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Agenda

• Overview of changes (dropped, changed, new)
• Presentation of PIRS for changed indicators
• Presentation of PIRS for new indicators
• Open Comment, Question, and Answer period
List of Dropped FTF Indicators

4-16  Ease of doing business rank*
4.5-11 Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities
4.5.1-21  # of climate vulnerability assessments conducted…
4.5.1-26  Avg. # of days required to trade goods across borders
4.5.2-41  # of water resources sustainability assessments…
4.5.2-25  # of people with savings account or insurance policy…
4.5.2-32  # of stakeholders using climate information…
4.5.1-22  # of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated
CBLD-5  Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity among USG direct and indirect local IPs
List of Changed FTF Indicators

4.5.2-5  Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

4.5.2-2  Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

4.5.1-24  Number of policies completing the following processes/steps of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Analysis; Stakeholder consultation/public debate; Drafting or revision; Approval (Legislative or regulatory); Full and effective implementation

4.5.2-6  Number of individuals who have received long-term agricultural sector productivity training

4.5.2-34  Number of people implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change
List of New FTF Indicators

4-(TBD8) Depth of Poverty: The mean aggregate consumption shortfall relative to the $1.25 poverty line

4.5.3(TBD1) Prevalence of women of reproductive age who consume targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities

4.5.3(TBD2) Prevalence of children 6-23 months who consume targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities

4.5.3(TBD3) Total quantity of targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities produced by direct beneficiaries that is set aside for home consumption
Overview of Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for Changed Indicators
CHANGE: Number of policies completing… (formerly # 4.5.1-24)

• Significant revision with changes in:
  o Processes/steps in policy change process
  o Policy areas
  o “Double-counting”
• Disaggregated by:
  o Policy area
  o Process/step
  o Total number of policies
• Reporting: For FY 2014 reporting, actuals and targets in different places. For FY 2015, solely under the new PIRS and #.
CHANGE: Number of farmers and others who have applied improved techs…

- Dropped: New/Continuing Disaggregate
- Addition: Producers/Others Disaggregate
  - Will allow us to better monitor and report on our activities across the value chain.
- Addition: Technology Type disaggregates
  - Will allow us to better monitor and report on the kinds of technologies and practices we are promoting. Will give us a quick idea of scale potential, and an assessment of our scaling efforts.
CHANGE: Number of farmers and others who have applied improved techs…(cont’d.)

• Most of the TT disaggregates are the same as under 4.5.2-2 (Number of Hectares). But the list here is longer, as it allows reporting on efforts focused on individuals across the value chain in land, and non-land based activities.

• Since these data are likely being collected already, we hope these changes will involve none to minimal extra reporting burden.

• Reporting: To the extent possible, begin reporting on new disaggregates in FTFMS as of FY 2014. Reporting on all disaggregates required for FY 2015.
CHANGE: Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices…

• Addition: “Cultural Practices” disaggregate category
  • Formerly these activities were tracked under “Others” category, but were making it disproportionately large. Also, we received feedback from IPs to consider it as a separate category, and we listened!
CHANGE: Number of individuals who have received... long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training

• Addition of New/Continuing Disaggregate

CHANGE: Number of people implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change

• Change from “stakeholders” to “people”
Overview of Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for New Indicators
NEW: Depth of Poverty

• Title II programs (R), Economic Resilience Programs (RiA)
• Measures the depth of poverty in relation to the $1.25 expenditures per person per day poverty threshold
  o Gives an indication of severity or intensity of poverty, complementing the Prevalence of Poverty Indicator
  o Does not require additional data collection
• Reporting: ZOI Impact Indicator reported for the interim and subsequent Population-based Surveys (PBS)
• Disaggregated by Gendered Household Type
Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture PIRS Cross-Cutting (1)

- Indicators for new SPSD agriculture element 4.5.3 Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture
- Indicators applicable if commodity is:
  - Promoted by USG-funded value chain activity
  - Selected for nutrition objectives
    - Own production ➔ home consumption agriculture to nutrition pathway
    - Increased market availability
  - Nutrient-rich
- Not applicable to home/community gardens, sustainable intensification/resilience activities
Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture PIRS Cross-Cutting (2)

• Nutrient-rich criteria
  o Bio-fortified
  o Legume, nut or seed
  o Animal-sourced food
  o Dark yellow or orange-fleshed root or tuber
  o Fruit or vegetable “high source” one+ micronutrients per 100 calories & per 100 grams
    • Amaranth leaves, cabbage, moringa leaves, okra, sweet green pepper
    • Mango, passion-fruit, pineapple
Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture PIRS Cross-Cutting (3)

• Disaggregated by commodity
  o Targets required only at commodity level
• “Piggy-backed” on existing required data collection
NEW: Prevalence of (4.5.3-TBD1) women of reproductive age (WRA) and (4.5.3-TBD2) children 6-23 months who consume targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities (NRVCC)

- Optional (i.e. “Standard”)
- ZOI population-level
- Collect during ZOI population-based survey
  - Disaggregate Women’s Dietary Diversity and Minimum Adequate Diet food groups as needed
  - Establish “baseline” during upcoming interim survey
NEW: Prevalence of 4.5.3(TBD1) women of reproductive age (WRA) and 4.5.3(TBD2) children 6-23 months who consume targeted NRVCC (cont’d.)

- Overall value = % WRA or children 6-23 mo in sample who consumed at least one NRVCC
  - 3.1.9.1-2 (children) also disaggregated by sex
- Commodity disaggregate = % WRA or children 6-23 mo who consumed specific NRVCC
- Enter total ZOI population of WRA and of male and female children 6-23 mo
NEW: 4.5.3(TBD3) Total quantity of targeted nutrient-rich value chain commodities produced by direct beneficiaries that is set aside for home consumption

- Required if Applicable for new implementing mechanisms
  - Encouraged for FY14 awards w/o indicator baselines
- Direct beneficiary level
- One additional question when collecting gross margin data
- Commodity-level information only
  - Will not sum across commodities
Slide 21 What do you foresee might be unique challenges associated with collecting the amount of a nutrient-rich commodity set aside for home consumption?

No problem...will be collected through annual beneficiary surveys and am glad the recall period is short.

Main issue seasonal crops in a 12 month period, trust on HH recall

Farmers have difficulