the severity of climate change. Examples include drought and flood resistant varieties; short-duration varieties; adjustment of sowing time; diversification, use of perennial varieties; agroforestry.

RATIONALE: This indicator tracks application of practices that can support producers and the landscapes where they live to proactively protect themselves against climate disturbances while promoting better management and improved quality of land and water resources. Improved management practices on agriculture land, in aquaculture and in freshwater and marine fisheries relating to improved natural resource or ecosystem management and those practices that bring benefits related to climate mitigation and climate adaptation are critical for ensuring that smallholder producers and their communities are taking steps to safeguard themselves against climate and weather disturbances.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Hectares	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

None	
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Sample survey of activity participants, activity or association records, reports from activity partners, farm records. If a sample survey of participants is conducted, data may be collected through participant interviews and/or direct observations of measures of participants' land.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: BASELINE INFO: The baseline is the area under improved management practices and technologies that support improved climate risk reduction and/or natural resources management that are promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-28]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** The data for this specific indicator is derived from three disaggregates from indicator FFPr Standard Indicator 3 (FtF EG.3.2-25). Recipients are expected to report on the unique number of hectares within these three disaggregates to avoid double counting. For example, if a Recipient is reporting on the improved management practices and technologies for the same hectare under two or all of these three disaggregates, that hectare should be counted only once. For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity	**FFPr 1.2:** Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies **FFPr 1.3**: Improved Farm Management
FFPr INDICATOR 3: Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the area in hectares where USDA-promoted management practices or improved technologies were applied during the reporting year to areas managed or cultivated by producers participating in a USDA-funded activity. Management practices counted are agriculture-related, land- or water-based management practices and technologies in sectors such as cultivation of food or fiber, aquaculture, fisheries, and livestock management, including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. Improved management practices or technologies are those promoted by the recipient as a way to increase producer's productivity directly or to support stronger and better functioning systems. Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted.

The application of both intensive and extensive agriculture-related management practices and technologies in different landscapes are captured under the Type of Hectare disaggregate. The Type of Hectare disaggregates are: **crop land, cultivated pasture, rangeland, conservation/protected area, freshwater or marine ecosystems, aquaculture**, and **other**[1]. Those interventions carried out on crop land, cultivated pasture and aquaculture are considered "intensive". Those carried on rangeland, conservation/protected area and freshwater or marine ecosystems are considered "extensive". The same area cannot be counted under more than one Type of Hectare disaggregate category.

Management practice and technology type categories, with some illustrative (not exhaustive) examples, include:

- Crop genetics: e.g. improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content (e.g. through bio-fortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize), and/or more resilient to climate impacts (e.g. drought tolerant maize or stress tolerant rice); improved germplasm.
- Cultural practices: context specific agronomic practices that do not fit in other categories, e.g. seedling production and transplantation; cultivation practices such as planting density, crop rotation, and mounding.
- Livestock management: e.g. improved grazing practices, improved fodder crop, cultivation of dual purpose crops.
- Wild-caught fisheries management: e.g. sustainable fishing practices.
- Aquaculture management: e.g. pond culture; pond preparation; management of carrying capacity.
- Natural resource or ecosystem management: e.g. biodiversity conservation; strengthening of ecosystem services, including stream bank management or restoration or re/afforestation; woodlot management.
- Pest and disease management: e.g. Integrated Pest Management; improved fungicides; appropriate application of fungicides; improved and environmentally sustainable use of cultural, physical, biological, and chemical insecticides and pesticides; crop rotation; alflatoxin prevention and control during production.
- Soil-related fertility and conservation: e.g. Integrated Soil Fertility Management; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil

amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter, mulching); improved fertilizer; improved fertilizer use practices; inoculant; erosion control.

- Irrigation: e.g. drip, surface, and sprinkler irrigation; irrigation schemes.
- Agriculture water management - non-irrigation-based: e.g. water harvesting; sustainable water use practices; practices that improve water quality.
- Climate mitigation: technologies selected because they minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g. drip irrigation).
- Climate adaptation/climate risk management: technologies promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk and minimizing the severity of climate change. Examples include drought and flood resistant varieties; short-duration varieties; adjustment of sowing time; diversification, use of perennial varieties; agroforestry.
- Other: e.g. improved mechanical and physical land preparation; non-market- and non-climate-related information technology; improved record keeping; improved budgeting and financial management; Improved capacity to repair agricultural equipment; improved quality of agricultural products or technology.

If a lead farmer cultivates a plot used for training, e.g a demonstration plot used for Farmer Field Days or Farmer Field School, the area of the demonstration plot should be counted under this indicator, and the farmer counted under FFPr Standard Indicator 4 *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*. However, if the demonstration or training plot is cultivated by extensionists or researchers, e.g. a demonstration plot in a research institute, neither the area nor the extensionist/researcher should be counted under the respective indicators.

This is a snapshot indicator, which is designed to capture area under improved management practices and technologies only for the reporting year. The baseline is the area under improved management practices and technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity. The area under the USDA activity-promoted practice or technology during the project period still gets counted in any subsequent years the practice or technology is applied. However, this also means that yearly totals can NOT be summed to count unique hectares under improved management practices and technologies over the life of the project.

Recipients may use sales data from assisted firms for some kinds of inputs to estimate the number of producers for FFPr Standard Indicator 4 *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance* and Indicator 3 *Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance* if they use clearly documented assumptions that are regularly validated through spot surveys or similar methods. For example, a Recipient working to strengthen the certified soy seed market within a defined market area could use data on the number and volume of certified soy seed sales by assisted firms during the reporting year to estimate the number of farmers applying certified soy seed (for example, by using a conservative assumption that one sales equals one farmer applying) and hectares under certified seed by assuming a periodically validated planting density. All assumptions underlying the indicator estimates should be documented annually in an Indicator Comment.

For cultivated cropland, these three indicators *Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*, *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*, and *Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USDA assistance* (FFPr Standard Indicators 3, 4, and 1, respectively) only capture results for land that is individually managed. However, communally- or group-managed areas under extensive "Type of Hectares" disaggregates, such as conservation landscapes or rangeland, can be reported under Standard Indicator 3 under the association-applied category under the Sex and Age disaggregate. Association-applied would be applicable for landscapes where communities or organizations develop and adhere to policies regarding management, harvest, protection, etc.

[1] Type of hectare disaggregates defined as:

- Crop land: areas used for the production of crops for harvest, including cultivated, harvested, fallow or crop failure. Include home gardens in this category.
- Cultivated pasture: land where forage crops are primarily grown for grazing.
- Rangelands: land on which the native vegetation (climax or natural potential plant community) is predominantly grasses, grass-like plants, forbs, or shrubs suitable for grazing or browsing use.
- Conservation/protected areas: terrestrial areas that are protected because of their recognized, natural, ecological, or cultural values. The protected status may fall into different categories and include strictly protected to those that allow for some limited human occupation and/or sustainable use of natural resources, such as agroforestry, collection of NTFPs, etc.
- Fresh-water or marine ecosystems: aquatic areas that include freshwater, such as lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, springs, and freshwater wetlands, and water with higher salt content, such as salt marshes, mangroves, estuaries and bays, oceans, and marine wetlands.
- Aquaculture: areas dedicated to the breeding, rearing, and harvesting of aquatic animals and plants for food. All types of fisheries should be estimated in hectares, not cubic meters, for the purpose of aggregation across projects.
- Other: Areas that don't fit into these categories. Please describe the Hectare type in the indicator comment.

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

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Hectares	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Type of Hectare:

- Crop land,
- Cultivated pasture,
- Rangeland,
- Conservation/protected area,
- Freshwater or marine ecosystems;
- Aquaculture,
- Other

SECOND LEVEL:
Sex: Male, Female, Association-applied

Age: 15-29, 30+, Association-applied

Management practice or technology type (see description, above): Crop genetics, Cultural practices, Livestock management, Wild-caught fisheries management, Aquaculture management, Natural resource or ecosystem management, Pest and disease management, Soil-related fertility and conservation, Irrigation, Agriculture water management-non-irrigation based, Climate mitigation, Climate adaptation/climate risk management, Other

Commodity:
Type of crop, type of animal or animal product, type of fish – freshwater or marine, or "Disaggregates not available"
Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for this indicator. The overall "horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired.

Activities promoting sustainable intensification or those where multiple commodities are involved where counting hectares is complicated and not meaningful are not required to disaggregate by commodity, and should use the "Disaggregates not available" category under the Commodities disaggregate.

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Sample survey of activity participants, activity or association records, reports from activity partners, farm records. If a sample survey of participants is conducted, data may be collected through participant interviews and/or direct observations of measures of participants' land.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Since it is very common for FFPr activities to promote more than one improved management practice or technology, this indicator allows the tracking of the number of hectares under the different management practices and technology types and the total *unique* number of hectares on which one or more practices or technologies has been applied at the activity level.

- If a participant applied more than one improved technology during the reporting year, count that area on which the participant applied those technologies under each relevant Management Practice type applied under the relevant Hectare type. However, count the area only once in the applicable Sex, Age and Commodity disaggregate categories under the relevant Hectare type. This will not result in double-counting for the total in FTFMS.
- If an activity is promoting a single technology for multiple benefits, the area under the technology may be reported under each relevant category under the Management Practice/Technology Type disaggregate. For example, drought tolerant seeds could be reported under Crop genetics and Climate adaptation/climate risk management depending for what purpose(s) or benefit(s) the activity was promoted.
- If a participant cultivates a plot of land more than once in the reporting year, the area should be counted each time one or more improved management practice/technology is applied. For example, because of access to irrigation as a result of a FFPr activity, a farmer can now cultivate two cycles of crops instead of one. If the farmer applies USDA-promoted technologies on

her/his plot for the two cycles, the area of the plot would be counted twice under this indicator. Note that the farmer would only be counted once under Standard Indicator 4 *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*.

For example: An activity supports dissemination of improved seed, Integrated Pest Management, and drip irrigation. During the reporting year, a total of 1,000 hectares were under improved technologies: 800 with improved seed, 600 with IPM and 950 with drip irrigation.

There should be a clear link between Indicator 3, the *Number of hectares under improved management practices and technologies* and Indicator 4, the *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*. If a producer applied improved management practices and technologies to his/her land, then the producer would be counted under Indicator 4 and the # of hectares s/he applied the new techniques or technologies on would be counted in Indicator 3.

BASELINE INFO: The baseline is the area under improved management practices and technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-25]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity	**FFPr 1.2:** Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies **FFPr 1.3**: Improved Farm Management
FFPr INDICATOR 4: Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the total number of agriculture system actors participating in USDA-funded activities who have applied improved management practices and/or technologies promoted by USDA anywhere within the food and agriculture system during the reporting year. These individuals can include:

- Farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and nonfood crops, livestock and livestock products, fish and other fisheries/aquaculture products, agro-forestry products, and natural resource-based products, including non-timber forest products such as fruits, seeds, and resins;
- Individuals in the private sector, such as entrepreneurs, input suppliers, traders, processors, manufacturers, distributors, service providers, and wholesalers and retailers;
- Individuals in government, such as policy makers, extension workers and natural resource managers;
- Individuals in civil society, such as researchers or academics and non-governmental and community organization staff.

The indicator tracks those individuals who are changing their behavior while participating in USDA-funded activities. Individuals who attended training or were exposed to a new technology do not count under this indicator unless the individual actually applies what she/he learned.

Improved management practices or technologies are those promoted by the recipient as a way to increase agriculture productivity or support stronger and better functioning systems. The improved management practices and technologies are agriculture-related.

Management practice and technology type categories, with some illustrative (not exhaustive) examples, include:

- Crop genetics: e.g. improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding, higher in nutritional content (e.g. through bio-fortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, high-protein maize), and/or more resilient to climate impacts (e.g. drought tolerant maize, or stress tolerant rice); improved germplasm.
- Cultural practices: context specific agronomic practices that do not fit in other categories, e.g. seedling production and transplantation; cultivation practices such as planting density, crop rotation, and mounding.
- Livestock management: e.g. improved livestock breeds; livestock health services and products such as vaccines; improved livestock handling practices and housing; improved feeding practices; improved grazing practices, improved waste management practices, improved fodder crop, cultivation of dual purpose crops.
- Wild-caught fisheries management: e.g. sustainable fishing practices; improved nets, hooks, lines, traps, dredges, trawls; improved hand gathering, netting, angling, spearfishing, and trapping practices.
- Aquaculture management: e.g. improved fingerlings; improved feed and feeding practices; fish

health and disease control; improved cage culture; improved pond culture; pond preparation; sampling and harvesting; management of carrying capacity.

- Natural resource or ecosystem management: e.g. terracing, rock lines; fire breaks; biodiversity conservation; strengthening of ecosystem services, including stream bank management or restoration or re/afforestation; woodlot management.
- Pest and disease management: e.g. Integrated Pest Management; improved fungicides; appropriate application of fungicides; improved and environmentally sustainable use of cultural, physical, biological, and chemical insecticides and pesticides; crop rotation; aflatoxin prevention and control.
- Soil-related fertility and conservation: e.g. Integrated Soil Fertility Management; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter, mulching); improved fertilizer; improved fertilizer use practices; inoculant; erosion control.
- Irrigation: e.g. drip, surface, and sprinkler irrigation; irrigation schemes.
- Agriculture water management - non-irrigation-based: e.g. water harvesting; sustainable water use practices; practices that improve water quality.
- Climate mitigation: technologies selected because they minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g. drip irrigation, upgrades of agriculture infrastructure and supply chains).
- Climate adaptation/climate risk management: technologies promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk and minimizing the severity of the impacts of climate change. Examples include drought and flood resistant varieties; short-duration varieties; adjustment of sowing time; agricultural/climate forecasting; early warning systems; diversification, use of perennial varieties; agroforestry; risk insurance.
- Marketing and distribution: e.g. contract farming technologies and practices; improved input purchase technologies and practices; improved commodity sale technologies and practices; improved market information system technologies and practices.
- Post-harvest handling and storage: e.g. improved transportation; decay and insect control; temperature and humidity control; improved quality control technologies and practices; sorting and grading, sanitary handling practices.
- Value-added processing: e.g. improved packaging practices and materials including biodegradable packaging; food and chemical safety technologies and practices; improved preservation technologies and practices.
- Other: e.g. improved mechanical and physical land preparation; non-market- and non-climate-related information technology; improved record keeping; improved budgeting and financial management; Improved capacity to repair agricultural equipment; improved quality of agricultural products or technology.

This indicator endeavors to capture the individuals who have made the decision to apply a particular management practice or technology, not those who have had to do so as a condition of employment or an obligation.

RATIONALE: Improved management practices and technological change and adoption by different actors in the agricultural system will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity and supporting stronger and better functioning systems.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Individuals	**INDICATOR LEVEL:** Outcome	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:** Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

DISAGGREGATE BY:

FIRST LEVEL

Value chain actor type:

- Smallholder producers (e.g. farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and nonfood crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products)
- Non-smallholder producers (e.g. farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and nonfood crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products)
- People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)
- People in private sector firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)
- People in civil society (e.g. staff and volunteers from non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, research and academic organizations)
- Others

Note: Only count producers under the "Producers" disaggregate and not the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate and not the "Civil Society" disaggregate to avoid double-counting.

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

SECOND LEVEL

Sex: Male, Female

Age: 15-29, 30+

Management practice or technology type: Crop genetics, Cultural practices, Livestock management, Wild-caught fisheries management, Aquaculture management, Natural resource or ecosystem management, Pest and disease management, Soil-related fertility and conservation, Irrigation, Agriculture water management-non-irrigation based, Climate mitigation, Climate adaptation/climate risk management, Marketing and distribution, Post-harvest handling and storage, Value-added processing, Other

Commodity:

Type of crop, type of animal or animal product, type of fish – freshwater or marine, or "Disaggregate not applicable".

Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for this indicator. The overall

"horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired.

Activities promoting sustainable intensification or those where multiple commodities are involved (e.g. transportation), where counting participants by commodity is complicated and/or not meaningful are not required to disaggregate participants by commodity, and should use the "Disaggregate not applicable" category under the Commodity disaggregate.

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected via sample survey of participants, census of private sector/government participants, project or association records, farm records, company/organization records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: All significant improvements to existing techniques or technologies should be counted. In a case where, for example, an individual applies more than one innovation as a result of USDA assistance, count the individual once in the applicable Value chain actor type, Sex, and Age disaggregate categories. If more than one participant in a household is applying improved technologies, count all the adult participants. Individuals should only be counted once per reporting year under the Value chain actor type, Sex, and Age disaggregate categories.

Since it is common for USDA-funded activities to promote more than one improved technology or management practice to producers and other individuals, this indicator allows the tracking of the total number of participants that apply any improved management practice or technology during the reporting year and the tracking of the total number of participants that apply practices or technologies in specific management practice and technology type categories.

- Count the participant if they have applied a management practice or technology promoted with USDA assistance at least once in the reporting year.
- Count each participant only once per year in the applicable Sex disaggregate category and Age disaggregate category to track the number of individuals applying USDA-promoted management practices or technology types. If more than one participant in a household is applying improved technologies, count each participant in the household who does so.
- Under the Commodity disaggregate, count each participant once under each commodity for which they apply a USDA-promoted management practice or technology type. For example, if a participant uses USDA-promoted improved seed for the focus commodities of maize and legume, count that participant once under maize and once under legumes.
- Count each individual once per management practice or technology type once per year under the appropriate Management practice/technology type disaggregate. Individuals can be counted under a number of different Management practices/technology types in a reporting year.

This indicator counts individuals who applied improved management practices and technologies learned through training provided through USDA assistance. Therefore, there should be a clear link between Indicator 4*, Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance* and Indicator 21, *Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training*.

Furthermore, there should be a clear link between Indicator 3, *Number of hectares under improved*

management practices or technologies and Indicator 4, *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*. If a farmer applied improved management practices or technologies to his/her land, then the farmer would be counted under Indicator 4 and the # of hectares s/he applied the improved management practices or technologies on would be counted in Indicator 3. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is the number of participant producers and other actors applying improved management practices or technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-24]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.1:** Increased Use of Financial Services

FFPr INDICATOR 5: Number of individuals accessing agriculture-related financing as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Total number of agricultural producers (individual farmers, fishers, cooperatives, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, other Micro, Small and Medium enterprises (MSME), and larger enterprises that are in a targeted agricultural value chain and are participating in a USDA-funded activity that access agriculture-related financing with USDA assistance. This indicator counts individuals accessing debt (both cash and in-kind loans) and non-debt financing.

USDA assistance may consist of technical assistance, full or partial guarantee provision, insurance coverage, or other capacity-building and market-strengthening activities to producers, organizations and enterprises.

Debt: Count individuals accessing cash loans and of in-kind lending. For cash loans, count only individuals accessing credit through formally registered financial institutions[1]. The institutions can be of any size from microfinance institutions to national commercial banks, as well as any non-deposit taking financial institutions and other types of financial NGOs. In-kind lending in agriculture is the provision of services, inputs, or other goods up front, with payment in the form of product (value of service, input, or other good provided plus interest) or cash provided at the end of the season. Assumptions used to calculate the value of in-kinds loans should be documented and made available for data quality assessments.

Non-Debt: Count individuals accessing any financing other than cash loans and in-kind lending. Examples include: equity, convertible debt, or other equity-like investments, which can be made by local or international investors; and leasing, which may be extended by local banks or specialized leasing companies.

[1] Individuals accessing agriculture-related financing through informal groups are not included because this indicator is attempting to capture the systems-level changes that occur through increased access to formal financial services.

RATIONALE: Increased access to and utilization of finance will help expand markets and trade, which will, in turn, expand agricultural productivity.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Type of financing accessed: **Debt**

SECOND LEVEL

Type of debt: Cash, In-kind

Size of recipient: Individuals/microenterprises; Small and medium enterprises; Large enterprises

and corporations.

Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

FIRST LEVEL
Type of financing accessed: **Non-debt**

SECOND LEVEL
Size of recipient: Individuals/microenterprises; Small and medium enterprises; Large enterprises and corporations.

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects, review of bank/financial institution or USDA records, or survey of financial institutions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The indicator does not measure the value of the assistance but the number of individuals who accessed financing as a result of USDA assistance. **Count each individual only once per reporting year within each financial product category** (debt and non-debt), even if the individual accessed financing multiple times in the reporting year. However, an individual may be counted under each financial product category (debt and non-debt) if both types of financing were accessed during the reporting year. Individuals participating in group-based savings, lending or microfinance programs should be counted under Indicator 6.

Indicator 5 measures the number of *individuals* accessing financing. Indicator 7 measures the number of *loans* disbursed to farmers and others, and Indicator 8 measures the *value* of agriculture-related financing accessed by producers and other value chain participants.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM***

to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-27]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** FtF collects this information as part of the Value of agriculture-related financing indicator. In order to capture this data in USDA's database system, a separate indicator on volume has been developed. For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.2.3, 2.2.3.1, 2.3.1.1:** Increased Use of Financial Services

FFPr INDICATOR 6: Number of individuals participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs with USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator tracks individual participation in group-based savings, microfinance, or lending programs. This performance indicator tracks financial inclusion and captures the uptake of financial services by the participants of USDA-funded activities.

Group-based savings programs are formal or informal community programs that serve as a mechanism for people in poor communities with otherwise limited access to financial services to pool their savings. The specific composition and function of the savings groups vary and can include rotating loan disbursement. The definition is inclusive of all of the different types of group-based savings programs, including programs that promote mobile savings. Participants in village savings and lending associations assisted by USDA should be counted under this indicator.

It should be noted that the indicator captures the numbers who are participating but does not say anything about the intensity of participation. Furthermore, while summing the number of individuals participating in savings and credit programs is acceptable as a measure of financial inclusion, saving and credit are functionally different and the numbers participating in each type of program should not be compared against each other. Savings groups have added benefits, like fostering social capital, that also contribute to resilience and a household's ability to manage risk and protect their well-being.

RATIONALE: Access to group-based savings, microfinance, or lending programs is one pathway to a household's financial inclusion. Access to financial services is important for households to diversify their livelihood strategies, protect well-being outcomes and manage risks.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Sex: Female, Male

Age: 15-29, 30+

Product Type: Savings, Credit

Duration:

- New = participated in a savings, micro-finance or lending program for the first time in the reporting year
- Continuing = participated in a savings, micro-finance or lending program in a previous reporting year and continues to participate in a savings, micro-finance or lending program in the current reporting year

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participant-based survey, activity records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: If someone participates in both savings and credit programs they should be counted for both of the product type disaggregates, but only once for the age, sex, and duration disaggregates. Individuals should be reported in the "new" duration disaggregate in the first reporting year they participate, and in the "continuing" duration disaggregate in any subsequent reporting years in which they participate. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.4.2-7]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.1:** Increased Use of Financial Services

FFPr INDICATOR 7: Number of loans disbursed as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator captures the number of loans made/disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USDA assistance to producers, input suppliers, transporters, processors, other MSMEs, and larger enterprises that are in a targeted agricultural value chain.

The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient not loans merely in process (e.g. loan applications, loan applications approved but not yet available to the recipient). Count cash loans and the value of in-kind lending. For cash loans, count only loans made by financial institutions and not by informal groups such as village savings and loan groups that are not formally registered as a financial institution.[1] The loans counted can be made by any size financial institution from microfinance institutions to national commercial banks, as well as non-deposit taking financial institutions and other types of financial NGOs.

The number of loans accessed through informal groups is not included because this indicator is attempting to capture the systems-level changes that occur through increased access to formal financial services.

RATIONALE: Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This, in turn, will help expand markets and trade and should also contribute to increased agricultural productivity.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Loans	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects, a review of banking/lending institution records or a survey of survey of financial institutions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Indicator 5 measures the number of *individuals* accessing debt and non-debt financing. Indicator 7 measures the number of *loans* (debt financing) disbursed to producers and others, and Indicator 8 measures the *value* of agriculture-related financing accessed.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.1:** Increased Use of Financial Services

FFPr INDICATOR 8: Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator sums the total U.S. dollar value of debt (both cash and in-kind loans) and non-debt financing, such as equity financing, disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USDA-assistance to producers (individual farmers, fishers, cooperatives, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, other MSMEs, and larger enterprises that are in a targeted agricultural value chain. The indicator counts the value of non-debt financing and both cash and non-cash lending disbursed to the participant, not financing merely committed (e.g., loans in process, but not yet available to the participant).

Debt: Count cash loans and the value of in-kind lending. For cash loans, count only loans made by financial institutions and not by informal groups such as village savings and loan groups that are not formally registered as a financial institution [1]. However, the loans counted can be made by any size financial institution from microfinance institutions through national commercial banks, as well as any non-deposit taking financial institutions and other types of financial NGOs. In-kind lending in agriculture is the provision of services, inputs, or other goods up front, with payment usually in the form of product (value of service, input, or other good provided plus interest) provided at the end of the season. For in-kind lending, USDA may facilitate in-kind loans of inputs (e.g., fertilizer, seeds) or equipment usage (e.g. tractor, plow) via implementing partners or partnerships. NOTE: formal leasing arrangements should be captured in non-debt financing section below), or transport with repayment in kind.

Non-Debt: Count any financing received other than cash loans and in-kind lending. Examples include: equity, convertible debt, or other equity-like investments, which can be made by local or international investors; and leasing, which may be extended by local banks or specialized leasing companies.

The value of loans accessed through informal groups is not included because this indicator is attempting to capture the systems-level changes that occur through increased access to formal financial services.

RATIONALE: Increased access to finance demonstrates improved inclusion in the financial sector and appropriate financial service offerings. This, in turn, will help expand markets and trade and ought to also contribute to expanding agricultural productivity which will help achieve the key objective of defining inclusive agricultural sector more broadly than just crop production. In turn, this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
US Dollars	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Type of financing accessed: **Debt**

SECOND LEVEL

Type of debt: Cash, In-kind

Size of recipient: Individuals/microenterprises; Small and medium enterprises; Large enterprises

and corporations.

Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

FIRST LEVEL
Type of financing accessed: **Non-debt**

SECOND LEVEL
Size of recipient: Individuals/microenterprises; Small and medium enterprises; Large enterprises and corporations.

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

DATA SOURCE:
WHO WILL COLLECT DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected using a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects or financial institution and investor records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Count targeted individuals within the scope of the USDA project. Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation. Report exchange rate in indicator narrative in FAIS.

Indicator 5 measures the number of *individuals* accessing financing. Indicator 7 measures the number of *loans* disbursed to producers and others, and Indicator 8 measures the *value* of agriculture-related financing accessed by farmers and other value chain participants.

Note: This indicator is related to Indicator 14 *Value of new USG commitments and new public and private sector investment leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition*. Where there is a USDA commitment such as a grant, guarantee provision, or insurance coverage, the resulting value of debt or non-debt financing accessed by participants of USDA-funded activities should be counted under this indicator. The total value of the private sector investment leveraged should be counted under Indicator 14. These two indicators will not be aggregated, thus there is no "double counting."

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
Yes [EG.3.2-27]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity	**FFPr 1.2.4:** Increased Knowledge of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies
FFPr INDICATOR 9: Number of technologies, practices, and approaches under various phases of research, development, and uptake as a result of USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: This indicator tracks the progression of new or significantly improved technologies, practices, and approaches through research and development (R&D) to the demonstrated uptake by public or private sector stakeholders. The R&D process should be hypothesis driven, testable, and independently replicable. The technologies, practices, and approaches under R&D should have the potential to achieve significant improvements in reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition versus existing alternatives. Examples include a new seed variety, a new blend of fertilizer for a particular soil type, or proper sequencing of interventions to increase the adoption of a new technology. Support through USDA assistance includes human, financial, institutional support, in full or in part, for the discovery, research, development, testing, or making available for uptake by the public and private sector.

The technology, practice, or approach is disaggregated first into R&D categories, then into the phase of research. Definitions and illustrative examples of technologies, practices, and approaches by R&D category are:

- **Plant and Animal Improvement Research**: Includes trait, marker, and gene discovery for agriculturally important characteristics, coupled with application of conventional breeding and/or advanced biotechnological approaches for the genetic improvement of plant and animal species. Products include improved germplasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that is higher-yielding, more resilient to biotic and abiotic stresses, higher in nutritional content (e.g. biofortified crops such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes, high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds), and/or possesses improved market or processing traits.

- **Production Systems Research**: Includes Integrated Pest Management (including grafting), Sustainable Intensification (e.g. mechanization, small-scale irrigation, planting schedules, soil management), livestock management, post-harvest and food safety technologies; management practices for feed or food, Natural Resource Management, and vaccines and animal health services. Products include new land preparation, harvesting, processing and product-handling and food safety technologies and practices including packaging and storage methods; sustainable water and land management practices; and sustainable aquaculture and fisheries practices.

- **Social Science Research**: Includes research concerning the effectiveness of agricultural policy options (policy research); research on the socio-behavioral, socioeconomic, or sociopolitical factors that influence decision-making; economic research on products or approaches that overcome barriers to farmer investment in or adoption of improved technology and management practice, etc. (economic research); research or creation of new/improved tools for market access, including financial and insurance products (market access research); and nutrition research. Products include new risk management approaches, such as the integration of partially-subsidized index insurance into social safety nets that cost-effectively increase the resilience of vulnerable households; and approaches to effectively and sustainably change nutrition behaviors or the adoption of improved seeds.

Technologies, practices and approaches should be reported under each phase reached during the reporting year. It is not required that all technologies, practices, and approaches pass through all four phases to be reported under the indicator nor is it essential that all investments start at Phase I. For

example, a seed variety that is only being field-tested for country-level adaptation and then submitted for country-level certification would only be tracked through Phases II and III. However, any technology, practice, or approach that is reported under Phase IV must have been previously reported under Phase I, II, or III during the life of the activity.

Four phases of research, development, and uptake:

Phase I - Under research as a result of USDA assistance: Count new technologies, practices, or approaches under research in the current reporting year.

Phase II - Under field testing as a result of USDA assistance: "Under field testing" means that research has moved from focused development, where a promising technology or practice has been identified, to broader testing of effectiveness under conditions intended to resemble those that the potential users of the new technology will encounter.

Phase III - Made available for uptake as a result of USDA assistance: Count technologies, practices or approaches that are ready to be taken up or adopted by a public or private sector entity, which would then disseminate the technology, practice or approach to end users in a manner that promotes sustainable, widespread adoption at the population level.

Phase IV – Demonstrated uptake by the public and/or private sector with USDA assistance: A technology, practice, or approach has "demonstrated uptake" if any public- and/or private-sector actor has institutionalized or provided support for dissemination, independent of USDA assistance, at any point during the reporting period.

A technology, practice or approach should be reported each year it is actively in Phase I or Phase II during the mechanism's life of activity. A technology, practice, or approach reported under Phase III and IV should be counted only once per country by each recipient across the life of the project, and should be reported on during the first reporting year when the technology, practice or approach is made available for uptake (Phase III) or has demonstrated uptake (Phase IV).

RATIONALE: Research helps inform policy, strategic direction of programs, and methods to overcome barriers to implementation in developing country settings by strengthening the evidence-base for development. This indicator tracks the four phases of research and development and aligns with the cross-cutting contributions of research under the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) results framework.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number	Output (phases 1,2,3); Outcome (phase 4)	Progress to a higher phase is usually better.	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Category of Research

- Plant and Animal Improvement Research
- Production Systems Research
- Social Science Research

Within each category disaggregate by phase of development:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">

- Under research as a result of USDA assistance
- Under field testing as a result of USDA assistance
- Made available for uptake as a result of USDA assistance
- Demonstrated uptake by the public and/or private sector with USDA assistance

</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records, reports or surveys</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">MEASUREMENT NOTES:
BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS VERBATIM to allow for the information to be collected correctly.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</td></tr>
<tr><td>FtF INDICATOR:
Yes [EG.3.2-7]</td><td>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:
For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).</td></tr>
</table>

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.4.1/2.4.1** Increased Capacity of Government Institutions

FFPr INDICATOR 10: Number of individuals who have received USDA-supported degree-granting non-nutrition-related food security training

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of people who are currently enrolled in or have graduated during the reporting year from a degree-granting technical, vocational, associate, bachelor, master, or Ph.D. program. Degree candidates being supported through partial fellowships or exchange programs can be counted toward this indicator. A person who completes one degree-granting program in the fiscal year and is currently participating in another degree-granting program should be counted only once in the reporting year, no matter the length of either degree-granting program; she/he should be counted under the Continuing disaggregate.

Non-nutrition-related food security training includes training in areas such as agronomy, crop science, climate science, plant pathology, rural sociology, anthropology, agricultural economics, agricultural engineering, seed science and systems, bioinformatics, and conflict and conflict resolution.

This indicator measures individuals receiving degree-granting training; individuals applying new practices based on training should be reported under Indicator 4 *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*

RATIONALE: Measures enhanced human capacity for policy formulation, technology development and research/education capacity building and implementation, which is key to transformational development.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Sex: Male, Female

Duration:

- New = the individual received USDA-supported degree-granting training for the first time during the reporting year
- Continuing = the individual received USDA-supported degree-granting training in the previous year and continued to receive it in the reporting year

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:
Yes [EG.3.2-2]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.4.1/2.4.1** Increased Capacity of Government Institutions

FFPr INDICATOR 11: Number of host government or community-derived risk management plans formally proposed, adopted, implemented or institutionalized with USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The indicator tracks the performance of activities working with national governments, regional and/or local governments and/or communities to develop, implement, and institutionalize risk management plans.

Risk is defined as the potential for an uncertain event or trend to have adverse consequences on lives; livelihoods; health; property; ecosystems and species; economic, social and cultural assets; service provision (including environmental services); and infrastructure.

Ideally, risk management plans should be nested within one another. The community plan should be nested within a local or regional government plan that should in turn be nested in the national plan. Activities can work at any of these levels and report under this indicator.

A risk management plan should:

- identify risks (for example flooding, drought, landslide),
- assess their likelihood (a 3 year drought versus a 50 year drought), and
- develop strategies to reduce risk exposure (before the shock), mitigate the impact of the risk and increase ability to cope (during the shock), and reduce recovery time (after the shock).

Understanding that the implementation of plans takes time, the indicator disaggregates by the stage in implementation (proposed, adopted, implemented, and institutionalized).

Stages of Implementation:

- **Proposed**: A plan is in the proposed stage when the activity has started working on or designing a risk management strategy in conjunction with the community or host government (all levels). A plan can be in this stage for multiple years.
- **Adopted**: A risk management plan is in the adoption phase if the plan has been officially accepted by the stakeholders (e.g. local community leaders, local governments, congress). A plan is considered officially adopted when there is a written document outlining roles and responsibilities with signatures as applicable.
- **Implementation**: A risk management plan is in the implementation phase if elements of the plan are being actively implemented. Implementation can be an ongoing process (examples of implementation activities are given in the Rationale section below).
- **Institutionalization**: The end goal is to have the host government or community internalize the risk management plan and take over administration, financing, and implementation, thus making the plan sustainable. Institutionalization will be different for government and community plans. Government institutionalization should be more structured and include a budget line item. Community institutionalization will be less formalized and will include more qualitative evidence that the community is invested and providing and/or securing resources (monetary or in-kind) that will sustain implementation past the end of the activity.

A plan should be reported under only one plan type (government or community). But a plan should be

reported under each stage reached during the reporting year. Recipients may report that a plan has been implemented in more than one year. For example, if in year one the community implements several actions under the plan to improve the management of water resources and in the next year works to develop a nursery to support reforestation efforts, the community can be counted and reported under the Implementation phase both years.			
RATIONALE: In the geographic areas where Food for Progress works, research has shown that covariate shocks, and therefore people's exposure to risk, are cyclical and to be expected. Proactively developing risk management plans with strategies and potential coping mechanisms will reduce the impact on the community. Notably, risk exposure, particularly weather risk exposure, impacts behavior and livelihood decisions, ex ante, regardless of whether the shock actually occurs. Risk management plans can change the calculus and impact beneficiaries' behavior in the absence of a shock.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number	**INDICATOR LEVEL:** Output	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:** Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Type: Government, Community Phase of development: Proposed, Adopted, Implemented, Institutionalized			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: BASELINE INFO: Baselines are required and should be collected at the onset of the activity. Baseline can be zero if there are no risk management plans at any of the stages of development in the target communities/levels of government prior to the start of the activity.			
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [RESIL-1]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).		

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.4.4/2.4.4:** Improved Capacity of Key Groups in the Agriculture Production Sector

FFPr INDICATOR 12: Number of organizations with increased performance with USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures whether USDA-funded capacity development efforts have led to improved organizational performance in organizations receiving organizational performance improvement support.

This indicator should only be used when a project intentionally allocates resources (human, financial, and/or other) toward strengthening organizational capacity and undergoes a deliberate performance improvement process that is documented. With support from the recipient, each organization being supported should determine how it will define and monitor performance improvement based on its organizational mandate and strategic goals and objectives.

The recipient can count an organization under this indicator if:

(a) an organization demonstrates that it has undergone and documented at a minimum the following four steps:

1. Obtain organizational stakeholder input to define desired performance outputs or outcomes.
2. Analyze and assess performance gaps (the difference between desired performance and actual performance).
3. Select and implement performance improvement solutions.
4. Monitor and evaluate performance, and

(b) an organization demonstrates that its targets for performance improvement have been met or achieved. The recipient sets annual targets for this indicator based on how many organizations will have improved organizational performance each year.

Organizations may choose their preferred approach and/or tools for documenting the process and achievement of performance improvement targets. One example of a broad performance improvement and measurement tool that USAID has endorsed is the Organizational Performance Index (OPI), which can be used for assessing performance across multiple domains. Other examples include university accreditation self-assessments, a balanced scorecard approach, Six Sigma, and many others. A description of the approach and/or tool used, including reliability and validity, should be documented to the extent possible in the project Performance Monitoring Plan.

RATIONALE: This indicator measures capacity development efforts to change behavior to improve organization performance in the agricultural sector.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Organizations	Outcome	N/A	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of organization:

- Research and educational
- Private sector firms

- Producer associations
- Extension organizations
- Government agencies
- Non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations
- Women's group
- Trade and business association
- Water users association
- Other

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data should be collected using appropriate methods (including relevant questionnaires or other data documentation methods). Tools and data collection methods should be documented in the project Performance Monitoring Plan.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

Recipients should upload documentation in FAIS for the four steps identified above for each organization being reported under this indicator.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [EG.3.2-29]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.4.5/2.4.5:** Increased Leverage of Private Sector Resources

FFPr INDICATOR 13: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to USDA intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once, though each partnership for a different purpose should be counted. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and private entity. A private entity can be a for-profit entity, an NGO using private funds, a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully). A public entity can be a donor-funded program participant (or the project itself), a national or sub-national government, or state-owned enterprises which are non-profit.

A project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships, we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included.

An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, processing, or transportation. A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.

This indicator is not directly paired with the following indicator on the value of public and private investments leveraged. In other words, this indicator tracks the number of public-private partnerships formed, and these partnerships may or may not be the same ones that result in investments leveraged by USDA.

RATIONALE: The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities, which ultimately contributes to agricultural sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children, and the poor) there will also be a reduction in poverty.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Partnerships	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of partnership (refer to the primary focus of the partnership if applicable):

- Agricultural production
- Agricultural post-harvest transformation
- Nutrition

- Multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)
- Other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships)

DATA SOURCE:
WHO WILL COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and partnerships.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Only count partnerships that are attributable to USDA investment.

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

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 1.4.5/2.4.5:** Increase leverage of private sector resources **FFPr 2.2:** Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products
FFPr INDICATOR 14: Value of new USG commitments and new public and private sector investment leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	
DEFINITION: Investment is defined as any use of public or private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, to improve the sustainable use of agricultural-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), or to improve water or land management anywhere along the food, feed, and fiber system, and natural resources management. Data should be collected for four categories: "host government," "other public sector," "private sector", and "new USG commitments". "Host Government" includes any investments from the national, regional, or local governments. "Other public sector" includes any investments provided by the Program Participant itself, or other Private Voluntary Organizations "Private sector" includes any investments from a private actor, including for-profit organizations, private philanthropic organizations, or individuals. "New USG commitments" refers to funds in the form of a direct loan, part of a grant, or other award designed to leverage additional funds from private sector organizations. Subsidies paid to structure a guarantee or insurance product do not count as new USG commitments. "Leveraged by USDA" indicates that the investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by the activities funded or resources provided by USDA. "Investments" means the level of resources provided during each reporting year. For multi-year activities, commitments are recorded at the outset of the activity, if made prior to the start of the activity, or during the year when they are made, if commitments are received during implementation of an activity. This indicator is not directly paired with the preceding indicator on public-private partnerships. In other words, this indicator does not track only investments that may have been leveraged via those partnerships, but rather is separate and broader in tracking the value of any public or private sector investments leveraged (encouraged or facilitated) by the activities or resources provided by USDA.	
RATIONALE: Increased investment is essential to inclusive economic growth in the agricultural sector. Public and private sector investment is key to achieving long-term impact in improvements in food security, agricultural sustainability and expanded trade. Public and private sector investments should be coordinated and complimentary. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents as providing a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production and expanded trade. Public sector investments can be used to pilot programs, test innovation, and scale-up effective programs.	

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
U.S. Dollar	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period:

			October 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Type of investment: • Host Government • Other public sector • Private sector • New USG commitments			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by project records, firm/farm records.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in indicator narrative in FAIS. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.			
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.1-14]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).		

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 2.2:** Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products **FFPr 2.3:** Improved Transaction Efficiency **FFPr 2.2.3/2.3.1:** Improved Market and Trade Infrastructure

FFPr INDICATOR 15: Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The length of roads, in kilometers, on which construction of new roads or reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing or upgrading of existing roads is complete.

A road "improvement" indicates that the intervention significantly improved the ease of commercial transport along that road and includes reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing or upgrading of existing roads include improving drainage systems, while "constructed" refers to a new road.

In general, a road need not necessarily be paved with cement or asphalt but should significantly facilitate the transport of goods compared to the previous situation without the road or without the road improvement.

RATIONALE: A road opens up transport from rural spaces where rural-based production activities such as agriculture are taking place, and connects, either directly or indirectly, with population centers and market activity. The ability to move harvested goods to storage or processing facilities or to market has a direct impact on efficiency of post-production processes. As such, a project may aim to build or improve roads leading to and from farms.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Kilometers	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Construction type:

- Improved
- Constructed (new)

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through direct measurement or geo-spatial imaging (GPS) measurement of the length of roads added or improved in the project, project records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Count only those roads improved or constructed with USDA assistance.

Only count those kilometers of roads improved or constructed during the reporting year.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [EG.3.1-1]	For more guidance, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 2.1.2.2:** Improved Post-Harvest Infrastructure
FFPr INDICATOR 16: Total increase in installed storage capacity (dry or cold storage) as a result of USDA assistance	
DEFINITION: This indicator measures total increase in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through USDA programming and leveraged during the reporting year. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.	
RATIONALE: Post harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products can account for a significant proportion of overall commodity/product disappearance (waste) in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could, therefore, substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas, as well.	

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cubic Meters	**INDICATOR LEVEL:** Output	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:** Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of storage:

- Dry
- Cold

Type of installation:

- Refurbished
- New

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of farmers about new storage facilities, direct observation of storage units added to target farms (calculate total volume of additional storage capacity across all farms), project records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data on and off-farm, counting only storage added/refurbished that can be accessed by participants.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr 2.1.1.1:** Increased Adoption of Established Standards by Industry **FFPr 2.4.2:** Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework

FFPr INDICATOR 17: Number of policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Number of agricultural enabling environment policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management, and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that:

- Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process, i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulation/administrative procedure).
- Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure.
- Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for agriculture).
- Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority].
- Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority).
- Other: Or were otherwise shaped by the recipient's direct involvement.

RATIONALE: This indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. It includes the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the FFPr framework focused on expanding trade in agricultural products.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative	Stages 1 & 2: Output Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	Although this set of five indicators tracks individual policies through the stages, one should see the aggregates of these indicators, over time, change in certain ways. One should expect the value of the indicators measuring the earlier stages to decline and the indicators measuring the later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms).	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Stage: (1-5, other)

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Only count policies specifically addressed with USDA assistance.

Enter the name of the policy/regulation/administrative procedure and its stage in order to track movement through the stages. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, formation of the law or policy.

Recognizing that the policymaking process is not always linear, the same policy/regulation/ administrative procedure can be counted more than once in each stage over the life of the project. For example, if a trade regulation were introduced as a piece of legislation and subsequently tabled for further consultation with stakeholders, the trade regulation could be counted in stage 3 in the reporting year it was introduced, in stage 2 in the reporting year it was tabled, and in stage 3 if it were re-introduced in a subsequent reporting year. Only count the regulation once per reporting year.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products
FFPr INDICATOR 18: Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the value in U.S. dollars of the total amount of sales of products and services by USDA-assisted farms and firms during the reporting year within USDA-supported agricultural commodity value chains or markets. This indicator also collects additional data points on the value of sales in local currency and the number of activity participants, including the number of producers and the number of assisted private sector firms.

Examples of USDA assistance include facilitating access to improved seeds and other inputs, to extension, business development and financial services, and to micro-enterprise loans; providing technical support in production techniques; strengthening linkages to markets; and other activities that benefit producers or private sector firms in the agriculture and food system.

Annual sales include all sales by farms and firms participating in USDA-funded activities. This includes producers, such as farmers, fishers, and ranchers; and private sector non-farm enterprises, such as aggregators, input suppliers and distributors, traders, or processors of the targeted commodity(ies) throughout the value chain. In value-chain-facilitation and other market-strengthening activities, activity participants include the private sector firms with direct contact with the USDA-funded activity and the producers and other customers buying from or selling to the USDA-assisted firms. Food For Progress recognizes the difficulty and cost to collect sales data directly from producers, especially when working with firms though a market-system approach intended to strengthen the links between producers and firms that purchase from them for onward sales, processing, etc. In these cases, recipients may consider collecting data from firms on producers who sold to the firms while collecting data on sales of the firms, rather than attempting to collect sales data from the producers directly. Recipients can then report both producer and firm sales under the appropriate disaggregate.

"Private sector" includes any privately-led agricultural enterprise managed by a for-profit company. A community-based organization (CBO) or nongovernmental organization (NGO) may be included if the CBO or NGO engages in for-profit agricultural activity. Activity participants may be involved in agricultural production, agro-processing, wholesale or retail sales, fisheries, input supply, or other business activities in USDA-assisted value chains and/or markets.

Only count sales in the reporting year that are attributable to USDA, i.e. where USDA assisted the individual farmer or firm, or the market actor with which they are engaged directly, and for those value chains/commodities/markets which USDA supports.

Under participants, count the number of assisted producers for whom sales data are available. Include producers reached directly with outreach and those buying from or selling to USDA-assisted firms in a systems strengthening approach. For firms, count the USDA-assisted firm as the participant.

It is **essential that a Baseline Year Sales data point be entered**. If data on the total value of sales by participant farms or firms prior to USDA-funded activity implementation is not available, do not leave the baseline blank or enter '0'. Use the earliest Reporting Year Sales actual as the Baseline Year Sales. The number of participants in USDA-funded activities often increases over time as the activity rolls out. Unless an activity has identified all prospective participants at the time the baseline is established, the

baseline sales value will only include sales made by participant farms and firms identified when the baseline is established during the first year of implementation. The baseline sales value will not include the baselines from farms and firms added in subsequent years. To address this issue, **USDA requires reporting the number of participants, both producers and private sector firms for each value chain product or service along with baseline and reporting year sales**. These data points can be used to calculate average sales per participant at baseline, disaggregated by farm and firm and assist with interpreting the reasons for an observed growth in the value of sales. To generate meaningful out-year targets for annual sales, targets for number of participants, disaggregated by farm and firm, are also required.

The type of Product or Service sold by the producer or firm is the first level disaggregate when reporting. These are broken down into the following disaggregate categories to be reported in FAIS, with illustrative examples:

Products:

- Agricultural commodities, which generally include those raw products sold by producers such as staples, legumes, horticulture, livestock, and fish but does NOT include seeds. The specific commodity (maize, mung beans, tomatoes, etc.) needs to be selected.
- Inputs: Seeds and planting material.
- Inputs: Other non-durable inputs, such as fertilizer and pesticides.
- Inputs: Durable equipment and machinery, including land preparation equipment, irrigation equipment, and other equipment or machinery.
- Processed products/value added products (post-harvest). The specific commodity does not need to be selected.
- Post-harvest storage and processing equipment, including PICS bags and processing machinery.

Services:

- Business services, including financial, entrepreneurial, legal, and other enterprise/producer strengthening services
- Information services: SMS, Radio, TV, print, etc.
- Production support services: other services that are sold to farmers, fishers, ranchers and pastoralists, including extension services, veterinary services, rental of equipment, land preparation, warehousing, post-harvest processing

RATIONALE: Value (in US dollars) of sales at the farm and enterprise level is a measure of the competitiveness of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by farmers and enterprises receiving USDA assistance. An increase in sales of agricultural products and services is directly related to increasing agricultural productivity and expanding trade of agricultural products.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
U.S. Dollar	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Type of product or service: *See definition for list of product and service types*. For agricultural commodities, report the specific commodity.

SECOND LEVEL

Type of producer/firm (firms are non-farm enterprises): Producer - smallholder, Producer – non-smallholder, Firm – microenterprise, Firm - Small and medium enterprise, Firm- Large enterprise or corporation. (see definition of smallholder and firm type below)

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.

THIRD LEVEL

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data from assisted producers and firms may need to be collected separately. Ideally, this indicator will be collected directly from a census of all participant farms and firms, from recorded sales data and/or farm/firm records. A sample survey-based approach for participant producers within the geographic area reached by the assisted market is also acceptable. Recipients should work with assisted firms to ensure that appropriate information is provided.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance.

If a sample of participants is used to collect sales data, sample survey weighted estimates must be extrapolated to total participant estimated values before entry into FAIS to accurately **reflect total value of reporting year sales in USD** by the project's participants. Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in comments in FAIS.

Report the **number of participants**, both producers and private sector firms for each value chain product or service, and for each type of producer/firm, sex, and age disaggregate. For example, to report on the number of participants in the coffee value chain, recipients should enter the following information for the reporting year:

Number of participants

- total number of smallholder, female, coffee-producing program participants
- total number of smallholder, male, coffee-producing program participants
- total number of smallholder, 15-29 year old, coffee-producing program participants
- total number of smallholder, 30+ year old, coffee-producing program participants
- *Repeat as necessary with each relevant Type of producer/firm*

Note that the **volume (in metric tons) of sales** of agricultural commodities will be reported in Indicator 19. There should be a correlation between the value of sales of agricultural commodities reported for this Indicator and the volume (in metric tons) of sales reported in Indicator 19.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline data reflects value of sales in the year prior to programming and should be collected through records of assisted firms and/or a sample survey of producers via recall.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-26]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products

FFPr INDICATOR 19: Volume of commodities sold by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator will collect the volume (as calculated in gross metric tons (MT)) of sales of targeted commodities by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance. This includes the volume of all sales of targeted commodity(ies), not just the volume of farm-gate sales.

The actual number reported for the indicator will be the gross volume of sales of a product (crop, animal or fish) by project participants in the reporting period. Only count the gross volume of sales in the reporting period attributable to USDA investment.

USDA will use the data reported for this indicator, as well as the data reported on the value of annual sales, when reporting on the Feed the Future Initiative. Please note that the value of annual sales indicator cannot be calculated without a value for the baseline year's sales. If data on the total volume of sales of the value chain commodity by participants prior to USDA activity implementation is not available, do not leave the baseline blank or enter '0.' Use the earliest reporting year sales volume actual as the baseline year sales.

RATIONALE: Volume (in MT) of sales at the farm and enterprise level of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those beneficiaries receiving USDA assistance. This measurement also helps track supply, access to markets, and progress toward commercialization by farmers and enterprises receiving USDA assistance.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Metric Tons	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Commodity Type (type of crop, type of animal or animal product, or type of fish – freshwater or marine). Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for this indicator. The overall "horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired.

SECOND LEVEL

Type of producer/firm (firms are non-farm enterprises): Producer - smallholder, Producer – non-smallholder, Firm – microenterprise, Firm - Small and medium enterprise, Firm- Large enterprise or corporation. (see definition of smallholder and firm type below)

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.

THIRD LEVEL

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data from assisted producers and firms may need to be collected separately. Ideally, this indicator will be collected directly from a census of all participant farms and firms, from recorded sales data and/or farm/firm records. A sample survey-based approach for participant producers within the geographic area reached by the assisted market is also acceptable. Recipients should work with assisted firms to ensure that appropriate information is provided.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance, i.e. where USDA assisted the individual farmer or firm, or the market actor with which they are engaged directly, and for those value chains/commodities/markets which USDA supports.

If a sample of participants is used to collect sales data, sample survey weighted estimates must be extrapolated to total participant estimated values before entry into FAIS to accurately reflect total sales by the project's participants.

Volume (in metric tons) of agricultural commodities should be directly related to value of agricultural commodities measured in Indicator 18.

BASELINE INFO: Volume of agricultural commodities reported at baseline and for the reporting years should be the volume that was sold and reported as sales in Indicator 18.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [EG.3.2-26]	FtF collects this information as part of the Value of annual sales indicator. In order to capture this data in USDA's database system, a separate indicator on volume has been developed.

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products

FFPr INDICATOR 20: Number of jobs attributed to USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Jobs are all types of employment opportunities **created** during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises, including paid on-farm/fishery employment. Jobs lasting less than one month, or less than 20 days excluding weekends, are not counted in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through duration. This indicator counts both full-time employment and part-time employment, including temporary and seasonal employment. Full-time jobs last at least 260 days (excluding weekends) or 12 months. Part-time jobs last between 21 days and 259 days, excluding weekends. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as hours may vary.

Attributed to USDA assistance includes farming and non-farm jobs where USDA investments were intentional in assisting in any way to expand (or contract) jobs and where a program objective of the USDA investment was job creation. Examples of jobs created include cash for work programs, construction of roads and other infrastructure, on-farm employment, and employment in processing facilities. To be considered a job created, the positions must last longer than one month in duration.

RATIONALE: This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, USDA is concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not short-duration employment, defined as a period of less than one month.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Jobs	Outcome	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
FIRST LEVEL
Type of Employment: Full-time, Part-time

SECOND LEVEL
Sex of Job Holder: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by project records, firm/farm records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to FFPr projects.
Each job created should only ever be reported once in order to add the total number of jobs across years.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products

FFPr INDICATOR 21: Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted as received training, through formal or informal means.

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

Individuals include agricultural producers, ranchers, fisheries, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc., and extension specialists, researchers, inspectors, government employees, policy makers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system, and natural resources management.

In-country and offshore training are included. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.

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

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Sex: Male/Female

Duration:

- New = this reporting year is the first period the person applied the new technology or technique
- Continuing = the person first applied the new technology or technique in the previous period and continues to apply it

Type of individual:

- Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)
- People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)
- People in government (e.g. extension workers, policymakers)
- People in civil society (e.g. NGOs, CBOs, research and academic organizations)
    - Note: While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only

	count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double counting.
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records, reports, or surveys. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Count only those individuals targeted by USDA programs. This indicator is a comprehensive indicator that includes all USDA supported training. This indicator is to measure individuals *receiving* training, for which the outcome, individuals *applying* new practices should be reported under Indicator 4 *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*. Individuals should not be double counted in a given fiscal year. For example, if one individual participates in multiple project-sponsored training courses in a given fiscal year, they should only be counted one time in that fiscal year. Individuals participating in project-sponsored training courses in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products

FFPr INDICATOR 22: Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals directly participating in USDA-funded interventions, including those we reach directly, those reached as part of a deliberate service strategy, and those participating in the markets we strengthen. An individual is a participant if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided or facilitated by the activity. Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) do not count under this indicator. A participating individual counts if one can reasonably expect, and hold recipients responsible for achieving progress toward, changes in behaviors or other outcomes for these individuals based on the level of services and/or goods provided or accessed. Producers with increased access to goods, services and markets for their products and who purchase from or sell to market actors that have been strengthened as a result of our activities are considered to have received a significant intervention.

This indicator counts, with some exceptions listed below, all the individuals participating in FFPr activities, including:

- Smallholder and non-smallholder producers that projects or project-supported actors reach directly (e.g. through an irrigation training, through a loan provided, through distribution of drought-tolerant seeds to specific farmers);
- Proprietors of firms in the private sector that we help strengthen (e.g. agrodealers, aggregators, processors), but not all the employees of those firms;
- Producers who directly interact with those USDA-assisted firms (e.g. the producers who are customers of an assisted agrodealer; the producers from whom an assisted trader or aggregator buys), but not customers or suppliers who are not producers;
- Participants whose main source of income is labor (e.g. Laborers/non-producer diversified livelihood participants);
- People reached by productive safety nets, community-based micro-finance and diversified livelihood activities through our assistance;
- People in civil society organizations and government whose skills and capacity have been strengthened by projects or project-supported actors;

Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions in one fiscal year but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions. For example, if one individual participates in multiple USDA-sponsored training courses in a given fiscal year, they will only be counted one time in that fiscal year. Individuals participating in USDA-sponsored training courses in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

RATIONALE: This indicator is designed to capture the breadth of our food security work. This indicator tracks access to goods and services that can lead to adoption of improved agricultural techniques, technologies, practices, services, and policies that will result in greater agricultural productivity and expanded agricultural markets.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period:

			October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

- Sex: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)*
  - Male;
  - Female;

- Age Category: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)*
  - 15-29;
  - 30+;

- Type of Individual: *double-counting individuals across types is permitted here*
  - **People in government** *(e.g. policy makers, extension workers, healthcare workers);*
  - **Proprietors of USDA-assisted private sector firms** *(e.g. agrodealers, traders, aggregators, processors, service providers, manufacturers);*
  - **People in civil society** *(e.g. NGOs, Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), research and academic organizations, community volunteers)*
    While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count their proprietors under the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate and not the "Civil Society" disaggregate
  - **Laborers** (Non-producer diversified livelihoods participants);
  - **Producers** *(e.g. farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers);*
    Producers should be counted under the "Producers" disaggregate, not the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate

    SECOND LEVEL (only for the first-level disaggregate of "Producers")
    - Size:
      - Smallholder *(see definition below)*;
      - Non-smallholder;
      - Not applicable *(for aquaculture);*

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports, firm records, or through census or sampling of participating firms/farms/families/individuals, etc.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator provides a unique count of total project participants.

Individuals who are trained by a recipient as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy (e.g. cascade training) that then go on to deliver services directly to individuals or to train others to deliver services should be counted as participants of the project—the capacity strengthening is key for sustainability and an important outcome in its own right. The individuals who then receive the services or training delivered by those individuals are also considered participants. However, spontaneous spillover of improved practices to neighbors does not count as a deliberate service delivery strategy; neighbors who apply new practices based on observation and/or interactions with participants who have not been trained to spread knowledge to others as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy should not be counted under this indicator. Neighbors can be counted under Indicator 23 *Number of individuals benefiting indirectly as a result of USDA assistance.* BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3-2]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products

FFPr INDICATOR 23: Number of individuals benefiting indirectly as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals indirectly benefitting from USDA-funded interventions. The individuals will not be directly engaged with a project activity or come into direct contact with a set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. This may include for example family members of farmers trained. Participants' neighbors that, due to spontaneous spillover, apply USDA-promoted improved management practices or technologies may also be counted as indirect beneficiaries if Recipients use clearly documented assumptions that are regularly validated through spot surveys or similar methods.

Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may benefit from multiple interventions in one fiscal year but should only be counted once per fiscal year. If an individual is already counted as a participant under Indicator 22, the individual should not also be counted as an indirect beneficiary if they are indirectly benefitting from other project interventions. For example, if a farmer is counted as a participant after directly participating in a training course, the farmer should not also be counted as an indirect beneficiary if another family member participates in a different training course.

RATIONALE: Tracks indirect impact of project on community or area of intervention.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

Only indirect beneficiaries should be counted under this indicator. Individual beneficiaries should not come into direct contact or receipt of an intervention or set of interventions, but should indirectly benefit from one or more of the project's interventions. For example, *family members* who benefit from training should be counted under this indicator but *farmers* receiving the training should be counted as participants.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	**FFPr SO1:** Increased Agricultural Productivity **FFPr SO2:** Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products

FFPr INDICATOR 24: Number of USDA social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets

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

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

Participants in Cash For Work activities that receive regular payments in exchange for their labor contribution to a physical community asset such as a road or irrigation canal are social assistance beneficiaries. What sets productive safety nets apart from other social assistance programs is that the assistance—a predictable resource transfer—is provided in exchange for labor or to offset the opportunity cost of an investment of time. For this reason they are sometimes referred to as "conditional" safety net programs. Another difference is an expectation that, over time, individuals or households enrolled in a productive safety net program will "graduate" from that program.

RATIONALE: This indicator measures number of people participating in United States Government supported social assistance programming with productive components aimed at increasing self-sufficiency of the vulnerable population. This is an output indicator and is applicable to multiple parts of the Global Food Security Strategy results framework.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of Asset strengthened: Community assets, Human assets/capital, and Household assets

Sex: Male, Female

Duration:

- New = this is the first year the person participated in a productive safety net
- Continuing = this person participated in the previous reporting year and continues to participate in the current reporting year

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participant-based survey, activity records

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [ES.5-1]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MCGOVERN-DOLE STANDARD INDICATORS SUMMARY

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
1	MGD SO1	Improved Literacy of School Age Children	outcome	Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text	N	Percent	*Baseline, Midterm and Endline*
2	MGD 1.3	Improved Student Attendance	outcome	Average student attendance rate in USDA supported classrooms/schools	N	Percent	Biannual
3	MGD 1.1.2	Better Access to School Supplies and Materials	output	Number of teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
4	MGD 1.1.4	Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers	outcome	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
5	MGD 1.1.4	Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers	output	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
6	MGD 1.1.5	Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	outcome	Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
7	MGD 1.1.5	Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	output	Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
8	MGD 1.3.3/ 2.4	Improved School Infrastructure/ Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services	output	Number of educational facilities (i.e. school buildings, classrooms, improved water sources, and latrines) rehabilitated/constructed as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
9	MGD 1.3.4	Increased Student Enrollment	outcome	Number of students enrolled in school receiving USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
10	MGD 1.4.2/ 2.7.2	Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework	output (stages 1 & 2) outcome (stages 3, 4 & 5)	Number of policies, regulations, or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
11	MGD 1.4.3/ 1.4.4	Increased Government Support/ Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups	output	Value of new USG commitments, and new public and private sector investments leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	Y	U.S. Dollar	Annual
12	MGD 1.4.4	Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups	output	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
13	MGD 1.4.4	Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups	output	Number of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or similar "school" governance structures supported as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
14	MGD 1.2.1/ 1.3.1/ 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1	Reduced Short-Term Hunger/ Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives/Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)	output	Quantity of take-home rations provided (in metric tons) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Metric Tons	Biannual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
15	MGD 1.2.1/ 1.3.1/ 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1	Reduced Short-Term Hunger/ Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives/Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)	output	Number of individuals receiving take-home rations as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
16	MGD 1.2.1/ 1.3.1/ 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1	Reduced Short-Term Hunger/ Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives/Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)	output	Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
17	MGD 1.2.1/ 1.3.1/ 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1	Reduced Short-Term Hunger/ Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives/Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)	output	Number of school-age children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
18	MGD 1.2.1/ 1.3.1/ 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1/ 2.5	Reduced Short-Term Hunger/ Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives (Or Decreased Disincentives)/ Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)/Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions	output	Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
19	MGD SO2	Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	outcome	Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new child health and nutrition practices as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
20	MGD SO2	Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	outcome	Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new safe food preparation and storage practices as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
21	MGD SO2	Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	outcome	Percent of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted infant and young child feeding behaviors	Y	Percent	Annual
22	MGD 2.2	Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices	output	Number of individuals trained in safe food preparation and storage as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
23	MGD 2.3	Increased Knowledge of Nutrition	output	Number of individuals trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
24	MGD 2.3	Increased Knowledge of Nutrition	output	Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	Y	Number	Annual
25	MGD 2.3	Increased Knowledge of Nutrition	output	Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USDA-supported programs	Y	Number	Annual
26	MGD 2.3	Increased Knowledge of Nutrition	output	Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	Y	Number	Annual
27	MGD 2.4	Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services	output	Number of schools using an improved water source	N	Number	Biannual
28	MGD 2.4	Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services	output	Number of schools with improved sanitation facilities	N	Number	Biannual
29	MGD 2.5	Increased Access to Preventative Health Services	output	Number of students receiving deworming medication(s)	N	Number	Biannual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
30	MGD SO1 and SO2	Improved Literacy of School Age Children/ Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	output	Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs	Y	Number	Annual
31	MGD SO1 and SO2	Improved Literacy of School Age Children/ Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	output	Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions	N	Number	Annual
32	MGD SO1 and SO2	Improved Literacy of School Age Children/ Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	output	Number of schools reached as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual

MCGOVERN-DOLE STANDARD INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD SO1:** Improved Literacy of School-Age Children

MGD INDICATOR 1: Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text

DEFINITION: Proportion of learners who attain the specified threshold at the end of two grades of primary schooling, the beginning of the third year of primary schooling, or the equivalent levels of accelerated learning programs. Students and learners in formal and non-formal education programs should be included. Measures of the indicator will be determined in consultation with the country, and informed by national (or regional, if applicable) curriculum standards, and by international experience.

Illustrative examples include country-specific benchmarks on national assessments that have satisfactory psychometric validity and reliability and limited corruption issues or levels of oral fluency based on acceptable oral assessments, e.g. demonstrating satisfactory levels of comprehension as measured by comprehension questions on grade 2 texts, or reading a country-determined number of words correct per minute. The language(s) of assessment will be determined by country policies. Any assessment system with adequate psychometric validity and reliability is acceptable, e.g. ASER, EGRA, and national assessments.

A census of all the students and learners who received the treatment or intervention is not necessary. Rather, a statistical sample that is representative of that population is adequate. Those findings then may be extrapolated to the population.

$$\textit{MGD indicator 1} = \frac{\textit{\# of students and learners reading with sufficient understanding at the end of the first two grade of primary schooling}}{\textit{Total \# of students and learners at the end of the first two grades of primary schooling}}$$

RATIONALE: The indicator is useful for measuring the impact of USDA projects in improving the literacy of school age children.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Percent	Outcome	Higher is better	Baseline, midterm, and endline

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: For students and learners in both formal and non-formal education programs, data will be generated through early grade reading assessments (most likely oral). Assessments should be done at baseline, midterm, and endline, using comparable assessments given at the same grades or their equivalents (at the end of grade two, the beginning of grade 3, or at the equivalent level of accelerated learning programs). These assessments may be carried out by or in partnership with host governments or other organizations, national or international.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Note that the sampling approach must generate data representative at the level of USDA interventions. If, for instance, programs intervene in only two provinces, data

representative of those two provinces must be collected.

Nationally-representative data cannot be disaggregated by province unless the sampling frame was designed to do so, and is large enough for this type of disaggregation.

Testing data should be collected at the same time during each school year, if feasible.

If EGRA is used for literacy testing, evaluators must follow the standards articulated in the most recently published EGRA Toolkit (example: https://www.globalreadingnetwork.net/eddata/early-grade-reading-assessment-toolkit-second-edition-2016).

BASELINE INFO: This indicator will have a non-zero baseline percentage, representing the actual percentage of students in targeted project schools who can read and understand the meaning of grade level text before the project begins.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	*This indicator aligns with* USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator ES.1-1

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.3:** Improved Student Attendance

MGD INDICATOR 2: Average student attendance rate in USDA supported classrooms/schools

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the average attendance rate of males and females attending USDA supported schools. The indicator tracks any change over time in the attendance rate. The indicator doesn't rely on tracking individual student's attendance, but rather reflects an "attendance rate" calculated by how many children are in attendance at a given time compared to how many could be (based on enrollment).

"Students" are learners of school-age in formal or non-formal schools or non-school based settings for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education, knowledge, or skills.

"USDA supported classrooms/school" is defined as those classrooms or schools that receive direct services from a USDA-supported program. Services include, for example, school meals and/or take home rations; subsidies for school books, uniforms, and transportation fees; school enrollment fees; and activities focused on increasing parents' and communities' knowledge of the importance of schooling.

RATIONALE: The indicator is useful for measuring the impact of USDA projects in boosting the number of students that attend school. The McGovern-Dole program legislation targets low-income areas where children's enrollment and attendance in school is low or female enrollment and participation in preschool or school is low. Increased attendance gives students increased opportunities to learn.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Percent	Outcome	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Depending on the accuracy of school records, student data from school/teacher attendance records can be collected and analyzed, or data collected by Recipients during visits using real-time headcounts and enrollment data may be used.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Data should be collected by recipients in a representative sample of schools that the project is operating in during the reporting period. Data should be collected two or more times during the reporting period and combined when reporting to mitigate the risk of an attendance anomaly on a single day. Recipients should aim to collect data on "typical" school days where attendance levels are expected to realistically reflect students' attendance. The attendance rate may rely on school records when those records appear accurate, but should instead rely on headcounts by recipient staff when there is doubt about the accuracy of records.

External evaluators should replicate the attendance rate data collection and calculation method during each evaluation to triangulate project monitoring data.

BASELINE INFO: The baseline will be a non-zero number, reflecting the average attendance rate in schools before the project begins.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.1.2:** Better Access to School Supplies and Materials

MGD INDICATOR 3: Number of teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance. This may represent a range of final 'products', including materials that are designed and then printed and published, or documents that are purchased and distributed. For the purposes of this indicator, however, the same material should only be counted once: in its final stage of USDA support.

Teaching and learning materials may include:

- textbooks
- student workbooks
- supplementary reading books, including library books or materials
- educational tapes, CDs and DVDs
- reference material in hard or electronic copies for use in preschool, primary, secondary, adult education, and/or teacher training classes.
- support materials for educational radio, cassette, CD or TV broadcasts

Small materials and supplies (e.g. pencils, small materials produced as hand-outs in training etc.), even if paid for by USDA funds should not be counted.

RATIONALE: Learning materials, including an adequate amount of materials per student, are critical to supporting educational quality. This measure provides an overall sense of the scope of products resulting from investments in this area.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Teaching/ Learning Materials	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports, school administrator/teacher records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: None

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	*This indicator aligns with* USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator ES.1-10.

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.1.4:** Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers
MGD INDICATOR 4: Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: This outcome indicator measures the number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who are using improved techniques and tools in their classrooms as a result of USDA assistance.

Teachers, educators, teaching assistants who have successfully completed a pre- or in-services training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USDA support (i.e. scholarships or training program funded in whole or in part with USDA funds) should be evaluated as to whether the learned technologies and techniques are being applied in their classroom instruction.

Successful application requires that teachers, educators, and teaching assistants have incorporated the learned methods into their curriculum and are actively applying these methods in their daily classroom instruction.

RATIONALE: Increasing the skills and knowledge of teachers builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Increasing skills and knowledge of teachers will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Teachers / Educators / Teaching Assistants	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program observations, interviews, site visits, and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator counts the *application* of improved techniques and tools developed through USDA sponsored training, whereas the count of individuals trained is reported under MGD Indicator 5.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.1.4:** Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers

MGD INDICATOR 5: Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of teachers/educators/training assistants trained or certified directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part.

Teachers, educators, teaching assistants who have successfully completed a pre- or in-services training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USDA support (i.e. scholarships or training program funded in whole or in part with USDA funds)

Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours in duration.

RATIONALE: Training teachers and/or educators builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. This indicator provides an overall sense of scope by giving a count of the total number of teachers/educators trained through pre-service training. Training teachers to effectively teach literacy to children of different skill levels is essential to improving the overall quality of instruction.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Teachers / Educators / Teaching Assistants	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Trainings should be counted only if they are at least two working days in duration (16 hours). If a trainee is trained in more than one area or instance in a given reporting period, s/he should only be counted once in that reporting period. Participants may be counted in multiple fiscal years if they continue receiving training across fiscal years, but should be counted only once in the life-of-project total.

This indicator counts the individuals trained through USDA sponsored training, whereas the *application* of new techniques and tools developed is reported under MGD Indicator 4.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	*This indicator aligns with* USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator ES.1-6.

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.1.5:** Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators
MGD INDICATOR 6: Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	
DEFINITION: This outcome indicator measures the total number of school administrators who are applying the new knowledge and skills received in USDA-supported training and certification programs. Areas of training may include finance, management (e.g. logistics, monitoring, personnel use and support), governance (e.g., legislation, communication, enforcement), infrastructure (e.g. building, supplies), or quality assurance for improving literacy skills. School administrators should demonstrate the use of at least one new technique or technology in their standard practices or procedures related to finance, management, infrastructure, or quality assurance of instruction.	
RATIONALE: Increasing the skills and knowledge of school administrators builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Increasing skills and knowledge of school administrators will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning.	

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Administrators/ Officials	**INDICATOR LEVEL:** Outcome	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:** Annually covering the periods: October 1-September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Sex: Male, Female			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program observations, interviews, site visits, and reports.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator counts the *application* of improved techniques and tools developed through USDA sponsored training, whereas the count of individuals trained is reported under MGD Indicator 7. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.			
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.			

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.1.5:** Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators
MGD INDICATOR 7: Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	
DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of school administrators and officials (e.g. principals, superintendents) trained or certified directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part. School administrators or other education officials (public or private) are trained in aspects of their current positions, including areas such as finance, management (e.g. logistics, monitoring, personnel use and support), governance (e.g., legislation, communication, enforcement), infrastructure (e.g. building, supplies) or quality assurance for improving literacy skills. Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours) in duration.	
RATIONALE: Training school administrators or education officials builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Increasing skills and knowledge of school administrators, such as school principals or superintendents, will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning.	

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Administrators/ Officials	**INDICATOR LEVEL:** Output	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:** Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Sex: Male, Female			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Trainings should be counted only if they are at least two working days in duration (16 hours); however trainings may not necessarily occur over consecutive days. If a trainee is trained in more than one area or instance in a given reporting period, s/he should only be counted once in that reporting period. Participants may be counted in multiple fiscal years if they continue receiving training across fiscal years, but should be counted only once in the life-of-project total. This indicator counts the individuals trained through USDA sponsored training, whereas the *application* of new techniques and tools developed is reported under MGD Indicator 6. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.			
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.			

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** *This indicator aligns with* USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator ES.1-12.

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD 1.3.3:** Improved School Infrastructure **MGD 2.4:** Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services
MGD INDICATOR 8: Number of educational facilities (i.e. school buildings, classrooms, improved water sources, and latrines) rehabilitated/constructed as a result of USDA assistance	

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of classrooms/schools/latrines/improved water sources rehabilitated or constructed in whole or in part by a USDA-funded project.

Rehabilitation ranges from cosmetic upgrades such as whitewashing walls, to structural improvements (replacing broken windows, fixing leaking roofs, rebuilding damaged walls or roofs, repairing latrines, and upgrading fixing school kitchens), and mending broken furniture. Latrines (or toilets) that are repaired must meet set local government standards and should also be counted. Latrines (or toilets) counted are only those that have hand washing facilities within or near the toilets.

Classrooms are expected to be safe and secure spaces in which organized group learning takes place. Classrooms range from environmentally-appropriate, roofed structures without walls, to traditional four-walled structures with a roof and windows. Latrines (or toilets) constructed must allow for gender-specific latrines (or toilets) and must meet host country standards regarding the ratio of students per squat hole.

If a classroom block is rehabilitated/constructed, the number of classrooms in that block affected by the repair/construction should be counted. Similarly, if a block of latrines is rehabilitated/constructed, the number of latrines affected should be counted. This indicator does not include temporary classrooms (such as tents, open spaces set aside for instruction) frequently found in refugee settings.

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

Improved water sources are:

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

If the water source is rehabilitated or constructed but does not meet the criteria of "improved", it should not be counted as it is not likely to yield potable water. Note that MGD Indicator 27 counts the number of *schools* with an improved water source, whereas the number of improved water sources that the project rehabilitates or constructs is counted using this indicator. See MGD Indicator 27 for more detail on improved water sources.

RATIONALE: Classrooms of acceptable quality are an essential component of education, making instruction possible, more enjoyable and more acceptable for children. Classroom construction can also encourage parents to send their children to school especially in areas where schools were previously too far away. Schools in flagrant disrepair are a deterrent to attendance, especially for females, a

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">distraction from instruction, and frequently unsafe and inadequate for teaching and learning in inclement weather. Adequate school buildings positively impact school attendance.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</td></tr>
<tr><td>UNIT OF MEASURE:
Number: Facilities</td><td>INDICATOR LEVEL:
Output</td><td>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better</td><td>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:
Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">DISAGGREGATION:
<u>Type of Facility</u>:
Classrooms
Kitchens, cook areas
Improved Water Sources
Latrines
Other school grounds or school buildings</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by observation or from program participant records and reports.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">MEASUREMENT NOTES: Facilities at schools should only be counted if they receive direct assistance whether in whole or in part from a USDA project.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS VERBATIM to allow for the information to be collected correctly.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">FtF INDICATOR:
No</td><td colspan="2">DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This indicator aligns with USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator ES.1-14 (Number of Classrooms).</td></tr>
</table>

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.3.4:** Increased Student Enrollment

MGD INDICATOR 9: Number of students enrolled in schools receiving USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This is an outcome indicator measuring the number of school-age students or learners formally enrolled in school or equivalent non-school based settings for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education skills or knowledge. This number may include learners enrolled in educational radio and/or TV programming.

Only students enrolled at schools that are directly benefitting from USDA assistance should be counted under this indicator. For this indicator, USDA assistance to schools includes the provision of commodities for school feeding and/or the rehabilitation of school infrastructure.

RATIONALE: Student enrollment is typically a precursor to attendance, as children usually must be formally enrolled in order to attend class. Children must regularly attend school in order to improve their reading skills and understanding of grade-level text.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Students	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

School Level:

- Pre-Primary
- Primary
- Secondary

SECOND LEVEL:

- Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports, and school/teacher enrollment records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: The baseline for this indicator is a non-zero number. The baseline should reflect the actual enrollment in project schools before the project begins.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	*This indicator aligns with* USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators ES.1-3 and ES.1-4.

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD 1.4.2** Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework **MGD 2.7.2** Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework

MGD INDICATOR 10: Number of policies, regulations, or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Number of education enabling environment policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the areas of education, including school feeding, school finance, assessment, teacher recruitment and selection, etc., that:

Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures
Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure
Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for education)
Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority]
Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority)
Other: Or were otherwise shaped by the recipient's direct involvement.

This indicator is disaggregated by two types of policies/ regulation/ administrative procedures: educational, and child health and nutrition. To be counted under education, actions must have, as their ultimate purpose, improving equitable access to or the quality of education services. Child health may include government health facilities, established procedures, materials, public information, or training. Nutrition may include public sector investment allocated to nutrition, nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, nutritional products, nutrition service delivery, provision of deworming medication, school-based WASH, etc.,

Policies, regulations or administrative procedures that focus on *school feeding* should be captured as educational policies, regardless of which local ministry or agency is involved. Child health and nutrition actions besides those which focus on school feeding should be captured as child health and nutrition policies.

Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

RATIONALE: The indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for education and child health and nutrition. It includes the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the MGD framework focused on improving literacy of school-age children, or focused on increasing use of health, nutrition and dietary practices

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	INDICATOR LEVEL:	DIRECTION OF CHANGE:	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:
Number: Policies, regulations, and/or	Stages 1 & 2: Output	Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the	Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30

administrative procedures and supplementary narrative	Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	disaggregated stages, one should see the disaggregate for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)	

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of policy:

- Educational
- Child Health and Nutrition

Stage: Disaggregates will be shown by stages (1-5) and 6 as noted above.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation, and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, and regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in project reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Only count policies specifically addressed and supported with USDA assistance.

Enter the name of the policy/regulation/administrative procedure and its stage in order to track movement through the stages. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, or formation of the law or policy.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School Age Children	**MGD 1.4.3:** Increased Government Support **MGD 1.4.4:** Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups
MGD INDICATOR 11: Value of new USG commitments, and new public and private sector investments leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	
DEFINITION: The term "investments" is defined as public or private sector resources intended to complement existing/ongoing USDA-funded activities (*i.e.* education or nutrition activity, as described below), including resources provided for purposes of *cost-share* or *matching*. While the majority of such resources will be monetary in nature, non-monetary resources (e.g. in-kind contributions, labor, etc.) should be expressed in their respective dollar values. Data should be collected for four categories: "host government," "other public sector," "private sector", and "new USG commitments". "Host Government" includes any investments from the national, regional, or local governments. "Other public sector" includes any investments provided by the Program Participant itself, or other Private Voluntary Organizations. "Private sector" includes any investments from a private actor, including for-profit organizations, private philanthropic organizations, or individuals. "New USG commitments" refers to funds in the form of a direct loan, part of a grant, or other award designed to leverage additional funds from private sector organizations. Subsidies paid to structure a guarantee or insurance product do not count as new USG commitments. "Leveraged as a result of USDA assistance" indicates that the investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by the activities funded or resources provided by USDA. "Investments" means the level of resources provided during each reporting year. For multi-year activities, commitments are recorded at the outset of the activity, if made prior to the start of the activity, or during the year when they are made, if commitments are received during implementation of an activity. A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on improving the nutritional content of agricultural products provided to consumers, developing improved nutritional products, increasing support for nutrition service delivery, etc. An educational activity includes any activity focused on improving educational support to improve the quality of literacy or any other lower level result in the MGD results framework such as improving access to school supplies and materials, improved school infrastructure, increased access to food, and improved literacy instructional materials. This indicator is not directly paired with the preceding indicator (MGD Indicator 10) on public-private partnerships. In other words, this indicator does not track only investments that may have been leveraged via those partnerships, but rather is separate and broader in tracking the value of any public or private sector investments leveraged (encouraged or facilitated) by the activities or resources provided by USDA.	

RATIONALE: The assumption of this indicator is that the higher the value of investment, particularly by the host government, the greater the chances for long-term sustainability of education and nutrition-related activities beyond USDA's initial commitment. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable improvements. All of these investments are key to achieving long-term impact in project areas by increasing host country capacity and ownership of programs. Coordinated and complementary investments from the host government and other public and private sector donors will help achieve improved literacy and increased use of health and dietary practices, which then contribute to the key objective of improving the literacy of school age children and sustaining the benefits made during project implementation to literacy, attendance, and enrollment by graduating the project to full host-country ownership.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
U.S. Dollar	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of investment amount:

- Host Government amount
- Other Public sector amount
- Private sector amount
- New USG Commitment amount

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by partnership records/agreements.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Convert local currency to U.S. dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in indicator narrative in FAIS.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes, partially; combines EG.3.1-14 with USDA-specific disaggregates	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School Age Children	**MGD 1.4.4:** Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups

MGD INDICATOR 12: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Number of public-private partnerships in education or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to USDA assistance (*i.e.* education or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once, though each partnership for a different purpose should be counted. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. A private entity can be a for-profit entity, an NGO using private funds, a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully). A public entity can be a donor-funded program participant, a national or sub-national government, or state-owned enterprises which are non-profit. One example of a common local-level public-private partnership in MGD projects is a Village Savings and Loan group that contributes to a school canteen.

A project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included.

A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on improving the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, developing improved nutritional products, increasing support for nutrition service delivery, etc.

An educational activity includes any activity focused on improving educational support to improve quality of literacy or any other lower level result in the MGD results framework such as improving access to school supplies and materials, improved school infrastructure, increased access to food, and improved literacy instructional materials.

This indicator is not directly paired with the following indicator (MGD Indicator 11) on the value of public and private investments, and USG commitments, leveraged. In other words, this indicator tracks the number of public-private partnerships formed, and these partnerships may or may not be the same ones that result in investments leveraged by USDA.

RATIONALE: The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in education or nutrition-related activities. This will help achieve improved literacy and increased use of health and dietary practices which then contribute to the key objective of improving the literacy of school age children and sustaining the benefits made during project implementation to literacy, attendance, and enrollment by graduating the project to full host-country ownership.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Partnerships	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of Partnership:

- Education
- Nutrition
- Health
- Multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)
- Other

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data should be collected at the project level through observation and records of partnerships created. Partnership agreements should be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Only count partnerships that are attributable to USDA investment.

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

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School Age Children	**MGD 1.4.4:** Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups

MGD INDICATOR 13: Number of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or similar "school" governance structures supported as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: A PTA, School Management Committee (SMC), or other similar governance body for an individual school (or equivalent non-school setting) can be identified as:

- meeting at least four times during the school year
- participating in education activities by meeting with school officials quarterly
- contributing to school governance by reviewing all policies and procedures
- OR in any other way engaging to be more supportive of the school or non-school equivalent education setting.

Within the context of each school community, Recipients may determine whether such a structure exists, and then determine whether support in creating such a body or strengthening the existing body is relevant.

This indicator tracks the number of such groups that are supported by USDA during the reporting period. USDA support includes, but is not limited to, direct financial support (grants), coaching/ mentoring provided to the group, and/or training in skills related to serving on a PTA, SMC, or equivalent governance body.

RATIONALE: Support for PTA or other school governance structures is an important way to promote capacity building at the grassroots, local level. Such structures promote opportunities for democracy in action as well as improved local ownership, accountability, and educational quality.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: PTAs or similar	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data from project, school, community, and/or administrative records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The definitional criteria listed are intended to help identify what a PTA or similar school governance structure may look like, though ultimately Recipients may determine in context whether such structures exist. The indicator itself does not count how many meet the suggested criteria, but rather tracks how many such groups were supported as a result of USDA assistance.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	*This indicator aligns with* USG Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator ES.1-13.

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.2.1:** Reduced Short-Term Hunger **MGD 1.3.1:** Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives **MGD 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1:** Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)

MGD INDICATOR 14: Quantity of take-home rations provided (in metric tons) as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator will collect the total quantity of take-home rations provided during the reporting period, in metric tons. Take-home rations are provided to a student, family, teacher, or other person in a USDA-supported project.

Take-home rations transfer food resources to families conditional upon school enrollment and regular attendance of children, especially females. Rations are given to families typically once a month or once a term. They increase school participation and probably learning. Their effect depends on whether the value of the ration offsets some of the costs of sending the child to school.

Rations may also be given as an incentive to teachers or cooks in return for their time or service.

RATIONALE: School meals, coupled with take home rations, can serve as an effective mechanism for encouraging attendance, particularly among females, and attentiveness in school. Take home rations also increase household access to food in the short term.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Metric tons	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: Commodity type

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will track the quantity of rations distributed during the reporting period.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The quantity of take-home rations provided is counted under Indicator 14, while the number of *individuals* receiving take-home rations is counted under MGD Indicator 15.

The number of daily school meals provided to school-age children is counted under MGD Indicator 16 and the number of *individual school-age children* receiving school meals is counted under MGD Indicator 17.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.2.1:** Reduced Short-Term Hunger **MGD 1.3.1:** Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives **MGD 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1:** Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)

MGD INDICATOR 15: Number of individuals receiving take-home rations as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Take-home rations transfer food resources to families conditional upon school enrollment and regular attendance of children, especially females. Rations are given to families typically once a month or once a term. They increase school participation and probably learning. Their effect depends on whether the value of the ration offsets some of the costs of sending the child to school.

Rations may also be given as an incentive to teachers or cooks in return for their time or service.

RATIONALE: School meals, coupled with take home rations, can serve as an effective mechanism for encouraging attendance, particularly among females. Take home rations also increase household access to food in the short term.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Duration:

- New = this reporting period is the first period the individual received take-home rations
- Continuing = the person first received take-home rations in the previous period and continues to receive them

Type of Beneficiary:

- Male Students
- Female Students
- Pregnant and Lactating Women
- Others

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of individuals receiving take home rations at the project level, through reports and program data.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The quantity of take-home rations provided is counted under MGD Indicator 14. The number of daily meals provided to school age children is counted under MGD Indicator 16 and the number of school-age children receiving school meals is counted under MGD Indicator 17.

Individuals should not be double counted in a given fiscal year. The individual should be counted the first time that they receive a take-home ration in that fiscal year. Individuals that receive a take-home ration in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM***

to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.2.1:** Reduced Short-Term Hunger **MGD 1.3.1:** Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives **MGD 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1:** Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)

MGD INDICATOR 16: Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: A school meal may include a breakfast or lunch meal or a snack provided in the mornings or afternoon during the school period.

A school meal is counted each time it is provided to a student in a USDA-supported project.

A school feeding program provides meals, where the primary objective is generally to provide breakfast, mid-morning meals, lunch, or a combination (depending on the duration of the school day) to alleviate short-term hunger, increase attention span, facilitate learning, and obviate the need for children to leave the school to find food. School meals can be prepared in schools or in the community, or can be delivered from centralized kitchens. They can be an important source of micronutrients if prepared using fortified commodities, or if micronutrient powder is added during or after preparation.

RATIONALE: School meals, provided early in the school day to alleviate hunger before or while classes are in session, will help children to be more attentive and improve concentration. Ultimately, these children will be more successful in school and progress further and more quickly. School meals or snacks can also alleviate specific nutritional deficiencies of school-age children. The alleviation of hunger via school meals can be critical to improving the capacity of children to learn.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Meals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of school meals at the project level, through reports and program data. For this indicator, count the number of meals without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple meals. In that case, the person would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The number of school age children receiving school meals is counted under MGD Indicator 17. The quantity of take home rations is counted under MGD Indicator 14 and the number of individuals receiving take-home rations in counted under Indicator 15.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	**MGD 1.2.1:** Reduced Short-Term Hunger **MGD 1.3.1:** Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives **MGD 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1:** Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)

MGD INDICATOR 17: Number of school-age children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: A school meal may include a breakfast or lunch meal or a snack provided in the mornings or afternoon during the school period.

A school feeding program provides meals, where the primary objective is generally to provide breakfast, mid-morning meals, lunch, or a combination (depending on the duration of the school day) to alleviate short-term hunger, increase attention span, facilitate learning, and obviate the need for children to leave the school to find food. School meals can be prepared in schools or in the community, or can be delivered from centralized kitchens. They can be an important source of micronutrients if prepared using fortified commodities, or if micronutrient powder is added during or after preparation.

RATIONALE: School meals, provided early in the school day to alleviate hunger before or while classes are in session, will help children to be more attentive and improve concentration. Ultimately, these children will be more successful in school and progress further and more quickly. School meals or snacks can also alleviate specific nutritional deficiencies of school-age children. The alleviation of hunger via school meals can be critical to improving the capacity of children to learn.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Children	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female
Duration:

- New = this reporting period is the first period the individual received daily school meals
- Continuing = the individual first received daily meals in the previous period and continues to receive them

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of school-age children receiving school meals at the project level, through reports and program data.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The number of school meals provided is counted under MGD indicator 16. The quantity of take home rations is counted under MGD Indicator 14 and the number of individuals receiving take-home rations in counted under Indicator 15.

Students should not be double counted in a given fiscal year. The student should be counted the first time that they receive a school meal in that fiscal year. Students that receive a school meal in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD 1.2.1:** Reduced Short-Term Hunger **MGD 1.3.1:** Increased Economic and Cultural Incentives **MGD 1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1:** Increased Access to Food (School Feeding) **MGD 2.5:** Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions

MGD INDICATOR 18: Number of USDA social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets

DEFINITION: Productive safety nets are programs that protect and strengthen food insecure households' physical and human capital by providing regular resource transfers in exchange for time or labor. School feeding programs build human capital as it is used to encourage children's attendance in school and help them benefit from the instruction received. School meals and especially take-home rations provided are the resources transferred to assist children in attending school and may offset the opportunity costs to households that may, for example, rely on their children's income from work. Generally, there are three kinds of activities that can provide the foundation of a "productive safety net" program. These are:

- Activities which strengthen community assets (e.g. public works);
- Activities which strengthen human assets/capital (e.g. literacy training, school feeding, maternal and child health visits such as prenatal and well-baby visits); and/or
- Activities which strengthen household assets (e.g. take-home rations)

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

RATIONALE: Provides information on USDA assistance aimed at increasing self-sufficiency in vulnerable populations. School feeding programs build human capital as they are used to encourage children's attendance in school and help them benefit from the instruction received. School feeding programs as a social safety net provide an explicit or implicit transfer to households of the value of the food distributed. The value of the transfers varies from school snacks to large take-home rations.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of Asset strengthened: Community assets, Human assets/capital, and Household assets

Sex: Male, Female

Duration:

- New = this is the first year the person participated in a productive safety net
- Continuing = this person participated in the previous reporting year and continues to participate in the current reporting year

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant administrative records and reports. Recipients should keep detailed lists of all participants.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The key to qualifying as a social assistance beneficiary under this indicator is the receipt of a cash or in-kind resource transfer. A conditional cash or in-kind transfer "provides poor households with cash, food, or other benefits on condition that they keep children in school, attend health clinics, or make other desired behavioural changes." Therefore, students that received school meals and/or take-home rations should be counted as social assistance beneficiaries for this indicator. If the take-home ration size is calculated taking household requirement into account (i.e. with the objective of providing support to the family rather than the individual) then all family members should be counted as direct beneficiaries under this indicator. Teachers, cooks, and other school administrators that receive school meals as a form of payment for their services should not be counted as a beneficiary under this indicator. This indicator is usually a subset of the count of direct beneficiaries in a project because it tracks only those listed above, recipients of a cash or in-kind resource transfer, whereas direct beneficiaries include any participant who takes part in any project activity, including for example government officials or administrators who are trained, or PTA leaders who are mentored.

To avoid double counting, persons should not be counted multiple times in one fiscal year or in the life-of-project total. For example, a participant (student) receiving a school meal and a take home ration each year would be counted once each year, and once in the life-of-project total.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [ES.5-1]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD SO2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices

MGD INDICATOR 19: Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new child health and nutrition practices as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the total number of individuals who are applying the new knowledge and skills received in USDA-supported training and certification programs.

Examples of practices include: incorporating child health, nutrition and hygiene into a school curriculum, practices supporting dietary diversity, practices supporting proper handwashing at critical times, diarrhea treatment and management, sanitation practices (i.e., solid waste collection and management, safe water treatment and storage, etc.) and preventative health practices (i.e., administering deworming medication and micronutrient supplements, where applicable).

Individuals should demonstrate the use of at least one new practice in their lives or work intended to improve children's health or nutritional status.

RATIONALE: Increasing the skills and knowledge of individuals who can affect children's health and nutritional status builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Applying new practices gained from training can ultimately have a positive effect on children's health.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program observations, interviews, site visits, and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This indicator counts the *application* of new practices developed through USDA sponsored training, whereas the count of individuals trained is reported under MGD Indicator 23. The number of people demonstrating use of new practices can be used as the numerator, and the number of people trained in new practices as the denominator, to calculate the percentage of trainees who demonstrate what they learned. USDA and recipients may use this calculation to meaningfully discuss training effectiveness and project implementation.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD SO2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices

MGD INDICATOR 20: Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new safe food preparation and storage practices as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the total number of individuals who are applying the new knowledge and skills received in USDA-supported training and certification programs.

Examples of practices include: proper stacking, storage and handling of food; accounting for commodity receipt and distributions using stack cards and related efforts to maintain commodity quality and prevent loss and damage; hygienic and sanitary meal preparation in accordance with nutritional guidelines, regional culture and local diet; proper cleaning and disinfection of all food preparation tools, utensils and dishes prior to use; mandatory hand washing before cooking and eating; and ensuring adequate school warehouse standards.

Individuals should demonstrate the use of at least one new practice in their lives or work that supports safe food preparation and storage.

RATIONALE: Safe food preparation and storage can ultimately affect health. Increasing the skills and knowledge of individuals who can affect children's health and nutritional status builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Applying new practices gained from training can ultimately have a positive effect on children's health.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program observations, interviews, site visits, and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This indicator counts the *application* of new practices developed through USDA sponsored training, whereas the count of individuals trained is reported under MGD Indicator 22. The number of people demonstrating use of new practices can be used as the numerator, and the number of people trained in new practices as the denominator, to calculate the percentage of trainees who demonstrate what they learned. USDA and recipients may use this calculation to meaningfully discuss training effectiveness and project implementation.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD SO2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices
MGD INDICATOR 21: Percent of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted infant and young child feeding behaviors	
DEFINITION: This outcome indicator is directly linked to the MGD output indicator 25 (FtF HL.9-2) *Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USDA-supported programs*. It is only applicable to projects for which indicator 25 is also applicable. This indicator captures the application of promoted infant and young child feeding (IYCF) behaviors by the caregivers who participate in community-level interventions and whose children under two are counted under MGD indicator 25. Community-level nutrition interventions are implemented on an on-going basis at the community level and involve multiple, repeated contacts with pregnant women and mothers/caregivers of children. At a minimum 'multiple contacts' means two or more community-level interactions during the reporting year. However, an IP does not need to track the number of contacts and can estimate this based on the nature of the intervention. For example, a Care Group approach by its very nature includes multiple repeated contacts. Community-level nutrition activities should always include social and behavior change communication interventions focused on key maternal and infant and young child nutrition practices. Common strategies to deliver community-level interventions include The Care Group Model, Mothers' Support Groups, Husbands' Groups (École des Maris), and PD Hearth for malnourished children. Facility-level Interventions that are brought to the community-level may be counted as community-level interventions if these involve multiple, repeated contacts with the target population (e.g. services provided by community-based health extension agents, mobile health posts). The indicator must be customized by each project to reflect the key IYCF behaviors being promoted by the activity and to measure the application of those behaviors by activity participants, since the specific behaviors promoted may vary by activity. These behaviors are often small, doable actions that ultimately should lead to changes in key infant and young child feeding behaviors, including: 1. Early initiation of breastfeeding 2. Exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months 3. Continued breastfeeding at 1 year 4. Timely introduction of solid, semi-solid or soft foods 5. Feeding minimum dietary diversity 6. Feeding minimum meal frequency 7. Feeding a minimum acceptable diet 8. Consumption of iron-rich or iron-fortified foods The numerator for this indicator is the total number of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted IYCF behaviors. The denominator is total number of participants of community-level nutrition interventions.	

If data for this indicator are collected through a participant-based sample survey, the numerator is the sample-weighted number of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted IYCF behaviors. The denominator is the sample-weighted number of participants of community-level nutrition interventions with IYCF behavior data.

RATIONALE: Increasing the appropriate feeding of infants and young children during the critical period between birth and a child's second birthday is essential to prevent malnutrition and ensure optimal growth and development. Community-level interventions are a critical component of a comprehensive social and behavior change approach for nutrition, and are promoted as part of the USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy. Community-level interventions that promote appropriate infant and young child feeding practices are important for reaching vulnerable populations and sustaining behaviors.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: The baseline for this indicator is a non-zero number. It should be collected before project activities start and reflects the percent of participants who practice the promoted IYCF behaviors already.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [HL.9-15]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.2:** Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices

MGD INDICATOR 22: Number of individuals trained in safe food preparation and storage as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of health professionals or others trained or certified in safe food preparation and storage directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part.

This includes health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, cooks, school personnel, volunteers, or other non-health personnel trained in safe food preparation and storage through USDA-supported programs during the reporting year.

Training on safe food preparation and storage may cover, for example: proper procedures for storage, preparation, cooking, serving, preservation, sanitization of food contact surfaces, and the prevention of food contamination and food borne illnesses.

Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours) in duration.

RATIONALE: Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USDA-supported health area programs in this element. Training health professionals and other community members builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Trainings should be counted only if they are at least two working days in duration (16 hours); however trainings may not necessarily occur over consecutive days. If a trainee is trained in more than one area or instance in a given reporting period, s/he should only be counted once in that reporting period. Participants may be counted in multiple fiscal years if they continue to receive training across fiscal years, but only once in the life-of-project total.

This indicator counts the individuals trained through USDA sponsored training, whereas the *application* of new practices is reported under MGD Indicator 20. The number of people demonstrating use of new practices can be used as the numerator, and the number of people trained in new practices as the denominator, to calculate the percentage of trainees who demonstrate what they learned. USDA and recipients may use this calculation to meaningfully discuss training effectiveness and project implementation.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.3:** Increased Knowledge of Nutrition

MGD INDICATOR 23: Number of individuals trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of health professionals or others trained or certified in child health and nutrition directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part.

This includes health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel trained in child health and child nutrition through USDA-supported programs during the reporting year.

Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours) in duration.

RATIONALE: Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USDA-supported health area programs in this element. Training health professionals and other community members builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Trainings should be counted only if they are at least two working days in duration (16 hours); however trainings may not necessarily occur over consecutive days. If a trainee is trained in more than one area or instance in a given reporting period, s/he should only be counted once in that reporting period. Participants may be counted in multiple fiscal years if they continue to receive training across fiscal years, but should only be counted once in the life-of-project total.

This indicator counts the individuals trained through USDA sponsored training, whereas the *application* of new practices is reported under MGD Indicator 19. The number of people demonstrating use of new practices can be used as the numerator, and the number of people trained in new practices as the denominator, to calculate the percentage of trainees who demonstrate what they learned. USDA and recipients may use this calculation to meaningfully discuss training effectiveness and project implementation.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.3:** Increased Knowledge of Nutrition
MGD INDICATOR 24: Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	

DEFINITION: Children under 5: Children under 5 years are those 0-59 months of age. They are often targeted by US-supported activities with nutrition objectives.

Reached by nutrition-specific interventions: A child can be counted as reached if s/he receives one or more of the following nutrition-specific interventions directly or through the mother/caretaker:

1. Behavior change communication (BCC) interventions that promote essential infant and young child feeding behaviors including:
    - Immediate, exclusive, and continued breastfeeding
    - Appropriate, adequate and safe complementary foods from 6 to 24 months of age
2. Vitamin A supplementation in the past 6 months
3. Zinc supplementation during episodes of diarrhea
4. Multiple Micronutrient Powder (MNP) supplementation
5. Treatment of severe acute malnutrition
6. Treatment of moderate acute malnutrition
7. Direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products (i.e. CSB+, Supercereal Plus, Ready to Use Therapeutic Foods (RUST), Ready to Use Supplementary Foods (RUSF), etc)

Implementing Partners who have a strong justification may opt out of the requirement to disaggregate this indicator into the seven interventions and two sex disaggregates. For example, IPs may opt out if they rely on the government health system to collect this data and these disaggregates are not included in that system. The reason should be noted in indicator comments in the FAIS system. In this case, IPs may report solely the total number of children under 5 reached. If only some disaggregates are available then IPs should report both the total number and the number for each available disaggregate.

Projects that support Growth Monitoring & Promotion (GMP) interventions should report children reached under the BCC disaggregate (#1).

Children can be double-counted across the intervention disaggregates if they receive more than one intervention, but a unique number of children reached must be entered into the sex disaggregates. Children should be counted only once in the life-of-project total. In order to avoid double counting across interventions, the implementing partner should follow a two-step process:

1. First, count each child by the type of intervention. For example, a child whose mother receives counseling on exclusive breastfeeding and who also receives vitamin A during a child health day should be counted once under each intervention;
2. Second, eliminate double counting when estimating the total number of children under-5 reached and to disaggregate by sex. The partner may develop a system to track individual children using unique identifiers or estimate the overlap between the different types of interventions and subtract it from the total.

In cases where disaggregation is not possible, the unique number of children reached will likely be the number of children reached through Vitamin A distribution campaigns, in countries that support them.

In Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) activities, some children who are discharged as "cured" may relapse and be readmitted at a later date. There are standard methods for categorizing children as 'relapsed', but due to loss to follow-up, it is generally not possible to identify these children. Therefore, a limitation of this indicator is that there may be some double counting of children who were treated for severe and/or moderate acute malnutrition and relapsed during the same fiscal year.

RATIONALE: Good coverage of evidence-based nutrition-specific interventions among children under 5 years of age is essential to prevent and treat malnutrition and to improve child survival. Undernutrition is an underlying cause in 45 percent of childhood deaths.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Sex: Male, Female

Intervention:

- Number of children under 5 whose parents/caretakers received behavior change communication interventions that promote essential infant and young child feeding behaviors
- Number of children 6-59 months who received vitamin A supplementation in the past 6 months
- Number of children under 5 who received zinc supplementation during episode of diarrhea
- Number of children under 5 who received Multiple Micronutrient Powder (MNP) supplementation
- Number of children under 5 who were admitted for treatment of severe acute malnutrition
- Number of children under 5 who were admitted for treatment of moderate acute malnutrition
- Number of children under 5 who received direct food assistance

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [HL.9-1]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.3:** Increased Knowledge of Nutrition
MGD INDICATOR 25: Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USDA-supported programs	
DEFINITION: Children under 2: This indicator captures the children reached from birth to 23 months, and a separate standard indicator will count the number of pregnant women reached by USDA-supported programs (MGD Indicator 26, FtF HL.9-3). Children are counted as reached if their mother/caregiver participated in a community-level nutrition program. Community-level nutrition interventions: Community-level nutrition activities are implemented on an on-going basis at the community-level and involve multiple, repeated contacts with pregnant women and mothers/caregivers of children. At a minimum 'multiple contacts' means two or more community-level interactions during the reporting year. However, a recipient does not need to track the number of contacts and can estimate this based on the nature of the intervention. For example, a Care Group approach by its very nature includes multiple repeated contacts. Community-level nutrition activities should always include social and behavior change communication interventions focused on key maternal and infant and young child nutrition practices. Common strategies to deliver community-level interventions include The Care Group Model, Mothers' Support Groups, Husbands' Groups (École des Maris), and PD Hearth for malnourished children. Community-level nutrition activities should coordinate with public health and nutrition campaigns such as child health days and similar population-level outreach activities conducted at a national (usually) or subnational level at different points in the year. Population-level campaigns may focus on delivering a single intervention, but most commonly deliver a package of interventions that usually includes vitamin A supplements, de-worming tablets, and routine immunization, and may include screening for acute malnutrition, growth monitoring, and distribution of insecticide-treated mosquito nets. However, children under 2 reached only by population-level campaigns should not be counted under this indicator. Children reached solely through community drama, comedy, or video shows should not be included. However, projects should still use mass communication interventions like dramas to reinforce social and behavior change communication (SBCC) messages. Facility-level Interventions that are brought to the community-level may be counted as community-level interventions if these involve multiple, repeated contacts with the target population (e.g. services provided by community-based health extension agents, mobile health posts). Children are counted as reached if their mother/caregiver participated in the community-level nutrition program. If, after birth, the child benefits from the intervention, then the child should be counted—regardless of the primary recipient of the information, counseling, or intervention. For example, if a project provides counseling on complementary feeding to a mother, then the child should be counted as reached. Children reached by community-level nutrition programs should be counted only once per reporting year, regardless of the number of contacts with the child, and only once in the life-of-project total.	
RATIONALE: The 1,000 days between pregnancy and a child's second birthday are the most critical period to ensure optimum physical and cognitive development. Good coverage of nutrition projects	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">among children under 2 years of age is essential to prevent and treat malnutrition and to improve child survival. Undernutrition is an underlying cause in 45 percent of childhood deaths.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</td></tr>
<tr><td>UNIT OF MEASURE:
Number: Individuals</td><td>INDICATOR LEVEL:
Output</td><td>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better</td><td>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:
Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male, Female</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">MEASUREMENT NOTES:
BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS VERBATIM to allow for the information to be collected correctly.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">FtF INDICATOR:
Yes
[HL.9-2]</td><td colspan="2">DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:
For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).</td></tr>
</table>

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.3:** Increased Knowledge of Nutrition

MGD INDICATOR 26: Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs

DEFINITION: Pregnant women: This indicator captures the reach of activities that are targeted toward women during pregnancy, intended to contribute to the health of both the mother and the child, and to positive birth outcomes. A separate standard indicator will count the number of children under 2 reached by USG-supported programs (MGD Indicator 25, FtF HL.9-2).

Nutrition-specific interventions: A pregnant woman can be counted as reached if she receives one or more of the following interventions:

1. Iron and folic acid supplementation
2. Counseling on maternal and/or child nutrition
3. Calcium supplementation
4. Multiple micronutrient supplementation
5. Direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products (i.e. CSB+, Supercereal Plus, RUTF, RUSF, etc)

Nutrition interventions for women are often delivered at the facility level, included in the package of antenatal care, but they may also be delivered through community-level platforms, such as care groups or community health extension activities.

Iron and folic acid (IFA) supplementation is a commonly implemented intervention for pregnant women, often with broad coverage. Ideally, however, pregnant women should receive nutrition interventions beyond IFA, within a comprehensive Antenatal Care (ANC) program informed by the local epidemiology of nutrient deficiencies. A woman is reached with IFA if she receives the IFA according to national guidelines regardless of the number of days she adheres. If a woman only receives Iron or only Folic Acid, she would not be counted as reached.

If the project contributed to "supply" side activities (e.g. procuring the commodity), then the women reached through these interventions can be counted as reached. If the activities are only "demand" creation (e.g. awareness-raising), then they should not be counted under this indicator.

The nutrition interventions during pregnancy listed above affect neonatal health outcomes such as low birth weight, small for gestational age, preterm birth, and cretinism. Nevertheless, pregnant women reached by these interventions should be counted under this indicator, and not counted as a "child reached" under the two other nutrition-related MGD indicators: MGD indicator 24 *Number of children under 5 (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs*; MGD indicator 25 *Number of children under 2 (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USDA-supported programs*.

Women can be double-counted across the intervention disaggregates if they receive more than one intervention, but a unique number of women reached must be entered into the age disaggregates. Women should be counted only once in the life-of-project total. In order to avoid double counting across interventions, the Recipient should follow a two-step process:

1. First, count each pregnant woman by the type of intervention. For example, a woman who

receives IFA and who also receives nutrition counseling should be counted twice, once under each intervention;

2. Second, eliminate double counting when estimating the total number of pregnant women reached and to disaggregate by age group. The partner should estimate the overlap between the different types of interventions. For example, if 100 women receive comprehensive facility-based ANC care and 20 of those women are also participants in a community-based nutrition SBCC program, the total number of pregnant women reported in aggregate is only 100, not 120.

RATIONALE: Good coverage of nutrition-specific interventions among pregnant women is essential to prevent both child and maternal undernutrition and to improve survival. Undernutrition is an underlying cause in 45 percent of childhood deaths. Part of this burden can be alleviated through maternal nutrition interventions. Moreover, maternal anemia is estimated to contribute to 20 percent of maternal deaths.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Intervention:

- Number of women receiving iron and folic acid supplementation
- Number of women receiving counseling on maternal and/or child nutrition
- Number of women receiving calcium supplementation
- Number of women receiving multiple micronutrient supplementation
- Number of women receiving direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products

Age: Number of women < 19 years of age; Number of women > or = 19 years of age.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [HL.9-3]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.4:** Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services

MGD INDICATOR 27: Number of schools using an improved water source

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of project/targeted schools using an improved water source. To determine whether a school is using an improved water source, the school administrator is asked:

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

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

Improved water sources are:

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

Unimproved water sources are:

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

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

RATIONALE: Poor sanitation, water and hygiene have many serious repercussions. Inadequate access to safe water and sanitation services, coupled with poor hygiene practices, kills and sickens thousands of children every day. Illness prevents children from attending school. Access to clean water at the schools is vital to ensure safe food preparation and improved hygiene practices, including hand washing before meals.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Schools	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None	
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project level, through reports and program data.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator measures the number of schools using a clean water source. The water source must be accessible to the school for use every day of the school year for the school to be considered one that has access to a clean water source. The water source does not need to be implemented or installed by the project to be counted as a clean water source. The improved water source should be functioning as designed, not "present but dysfunctional", to count. BASELINE INFO: Recognizing that some schools may have an improved water source prior to project start, this indicator may have a non-zero baseline.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.4:** Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services

MGD INDICATOR 28: Number of schools with improved sanitary facilities

DEFINITION: This indicator measures whether there are adequate sanitary facilities at each project/targeted school and whether that sanitary facility meets the improved sanitation standards defined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). To be considered adequate, the school must have separate improved sanitation facilities available for the use of both males and females. The sanitation facilities must meet the definition of an improved sanitation facility as noted below:

Improved sanitation is defined as:

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

Unimproved sanitation includes:

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

RATIONALE: Poor sanitation, water and hygiene have many serious repercussions. Inadequate access to safe water and sanitation services, coupled with poor hygiene practices, kills and sickens thousands of children every day. Children – and particularly females – are often denied their right to education because their schools lack private and decent sanitation facilities.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Schools	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project level, through reports and program data.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator measures the number of schools that have improved sanitation facilities. It does not measure the number of sanitation facilities constructed by the project or the number of sanitation facilities at the schools. Organizations should consider whether the sanitation facilities at the school are adequate in serving the needs of the students – particularly female students – at each school. The sanitation facility should be functioning as designed, not "present but dysfunctional", to count.

BASELINE INFO: Recognizing that some schools may have improved sanitary facilities prior to project

start, this indicator may have a non-zero baseline.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD 2.4:** Increased Access to Preventative Health Services

MGD INDICATOR 29: Number of students receiving deworming medication(s)

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of students in a fiscal year that have received deworming medication(s), usually through the distribution of deworming tablets at school.

Deworming tablets can be distributed directly through the implementing organization or through a partner organization or government. In designing an MGD project, implementers must consider whether the regions they are working in require deworming. They must also determine which medications they are using in the deworming treatment, the correct dosage for the type of medication used, and the frequency of the treatment.

Medications and doses recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) for use in large-scale school deworming programs include:

- For soil-transmitted helminths: albendazole (400mg); mebendazole (500mg), or levamisole (80mg).
- For schistosomes: praziquantel (40mg/kg)

The WHO recommends the following treatment guidelines for the two types of helminth species most appropriately addressed through school-based deworming interventions:

- For soil-transmitted helminth (STH) infections, schools in high-risk areas with 50% or more children infected should implement treatment of all school-age children twice a year. Schools in low-risk areas with infection rates of 20% or more, but under 50%, should implement treatment of all school-age children once a year.
- For schistosomes, schools in high-risk areas with 50% or more children infected should implement treatment of all school-age children once a year. Schools in moderate-risk areas of 10% or more, but under 50%, should treat all school-age children once every two years and schools in low-risk areas of more than 1%, but less than 10%, should treat all school-age children twice during their primary-school years (i.e. once on entry and once on exit).

RATIONALE: Deworming tablets are often given to children to decrease the incidence of soil-transmitted helminth infections, such as roundworm, hookworm, whipworm, and schistosomes. These infections are among the most common infections in developing countries and impair the nutritional status of children infected. Regular deworming contributes to good health and nutrition for school-age children, which in turn leads to increased enrollment and attendance, reduced class repetition, and increased educational attainment and performance.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Students	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of individuals receiving the medication(s) at the project level, through reports and program data. The data are normally obtained from forms completed by the health professional administering the treatment. If the accuracy of the data collected via the forms is questioned, the project may consider conducting a "confirmation survey" to verify the information in a small sample of schools.

According to monitoring and evaluation guidelines established by WHO, to improve the accuracy of data, this indicator should be collected immediately after the administration of a round of deworming medications.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: As noted above, in determining the appropriate treatment for the specific beneficiary student population of the project, organizations should work with the Ministry of Health and follow guidance provided by the World Health Organization, http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2011/9789241548267_eng.pdf?ua=1

Students should only be counted once per fiscal year. Students that are treated for worms in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD SO1:** Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD SO2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices

MGD INDICATOR 30: Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals directly participating in USDA-funded interventions, including those we reach directly and those reached as part of a deliberate service strategy. An individual is a participant if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided or facilitated by the activity. Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) do not count under this indicator. A participating individual counts if one can reasonably expect, and hold recipients responsible for achieving progress toward, changes in behaviors or other outcomes for these individuals based on the level of services and/or goods provided or accessed.

This indicator counts, with some exceptions listed below, all the individuals participating in MGD activities, including:

- School-aged children who are recipients of USG school feeding programs
- Teachers, administrators, government personnel, parents, other community members, and anyone participating in training
- Members of households reached with household-level interventions (households with new access to basic sanitation through our work, households receiving family-sized rations);
- Adults that projects or project-supported actors reach directly through nutrition-specific and community-level nutrition interventions, (e.g. parents and other caregivers participating in community care groups, healthcare workers provided with in-service training on how to manage acute malnutrition), but <u>not children</u> reached with nutrition-specific or community-based interventions, who are counted under MGD indicators 24 and 25 instead;
- People reached by productive safety nets, community-based micro-finance and diversified livelihood activities through our assistance;
- People in civil society organizations and government whose skills and capacity have been strengthened by projects or project-supported actors;

Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions in one fiscal year but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions. For example, if one individual participates in multiple USDA-sponsored training courses in a given fiscal year, they will only be counted one time in that fiscal year. Individuals participating in USDA-sponsored training courses in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

RATIONALE: This indicator is designed to capture the breadth of our food security work. The indicator tracks access to services and overall project direct beneficiaries.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

- <u>Sex</u>: *the <u>unique</u> number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)*

- Male;
- Female;

➢ Age Category: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)*
- School-aged children (only to be used for counting those reached by USG school feeding programs; report the total reached with school feeding regardless of actual age)
- 15-29;
- 30+

➢ Type of Individual: *double-counting individuals across types is permitted here*
- **Parents/caregivers**;
- **Household members** *(household-level interventions only), such as new access to basic sanitation and/or receipt of family rations*;
- **School-aged children** (i.e. those participating in school feeding programs);
- **People in government** *(e.g. policy makers, extension workers, healthcare workers);*
- **Proprietors of USDA-assisted private sector firms** *(e.g. agrodealers, traders, aggregators, processors, service providers, manufacturers);*
- **People in civil society** *(e.g. NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations, community volunteers)*

  While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count their proprietors under the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate and not the "Civil Society" disaggregate
- **Laborers** (Non-producer diversified livelihoods participants);
- **Producers** *(e.g. farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers);*

  Producers should be counted under the "Producers" disaggregate, not the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate

  SECOND LEVEL (only for the first-level disaggregate of "Producers")
  - Size:
    - Smallholder *(see definition below)*;
    - Non-smallholder;
    - Not applicable *(for aquaculture);*

  Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports, firm records, or through census or sampling of participating firms/farms/families/individuals, etc.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator provides a unique count of total project participants.

Individuals who are trained by a recipient as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy (e.g. cascade training) that then go on to deliver services directly to individuals or to train others to deliver services should be counted as direct participants of the project—the capacity strengthening is key for sustainability and an important outcome in its own right. The individuals who then receive the services or training delivered by those individuals are also considered participants. However, spontaneous spillover of improved practices to neighbors does not count as a deliberate service delivery strategy; neighbors who apply new practices based on observation and/or interactions with participants who have not been trained to spread knowledge to others as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy should not be counted under this indicator. Neighbors can be counted under MGD indicator 31 *Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions*.

Only direct beneficiaries should be counted. Indirect beneficiaries should not be counted under this indicator. Individual beneficiaries should come into direct contact or receipt of an intervention or set of interventions (i.e. children who receive school meals, tuition waivers, uniforms, books). Family members benefiting from take home rations would all count but if children in the family also receive school meals they should not be double counted.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3-2]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	**MGD SO1:** Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD SO2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices

MGD INDICATOR 31: Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals indirectly benefitting from USDA-funded interventions. The individuals will not be directly engaged with a project activity or come into direct contact with a set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. This may include, for example, family members of students receiving school meals. Participants' neighbors that, due to spontaneous spillover, apply USDA-promoted improved practices or technologies may also be counted as indirect beneficiaries if Recipients use clearly documented assumptions that are regularly validated through spot surveys or similar methods.

Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may benefit from multiple interventions in one fiscal year but should only be counted once per fiscal year. If an individual is already counted as a direct beneficiary, the individual should not also be counted as an indirect beneficiary if they are indirectly benefitting from other project interventions. For example, if a family receives take home rations, the family members would be counted as direct beneficiaries and should not also be counted as an indirect beneficiary as a family member of a student receiving meals at the school.

RATIONALE: This indicator tracks indirect impact of project on community or area of intervention.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant beneficiary tracking records and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

Only indirect beneficiaries should be counted under this indicator. Individual beneficiaries should not come into direct contact or receipt of an intervention or set of interventions, but should indirectly benefit from one or more of the project's interventions.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School Age Children **MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	**MGD SO1:** Improved Literacy of School-Age Children **MGD SO2:** Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices

MGD INDICATOR 32: Number of schools reached as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The indicator tracks the number of schools reached during the reporting period by any project activity. While this will commonly be schools reached with school feeding, it will also count schools reached with any other activity (even absent feeding), such as teacher training or other capacity-building activities, facilities improvements, PTA strengthening, etc.

RATIONALE: The school is the hub of many program activities and having a simple school count is useful in reflecting the breadth of the program.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Schools	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from recipient records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	

LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROCUREMENT STANDARD INDICATORS SUMMARY

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in LRP Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
1	LRP SO1	Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement	output	Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs	Y	Number	Annual
2	LRP SO1	Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement	output	Number of individuals benefiting indirectly as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
3	LRP SO1	Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement	output	Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
4	LRP 1.1	Improved Cost-Effectiveness of Food Assistance	output	Cost of transport, storage and handling of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity)	N	U.S. Dollars	Biannual
5	LRP 1.1.1	Improved Cost-Effectiveness of Procurement	output	Cost of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	N	U.S. Dollars	Biannual
6	LRP 1.3.2	Strengthened Local and Regional Food Market Systems	output	Quantity of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	N	Metric Tons	Biannual
7	LRP 1.3.2.1	Increased Agricultural Productivity	outcome	Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	Y	U.S. Dollar	Annual

Indicator Number	Result #	Title in LRP Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure	Frequency of Reporting
8	LRP 1.3.2.1	Increased Agricultural Productivity	outcome	Volume of commodities sold by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	Y	Metric Tons	Annual
9	LRP 1.3.2.2	Increased Value Added to Post-Production Agricultural Products	output	Total increase in installed storage capacity (dry or cold storage) as a result of USDA Assistance	N	Cubic Meters	Biannual
10	LRP 1.4.2	Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework	output and outcome	Number of policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Annual
11	LRP 1.4.3	Improved Capacity of Relevant Organizations	output	Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
12	LRP 1.4.3	Improved Capacity of Relevant Organizations	outcome	Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	Y	Number	Annual
13	LRP 1.4.3/ LRP 1.4.1	Improved Capacity of Relevant Organizations/ Improved Capacity of Government Institutions	output	Number of people trained in disaster preparedness as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
14	LRP 1.4.4	Increased Leverage of Private-Sector Resources	output	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual
15	LRP 1.4.4/ LRP 1.3.2.3	Increased Leverage of Private-Sector Resources/ Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products	outcome	Value of new USG commitments and new public and private sector investment leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	Y	U.S. Dollar	Annual
16	LRP SO1	Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement	output	Number of schools reached as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number	Biannual

LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROCUREMENT STANDARD INDICATORS DEFINITIONS

LRP SO1: Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement

LRP INDICATOR 1: Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals directly participating in USDA-funded interventions, including those we reach directly, those reached as part of a deliberate service strategy, and those participating in the markets we strengthen. An individual is a participant if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided or facilitated by the activity. Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) do not count under this indicator. A participating individual counts if one can reasonably expect, and hold recipients responsible for achieving progress toward, changes in behaviors or other outcomes for these individuals based on the level of services and/or goods provided or accessed. Producers with increased access to goods, services and markets for their products and who purchase from or sell to market actors that have been strengthened as a result of our activities are considered to have received a significant intervention.

This indicator counts, with some exceptions listed below, all the individuals participating in LRP activities, including:

- Smallholder and non-smallholder producers that projects or project-supported actors reach directly (e.g. through an irrigation training, through a loan provided, through distribution of drought-tolerant seeds to specific farmers);
- Proprietors of firms in the private sector that we help strengthen (e.g. agrodealers, aggregators, processors), but not all the employees of those firms;
- Producers who directly interact with those USDA-assisted firms (e.g. the producers who are customers of an assisted agrodealer; the producers from whom an assisted trader or aggregator buys), but not customers or suppliers who are not producers;
- Participants whose main source of income is labor (e.g. Laborers/non-producer diversified livelihood participants);
- People reached by productive safety nets, community-based micro-finance and diversified livelihood activities through our assistance;
- People in civil society organizations and government whose skills and capacity have been strengthened by projects or project-supported actors;
- School-aged children who benefit from food procured and school meals provided by the project;

Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions in one fiscal year but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions. For example, if one individual participates in multiple USDA-sponsored training courses in a given fiscal year, they will only be counted one time in that fiscal year. Individuals participating in USDA-sponsored training courses in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

RATIONALE: This indicator is designed to capture the breadth of our food security work. The indicator tracks access to services and overall project direct beneficiaries. This indicator tracks access to goods and services that can lead to adoption of improved agricultural techniques, technologies, practices,

services, and policies that will result in greater agricultural productivity and expanded agricultural markets.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

- Sex: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)*
  - Male;
  - Female;

- Age Category: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)*
  - 15-29;
  - 30+;

- Type of Individual: *double-counting individuals across types is permitted here*
  - **Parents/caregivers**;
  - **Household members** (household-level interventions only), *such as new access to basic sanitation and/or receipt of family rations;*
  - **School-aged children** *(i.e. those participating in school feeding programs);*
  - **People in government** *(e.g. policy makers, extension workers, healthcare workers);*
  - **Proprietors of USDA-assisted private sector firms** *(e.g. agrodealers, traders, aggregators, processors, service providers, manufacturers);*
  - **People in civil society** *(e.g. NGOs, Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), research and academic organizations, community volunteers)*

    While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count their proprietors under the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate and not the "Civil Society" disaggregate
  - **Laborers** (Non-producer diversified livelihoods participants);
  - **Producers** *(e.g. farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers);*

    Producers should be counted under the "Producers" disaggregate, not the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate

    SECOND LEVEL (only for the first-level disaggregate of "Producers")
    - Size:
      - Smallholder *(see definition below)*;
      - Non-smallholder;
      - Not applicable *(for aquaculture);*

    Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant tracking records and reports, firm records, or through census or sampling of participating firms/farms/families/individuals, etc.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator provides a unique count of total project participants.

Individuals who are trained by a recipient as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy (e.g. cascade training) that then go on to deliver services directly to individuals or to train others to deliver services should be counted as participants of the project—the capacity strengthening is key for sustainability and an important outcome in its own right. The individuals who then receive the services or training delivered by those individuals are also considered participants. However, spontaneous spillover of improved practices to neighbors does not count as a deliberate service delivery strategy; neighbors who apply new practices based on observation and/or interactions with participants who have not been trained to spread knowledge to others as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy should not be counted under this indicator. Neighbors can be counted under LRP Indicator 2 *Number of individuals benefiting indirectly as a result of USDA assistance*.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3-2]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

LRP SO1: Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement

LRP INDICATOR 2: Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions

DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals indirectly benefitting from USDA-funded interventions. The individuals will not be directly engaged with a project activity or come into direct contact with a set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. This may include, for example, family members of students receiving school meals. Participants' neighbors that, due to spontaneous spillover, apply USDA-promoted improved practices or technologies may also be counted as indirect beneficiaries if Recipients use clearly documented assumptions that are regularly validated through spot surveys or similar methods.

Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may benefit from multiple interventions in one fiscal year but should only be counted once per fiscal year. If an individual is already counted as a direct beneficiary, the individual should not also be counted as an indirect beneficiary if they are indirectly benefitting from other project interventions.

RATIONALE: This indicator tracks the indirect impact of a project on the community or area of intervention.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION: None

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant beneficiary tracking records and reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

Only indirect beneficiaries should be counted under this indicator. Individual beneficiaries should not come into direct contact or receipt of an intervention or set of interventions, but should indirectly benefit from one or more of the project's interventions.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP SO1: Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement

LRP INDICATOR 3: Number of USDA social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets

DEFINITION: Productive safety nets are programs that protect and strengthen food insecure households' physical and human capital by providing regular resource transfers in exchange for time or labor. School feeding programs build human capital as it is used to encourage children's attendance in school and help them benefit from the instruction received. School meals and especially take-home rations provided are the resources transferred to assist children in attending school and may offset the opportunity costs to households that may, for example, rely on their children's income from work. Generally, there are three kinds of activities that can provide the foundation of a "productive safety net" program. These are:

- Activities which strengthen community assets (e.g. public works);
- Activities which strengthen human assets/capital (e.g. literacy training, school feeding, maternal and child health visits such as prenatal and well-baby visits); and/or
- Activities which strengthen household assets (e.g. take-home rations)

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

RATIONALE: Provides information on USDA assistance aimed at increasing self-sufficiency in vulnerable populations. School feeding programs build human capital as they are used to encourage children's attendance in school and help them benefit from the instruction received. School feeding programs as a social safety net provide an explicit or implicit transfer to households of the value of the food distributed. The value of the transfers varies from school snacks to large take-home rations.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of Asset strengthened: Community assets, Human assets/capital, and Household assets

Sex: Male, Female

Duration:

- New = this is the first year the person participated in a productive safety net
- Continuing = this person participated in the previous reporting year and continues to participate in the current reporting year

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant administrative records and reports. Recipients should keep detailed lists of all participants.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: The key to qualifying as a social assistance beneficiary under this indicator is the receipt of a cash or in-kind resource transfer. A conditional cash or in-kind transfer "provides poor households with cash, food, or other benefits on condition that they keep children in school, attend

health clinics, or make other desired behavioural changes." Therefore, students that received school meals and/or take-home rations should be counted as social assistance beneficiaries for this indicator. If the take-home ration size is calculated taking household requirement into account (i.e. with the objective of providing support to the family rather than the individual) then all family members should be counted as direct beneficiaries under this indicator. Teachers, cooks, and other school administrators that receive school meals as a form of payment for their services should not be counted as a beneficiary under this indicator. This indicator is usually a subset of the count of direct beneficiaries in a project because it tracks only those listed above, recipients of a cash or in-kind resource transfer, whereas direct beneficiaries include any participant who takes part in any project activity, including for example government officials or administrators who are trained, or PTA leaders who are mentored.

To avoid double counting, persons should not be counted multiple times in one fiscal year or in the life-of-project total. For example, a participant (student) receiving a school meal and a take home ration each year would be counted once each year, and once in the life-of-project total.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [ES.5-1]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

LRP 1.1: Improved Cost-Effectiveness of Food Assistance

LRP INDICATOR 4: Cost of transport, storage and handling of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity)

DEFINITION: This indicator will collect the cost (in US dollars) of transport, storage and handling for procured commodities by commodity type.

Costs should reflect all necessary costs for procured commodities. Cost should include storage, warehousing and commodity distribution costs; internal transport via rail, truck or barge transportation; commodity monitoring in storage and at distribution sites; vehicle procurement; in-country operational costs, and others, for the duration of a program. Cost should also include commodity quality and safety testing.

RATIONALE: Cost of transport, storage and handling of commodities procured provides key information in the estimation of total LRP costs (combined with commodity costs) and is a measure of the LRP program's impacts on the local or regional transport markets in the country or region receiving USDA assistance. This measurement also helps track access and barriers to markets as it relates to the availability of commodities in the beneficiary areas.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
US Dollars	Output	Lower is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Commodity Type: Commodity procured

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by project records, firm/farm records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance.
Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in comments in FAIS.

Note that the quantity (in metric tons) of commodities procured will be reported in LRP Indicator 6. There should be a direct link between the cost of freight of commodities procured reported for this indicator and the volume (in metric tons) of reported in LRP Indicator 6. Data for indicators 6 and 4 must be reported so that USDA can calculate the freight cost per metric ton of commodities procured.

There must also be a direct link between the cost of the procured commodities in LRP indicator 5 and costs of transport, storage and handling of commodities procured. The sum of LRP indicators 5 and 4 should be the total cost associated with the procurement, transport and delivery of commodities.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.1.1: Improved Cost-Effectiveness of Procurement

LRP INDICATOR 5: Cost of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)

DEFINITION: This indicator will collect the cost (in US dollars) of procured commodities by commodity type and source country.

The cost reported for the indicator is the actual cost of the procured commodities during the reporting period. Costs of procured commodities exclude all freight costs. Freight costs (ocean, inland, and internal) are reported in LRP Indicator 4.

RATIONALE: Value (in US dollars) of procured commodities is a measure of the LRP program's impacts on the local or regional market in the country or region receiving USDA assistance. This measurement also helps track access to markets and availability of commodities in the beneficiary areas.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
US Dollars	Output	Lower is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Source Country: Country where the commodity was procured.
Commodity Type: Commodity procured.

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by project records, firm/farm records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance. There should be a direct link between cost of commodities procured and direct beneficiaries (the number of individuals participating, LRP Indicator 1). Direct beneficiaries should include those beneficiaries receiving commodities through take-home rations, school meals or snacks, or direct distribution as a result of emergency assistance. Data should only be collected from direct project beneficiaries. These beneficiaries should be reported in LRP Indicator 1.

Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in comments in FAIS.

Note that the quantity (in metric tons) of commodities procured will be reported in LRP Indicator 6. There should be a direct link between the cost of procured commodities reported for this Indicator and the volume (in metric tons) of purchases reported in LRP Indicator 6. Data for indicators 6 and 5 must be reported so that USDA can calculate the cost per metric ton of commodities procured.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.3.2: Strengthened Local and Regional Food Market Systems

LRP INDICATOR 6: Quantity of commodity procured (MT) as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)

DEFINITION: This indicator will collect the quantity of commodities procured (in metric tons (MT) through USDA local and regional procurement program. This includes the quantity of all procured commodity(ies) as a result of USDA investment during the reporting period.

RATIONALE: Quantity (in MT) of procured commodities at the local and regional level indicates the amount of food provided to direct beneficiaries and is an indication of the availability of local foods for those beneficiaries receiving USDA assistance.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Metric Tons	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Source Country: Country where the commodity was procured.
Commodity Type: Commodity procured.

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by project procurement records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance. There should be a direct link between quantity of commodities procured and direct beneficiaries (the number of individuals participating, LRP Indicator 1). Direct beneficiaries should include those beneficiaries receiving commodities through take-home rations, school meals or snacks, or direct distribution as a result of emergency assistance. These beneficiaries should be reported in LRP Indicator 1.

Quantity (in metric tons) of procured commodities should also be directly related to value of procurements measured in LRP Indicator 5.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.3.2.1: Increased Agricultural Productivity

LRP INDICATOR 7: Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the value in U.S. dollars of the total amount of sales of products and services by USDA-assisted farms and firms during the reporting year within USDA-supported agricultural commodity value chains or markets. This indicator also collects additional data points on the value of sales in local currency and the number of activity participants, including the number of producers and the number of assisted private sector firms.

Examples of USDA assistance include facilitating access to improved seeds and other inputs, to extension, business development and financial services, and to micro-enterprise loans; providing technical support in production techniques; strengthening linkages to markets; and other activities that benefit producers or private sector firms in the agriculture and food system.

Annual sales include all sales by farms and firms participating in USDA-funded activities. This includes producers, such as farmers, fishers, and ranchers; and private sector non-farm enterprises, such as aggregators, input suppliers and distributors, traders, or processors of the targeted commodity(ies) throughout the value chain. In value-chain-facilitation and other market-strengthening activities, activity participants include the private sector firms with direct contact with the USDA-funded activity and the producers and other customers buying from or selling to the USDA-assisted firms. USDA recognizes the difficulty and cost to collect sales data directly from producers, especially when working with firms though a market-system approach intended to strengthen the links between producers and firms that purchase from them for onward sales, processing, etc. In these cases, recipients may consider collecting data from firms on producers who sold to the firms while collecting data on sales of the firms, rather than attempting to collect sales data from the producers directly. Recipients can then report both producer and firm sales under the appropriate disaggregate.

"Private sector" includes any privately-led agricultural enterprise managed by a for-profit company. A community-based organization (CBO) or nongovernmental organization (NGO) may be included if the CBO or NGO engages in for-profit agricultural activity. Activity participants may be involved in agricultural production, agro-processing, wholesale or retail sales, fisheries, input supply, or other business activities in USDA-assisted value chains and/or markets.

Only count sales in the reporting year that are attributable to USDA, i.e. where USDA assisted the individual farmer or firm, or the market actor with which they are engaged directly, and for those value chains/commodities/markets which USDA supports.

Under participants, count the number of assisted producers for whom sales data are available. Include producers reached directly with outreach and those buying from or selling to USDA-assisted firms in a systems strengthening approach. For firms, count the USDA-assisted firm as the participant.

It is **essential that a Baseline Year Sales data point be entered**. If data on the total value of sales by participant farms or firms prior to USDA-funded activity implementation is not available, do not leave the baseline blank or enter '0'. Use the earliest Reporting Year Sales actual as the Baseline Year Sales. The number of participants in USDA-funded activities often increases over time as the activity rolls out. Unless an activity has identified all prospective participants at the time the baseline is established, the baseline sales value will only include sales made by participant farms and firms identified when the baseline is established during the first year of implementation. The baseline sales value will not include

the baselines from farms and firms added in subsequent years. To address this issue, **USDA requires reporting the number of participants, both producers and private sector firms for each value chain product or service along with baseline and reporting year sales**. These data points can be used to calculate average sales per participant at baseline, disaggregated by farm and firm and assist with interpreting the reasons for an observed growth in the value of sales. To generate meaningful out-year targets for annual sales, targets for number of participants, disaggregated by farm and firm, are also required.

The type of Product or Service sold by the producer or firm is the first level disaggregate when reporting. These are broken down into the following disaggregate categories to be reported in FAIS, with illustrative examples:

Products:

- Agricultural commodities, which generally include those raw products sold by producers such as staples, legumes, horticulture, livestock, and fish but does NOT include seeds. The specific commodity (maize, mung beans, tomatoes, etc.) needs to be selected.
- Inputs: Seeds and planting material.
- Inputs: Other non-durable inputs, such as fertilizer and pesticides.
- Inputs: Durable equipment and machinery, including land preparation equipment, irrigation equipment, and other equipment or machinery.
- Processed products/value added products (post-harvest). The specific commodity does not need to be selected.
- Post-harvest storage and processing equipment, including PICS bags and processing machinery.

Services:

- Business services, including financial, entrepreneurial, legal, and other enterprise/producer strengthening services
- Information services: SMS, Radio, TV, print, etc.
- Production support services: other services that are sold to farmers, fishers, ranchers and pastoralists, including extension services, veterinary services, rental of equipment, land preparation, warehousing, post-harvest processing

RATIONALE: Value (in US dollars) of sales at the farm and enterprise level is a measure of the competitiveness of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by farmers and enterprises receiving USDA assistance. An increase in sales of agricultural products and services is directly related to increasing agricultural productivity and expanding trade of agricultural products.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
U.S. Dollar	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Type of product or service: *See definition for list of product and service types*. For agricultural commodities, report the specific commodity.

SECOND LEVEL

Type of producer/firm (firms are non-farm enterprises): Producer - smallholder, Producer – non-smallholder, Firm – microenterprise, Firm - Small and medium enterprise, Firm- Large enterprise or corporation.

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.

THIRD LEVEL

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.

Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed

For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data from assisted producers and firms may need to be collected separately. Ideally, this indicator will be collected directly from a census of all participant farms and firms, from recorded sales data and/or farm/firm records. A sample survey-based approach for participant producers within the geographic area reached by the assisted market is also acceptable. Recipients should work with assisted firms to ensure that appropriate information is provided.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance.

If a sample of participants is used to collect sales data, sample survey weighted estimates must be extrapolated to total participant estimated values before entry into FAIS to accurately **reflect total value of reporting year sales in USD** by the project's participants. Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in comments in FAIS.

Report the **number of participants**, both producers and private sector firms for each value chain product or service, and for each type of producer/firm, sex, and age disaggregate. For example, to report on the number of participants in the coffee value chain, recipients should enter the following information for the reporting year:

Number of participants

- total number of smallholder, female, coffee-producing program participants
- total number of smallholder, male, coffee-producing program participants
- total number of smallholder, 15-29 year old, coffee-producing program participants

- total number of smallholder, 30+ year old, coffee-producing program participants
- *Repeat as necessary with each relevant Type of producer/firm*

Note that the **volume (in metric tons) of sales** of agricultural commodities will be reported in LRP Indicator 4. There should be a correlation between the value of sales of agricultural commodities reported for this Indicator and the volume (in metric tons) of sales reported in LRP Indicator 8.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline data reflects value of sales in the year prior to programming and should be collected through records of assisted firms and/or a sample survey of producers via recall.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes [EG.3.2-26]	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

LRP 1.3.2.1: Increased Agricultural Productivity

LRP INDICATOR 8: Volume of commodities sold by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator will collect the volume (as calculated in gross metric tons (MT)) of sales of targeted commodities by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance. This includes the volume of all sales of targeted commodity(ies), not just the volume of farm-gate sales.

The actual number reported for the indicator will be the gross volume of sales of a product (crop, animal or fish) by project participants in the reporting period. Only count the gross volume of sales in the reporting period attributable to USDA investment.

USDA will use the data reported for this indicator, as well as the data reported on the value of annual sales, when reporting on the Feed the Future Initiative. Please note that the value of annual sales indicator cannot be calculated without a value for the baseline year's sales. If data on the total volume of sales of the value chain commodity by participants prior to USDA activity implementation is not available, do not leave the baseline blank or enter '0.' Use the earliest reporting year sales volume actual as the baseline year sales.

RATIONALE: Volume (in MT) of sales at the farm and enterprise level of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those beneficiaries receiving USDA assistance. This measurement also helps track supply, access to markets, and progress toward commercialization by farmers and enterprises receiving USDA assistance.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Metric Tons	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Commodity Type (type of crop, type of animal or animal product, or type of fish – freshwater or marine). Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for this indicator. The overall "horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired.

SECOND LEVEL

Type of producer/firm (firms are non-farm enterprises): Producer - smallholder, Producer – non-smallholder, Firm – microenterprise, Firm - Small and medium enterprise, Firm- Large enterprise or corporation. (see definition of smallholder and firm type below)

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.

THIRD LEVEL

Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed

	For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female. Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data from assisted producers and firms may need to be collected separately. Ideally, this indicator will be collected directly from a census of all participant farms and firms, from recorded sales data and/or farm/firm records. A sample survey-based approach for participant producers within the geographic area reached by the assisted market is also acceptable. Recipients should work with assisted firms to ensure that appropriate information is provided.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to USDA assistance, i.e. where USDA assisted the individual farmer or firm, or the market actor with which they are engaged directly, and for those value chains/commodities/markets which USDA supports. If a sample of participants is used to collect sales data, sample survey weighted estimates must be extrapolated to total participant estimated values before entry into FAIS to accurately reflect total sales by the project's participants. Volume (in metric tons) of agricultural commodities should be directly related to value of agricultural commodities measured in LRP Indicator 7. BASELINE INFO: Volume of agricultural commodities reported at baseline and for the reporting years should be the volume that was sold and reported as sales in LRP Indicator 7.	
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-26]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:** FtF collects this information as part of the Value of annual sales indicator. In order to capture this data in USDA's database system, a separate indicator on volume has been developed.

LRP 1.3.2.2: Increased Value Added to Post-Production Agricultural Products

LRP INDICATOR 9: Total increase in installed storage capacity (dry or cold storage) as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures total increase in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through USDA programming and leveraged during the reporting year. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.

RATIONALE: Post harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products can account for a significant proportion of overall commodity/product disappearance (waste) in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could, therefore, substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas, as well.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Cubic Meters	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of storage:

- Dry
- Cold

Type of installation:

- Refurbished
- New

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of farmers about new storage facilities, direct observation of storage units added to target farms (calculate total volume of additional storage capacity across all farms), project records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Collect data on and off-farm, counting only storage added/refurbished that can be accessed by participants.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.4.2: Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework

LRP INDICATOR 10: Number of policies, regulations, or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Number of enabling environment policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, education, nutrition, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it related to agriculture that:

Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures
Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure
Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for education)
Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority]
Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority)
Other: Or were otherwise shaped by the recipient's direct involvement.

This indicator is disaggregated by two types of policies/ regulation/ administrative procedures: educational, and child health and nutrition. To be counted under education, actions must have, as their ultimate purpose, improving equitable access to or the quality of education services. Child health may include government health facilities, established procedures, materials, public information, or training. Nutrition may include public sector investment allocated to nutrition, nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, nutritional products, nutrition service delivery, provision of deworming medication, school-based WASH, etc.

Policies, regulations or administrative procedures that focus on *school feeding* should be captured as educational policies, regardless of which local ministry or agency is involved. Child health and nutrition actions besides those which focus on school feeding should be captured as child health and nutrition policies.

Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

RATIONALE: The indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for education and child health and nutrition. It includes the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the MGD framework focused on improving literacy of school-age children, or focused on increasing use of health, nutrition and dietary practices.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Policies, regulations, and/or administrative	Stages 1 & 2: Output	Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one	Annually covering the period: October 1-

procedures and supplementary narrative	Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	should see the disaggregate for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)	September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of policy:

- Educational
- Child Health and Nutrition

Stage: Disaggregates will be shown by stages (1-5) and 6 as noted above.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation, and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, and regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in project reports.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Only count policies specifically addressed and supported with USDA assistance.

Enter the name of the policy/regulation/administrative procedure and its stage in order to track movement through the stages. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, or formation of the law or policy.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.4.3: Improved Capacity of Relevant Organizations

LRP INDICATOR 11: Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted as received training, through formal or informal means.

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

Individuals include agricultural producers, ranchers, fisheries, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc., and extension specialists, researchers, inspectors, government employees, policy makers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system, and natural resources management.

In-country and offshore training are included. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.

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

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Sex: Male/Female

Duration:

- New = this reporting period is the first period the person applied the new technology or technique
- Continuing = the person first applied the new technology or technique in the previous period and continues to apply it

Type of individual:

- Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)
- People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)
- People in government (e.g. extension workers, policymakers)
- People in civil society (e.g. NGOs, CBOs, research and academic organizations)
    - Note: While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double counting.

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records, reports, or surveys. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Count only those individuals targeted by USDA programs.

This indicator is a comprehensive indicator that includes all USDA supported training.

This indicator is to measure individuals *receiving* training, for which the outcome, individuals *applying* new practices should be reported under LRP Indicator 12 *Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance*.

Individuals should not be double counted in a given fiscal year. For example, if one individual participates in multiple project-sponsored training courses in a given fiscal year, they should only be counted one time in that fiscal year. Individuals participating in project-sponsored training courses in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year, but only once in the life-of-project total.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.4.3: Improved Capacity of Relevant Organizations

LRP INDICATOR 12: Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance

DEFINITION: This indicator measures the total number of agriculture system actors participating in USDA-funded activities who have applied improved management practices and/or technologies promoted by USDA anywhere within the food and agriculture system during the reporting year. These individuals can include:

- Farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and nonfood crops, livestock and livestock products, fish and other fisheries/aquaculture products, agro-forestry products, and natural resource-based products, including non-timber forest products such as fruits, seeds, and resins;
- Individuals in the private sector, such as entrepreneurs, input suppliers, traders, processors, manufacturers, distributors, service providers, and wholesalers and retailers;
- Individuals in government, such as policy makers, extension workers and natural resource managers;
- Individuals in civil society, such as researchers or academics and non-governmental and community organization staff.

The indicator tracks those individuals who are changing their behavior while participating in USDA-funded activities. Individuals who attended training or were exposed to a new technology do not count under this indicator unless the individual actually applies what she/he learned.

Improved management practices or technologies are those promoted by the recipient as a way to increase agriculture productivity or support stronger and better functioning systems. The improved management practices and technologies are agriculture-related.

Management practice and technology type categories, with some illustrative (not exhaustive) examples, include:

- Crop genetics: e.g. improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding, higher in nutritional content (e.g. through bio-fortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, high-protein maize), and/or more resilient to climate impacts (e.g. drought tolerant maize, or stress tolerant rice); improved germplasm.
- Cultural practices: context specific agronomic practices that do not fit in other categories, e.g. seedling production and transplantation; cultivation practices such as planting density, crop rotation, and mounding.
- Livestock management: e.g. improved livestock breeds; livestock health services and products such as vaccines; improved livestock handling practices and housing; improved feeding practices; improved grazing practices, improved waste management practices, improved fodder crop, cultivation of dual purpose crops.
- Wild-caught fisheries management: e.g. sustainable fishing practices; improved nets, hooks, lines, traps, dredges, trawls; improved hand gathering, netting, angling, spearfishing, and trapping practices.
- Aquaculture management: e.g. improved fingerlings; improved feed and feeding practices; fish health and disease control; improved cage culture; improved pond culture; pond preparation; sampling and harvesting; management of carrying capacity.

- Natural resource or ecosystem management: e.g. terracing, rock lines; fire breaks; biodiversity conservation; strengthening of ecosystem services, including stream bank management or restoration or re/afforestation; woodlot management.
- Pest and disease management: e.g. Integrated Pest Management; improved fungicides; appropriate application of fungicides; improved and environmentally sustainable use of cultural, physical, biological, and chemical insecticides and pesticides; crop rotation; aflatoxin prevention and control.
- Soil-related fertility and conservation: e.g. Integrated Soil Fertility Management; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter, mulching); improved fertilizer; improved fertilizer use practices; inoculant; erosion control.
- Irrigation: e.g. drip, surface, and sprinkler irrigation; irrigation schemes.
- Agriculture water management - non-irrigation-based: e.g. water harvesting; sustainable water use practices; practices that improve water quality.
- Climate mitigation: technologies selected because they minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g. drip irrigation, upgrades of agriculture infrastructure and supply chains).
- Climate adaptation/climate risk management: technologies promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk and minimizing the severity of the impacts of climate change. Examples include drought and flood resistant varieties; short-duration varieties; adjustment of sowing time; agricultural/climate forecasting; early warning systems; diversification, use of perennial varieties; agroforestry; risk insurance.
- Marketing and distribution: e.g. contract farming technologies and practices; improved input purchase technologies and practices; improved commodity sale technologies and practices; improved market information system technologies and practices.
- Post-harvest handling and storage: e.g. improved transportation; decay and insect control; temperature and humidity control; improved quality control technologies and practices; sorting and grading, sanitary handling practices.
- Value-added processing: e.g. improved packaging practices and materials including biodegradable packaging; food and chemical safety technologies and practices; improved preservation technologies and practices.
- Other: e.g. improved mechanical and physical land preparation; non-market- and non-climate-related information technology; improved record keeping; improved budgeting and financial management; Improved capacity to repair agricultural equipment; improved quality of agricultural products or technology.

This indicator endeavors to capture the individuals who have made the decision to apply a particular management practice or technology, not those who have had to do so as a condition of employment or an obligation.

RATIONALE: Improved management practices and technological change and adoption by different actors in the agricultural system will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity and supporting stronger and better functioning systems.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**

Number: Individuals	Outcome	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

FIRST LEVEL

Value chain actor type:

- Smallholder producers (e.g. farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and nonfood crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products)
- Non-smallholder producers (e.g. farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers of food and nonfood crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products)
- People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)
- People in private sector firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)
- People in civil society (e.g. staff and volunteers from non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, research and academic organizations)
- Others

Note: Only count producers under the "Producers" disaggregate and not the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate and not the "Civil Society" disaggregate to avoid double-counting.

Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.

SECOND LEVEL

Sex: Male, Female

Age: 15-29, 30+

Management practice or technology type: Crop genetics, Cultural practices, Livestock management, Wild-caught fisheries management, Aquaculture management, Natural resource or ecosystem management, Pest and disease management, Soil-related fertility and conservation, Irrigation, Agriculture water management-non-irrigation based, Climate mitigation, Climate adaptation/climate risk management, Marketing and distribution, Post-harvest handling and storage, Value-added processing, Other

Commodity:

Type of crop, type of animal or animal product, type of fish – freshwater or marine, or "Disaggregate not applicable".

Note: Horticultural product-specific disaggregation is not required for this indicator. The overall "horticulture" commodity disaggregate can be used if desired.

Activities promoting sustainable intensification or those where multiple commodities are

involved (e.g. transportation), where counting participants by commodity is complicated and/or not meaningful are not required to disaggregate participants by commodity, and should use the "Disaggregate not applicable" category under the Commodity disaggregate.

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected via sample survey of participants, census of private sector/government participants, project or association records, farm records, company/organization records.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: All significant improvements to existing techniques or technologies should be counted. In a case where, for example, an individual applies more than one innovation as a result of USDA assistance, count the individual once in the applicable Value chain actor type, Sex, and Age disaggregate categories. If more than one participant in a household is applying improved technologies, count all the adult participants. Individuals should only be counted once per reporting year under the Value chain actor type, Sex, and Age disaggregate categories.

Since it is common for USDA-funded activities to promote more than one improved technology or management practice to producers and other individuals, this indicator allows the tracking of the total number of participants that apply any improved management practice or technology during the reporting year and the tracking of the total number of participants that apply practices or technologies in specific management practice and technology type categories.

- Count the participant if they have applied a management practice or technology promoted with USDA assistance at least once in the reporting year.
- Count each participant only once per year in the applicable Sex disaggregate category and Age disaggregate category to track the number of individuals applying USDA-promoted management practices or technology types. If more than one participant in a household is applying improved technologies, count each participant in the household who does so.
- Under the Commodity disaggregate, count each participant once under each commodity for which they apply a USDA-promoted management practice or technology type. For example, if a participant uses USDA-promoted improved seed for the focus commodities of maize and legume, count that participant once under maize and once under legumes.
- Count each individual once per management practice or technology type once per year under the appropriate Management practice/technology type disaggregate. Individuals can be counted under a number of different Management practices/technology types in a reporting year.

This indicator counts individuals who applied improved management practices and technologies learned through training provided through USDA assistance. Therefore, there should be a clear link between LRP Indicator 12*, Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance* and LRP Indicator 11, *Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training*.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is the number of participant producers and other actors applying improved management practices or technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM***

to allow for the information to be collected correctly.	
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR: Yes [EG.3.2-24]	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:** For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

LRP 1.4.3: Improved Capacity of Relevant Organizations
LRP 1.4.1: Improved Capacity of Government Institutions

LRP INDICATOR 13: Number of people trained in disaster preparedness as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: Disaster preparedness includes: risk identification, analysis, prioritization, and reduction activities; the design and implementation of regional, national, local, or community level hazard reduction policies and plans; early warning systems, as appropriate; and identification of roles and responsibilities in preventing, responding to, and recovering from disasters and subsequent food crises.

Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards, when these exist. Trainings must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Only participants who complete a full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one topic, individuals should only be counted once for that training course. If a training course is conducted in more than one session/training event, only individuals who complete the full course should be counted; do not sum the participants for each training event. If individuals are retrained within the reporting period, having received training prior to the project or reporting period, they should be included in the count. Do not count sensitization meetings or one-off information meetings.

Individuals include agricultural producers, processers, national or local government employees, policy makers, researchers, school administrators, teachers, other school workers, community leaders, parents, health professionals, students, NGO staff, and others who are engaged in the food, nutrition, education, emergency response, and natural resources management.

In-country and offshore training are included. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.

Disaster means an event or a series of events that creates a need for emergency food assistance by threatening or resulting in significantly decreased availability of, or access to, food or the erosion of the ability of populations to meet food needs. Disasters include, but are not limited to, natural events such as floods, earthquakes, and drought; crop failure; disease; civil strife and war; and economic turmoil. Disasters can be characterized as slow or rapid-onset. The situation caused by a disaster is a "food crisis".

Emergency response means any activity that is designed to meet the urgent food and nutritional needs of those affected by acute or transitory food insecurity as a result of a disaster.

RATIONALE: Enhanced human capacity for planning for and responding to disasters and food crises, is expected to lead to improved national and food security, increased efficiency and effectiveness of disaster preparedness and emergency response, program and policy formulation and/or implementation, and is key to transformational development.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Individuals	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:
Sex: Male/Female

DATA SOURCE:
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from recipient training records, reports, or surveys. Recipients should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: This indicator is required only if the project is designed to provide an emergency response to food crises and disasters.

Count only those individuals targeted by USDA programs.

Individuals should not be double counted in a given fiscal year. For example, if one individual participates in multiple project-sponsored training courses in a given fiscal year, they should only be counted one time in that fiscal year. Individuals participating in project-sponsored training courses in multiple fiscal years may be counted once in each fiscal year.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:
The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:**
No	This is also a Foreign Assistance indicator HA.2.1-1 (see: http://www.state.gov/f/indicators/)

LRP 1.4.4: Increased Leverage of Private-Sector Resources

LRP INDICATOR 14: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance

DEFINITION: The number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to USDA intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and private entity. A private entity can be a for-profit entity, an NGO using private funds, a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully). A public entity can be a donor-funded program participant, a national or sub-national government, or state-owned enterprises which are non-profit.

A project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships, we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included.

An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation. A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.

Formal partnerships between schools and producers, cooperatives or other private sector entities for the purpose of sustainably supporting school meals programs should be counted as a nutrition focused partnership.

RATIONALE: The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities, which ultimately contributes to agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will also be a reduction in poverty.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
Number: Partnerships	Output	Higher is better	Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of partnership (refer to the primary focus of the partnership if applicable):

- Agricultural production
- Agricultural post-harvest transformation
- Nutrition
- Multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)
- Other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships)

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in project reports.
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Only count partnerships that are attributable to USDA investment. Each partnership's formation should only ever be reported once in order to add the total number of partnerships across years. BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE	
FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
No	None

LRP 1.4.4: Increased Leverage of Private-Sector Resources
LRP 1.3.2.3: Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products

LRP INDICATOR 15: Value of new USG commitments, and new public and private sector investments leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition

DEFINITION: The term "investments" is defined as public or private sector resources intended to complement existing/ongoing USDA-funded activities (*i.e.* education or nutrition activity, as described below), including resources provided for purposes of *cost-share* or *matching*. While the majority of such resources will be monetary in nature, non-monetary resources (e.g. in-kind contributions, labor, etc.) should be expressed in their respective dollar values. Data should be collected for four categories: "host government," "other public sector," "private sector", and "new USG commitments".

"Host Government" includes any investments from the national, regional, or local governments.

"Other public sector" includes any investments provided by the Program Participant itself, or other Private Voluntary Organizations.

"Private sector" includes any investments from a private actor, including for-profit organizations, private philanthropic organizations, or individuals.

"New USG commitments" refers to funds in the form of a direct loan, part of a grant, or other award designed to leverage additional funds from private sector organizations. Subsidies paid to structure a guarantee or insurance product do not count as new USG commitments.

"Leveraged as a result of USDA assistance" indicates that the investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by the activities funded or resources provided by USDA.

"Investments" means the level of resources provided during each reporting year.

For multi-year activities, commitments are recorded at the outset of the activity, if made prior to the start of the activity, or during the year when they are made, if commitments are received during implementation of an activity.

A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on improving the nutritional content of agricultural products provided to consumers, developing improved nutritional products, increasing support for nutrition service delivery, etc.

An educational activity includes any activity focused on improving educational support to improve the quality of literacy or any other lower level result in the MGD results framework such as improving access to school supplies and materials, improved school infrastructure, increased access to food, and improved literacy instructional materials.

This indicator is not directly paired with the preceding indicator (LRP Indicator 14) on public-private partnerships. In other words, this indicator does not track only investments that may have been leveraged via those partnerships, but rather is separate and broader in tracking the value of any public or private sector investments leveraged (encouraged or facilitated) by the activities or resources provided by USDA.

RATIONALE: The assumption of this indicator is that the higher the value of investment, particularly by the host government, the greater the chances for long-term sustainability of education and nutrition-

related activities beyond USDA's initial commitment. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable improvements. All of these investments are key to achieving long-term impact in project areas by increasing host country capacity and ownership of programs. Coordinated and complementary investments from the host government and other public and private sector donors will help achieve improved literacy and increased use of health and dietary practices, which then contribute to the key objective of improving the literacy of school age children and sustaining the benefits made during project implementation to literacy, attendance, and enrollment by graduating the project to full host-country ownership.

INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	**INDICATOR LEVEL:**	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:**	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:**
U.S. Dollar	Output	Higher is better	Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30

DISAGGREGATION:

Type of investment amount:

- Host Government amount
- Other Public sector amount
- Private sector amount
- New USG Commitment amount

DATA SOURCE:

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by partnership records/agreements.

MEASUREMENT NOTES: Convert local currency to U.S. dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. Report exchange rate in indicator narrative in FAIS.

BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.

DATA ENTRY IN FAIS:

The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE

FtF INDICATOR:	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**
Yes, partially; combines EG.3.1-14 with USDA-specific disaggregates	For more guidance on the Feed the Future indicator, please refer to the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook (https://www.agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-indicator-handbook).

LRP SO1: Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement			
LRP INDICATOR 16: Number of schools reached as a result of USDA assistance			
DEFINITION: The indicator tracks the number of schools reached during the reporting period by any project activity. While this will commonly be schools reached with school feeding, it will also count schools reached with any other activity (even absent feeding), such as teacher training or other capacity-building activities, facilities improvements, PTA strengthening, etc.			
RATIONALE: The school is the hub of many program activities and having a simple school count is useful in reflecting the breadth of the program.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Schools	**INDICATOR LEVEL:** Output	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better	**FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:** Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: None			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Recipients. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from recipient records.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: BASELINE INFO: Baseline is zero.			
DATA ENTRY IN FAIS: The indicator title must be entered into the relevant performance reporting section of FAIS ***VERBATIM*** to allow for the information to be collected correctly.			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	**DEFINITIONAL AND MEASURMENT NOTES:**		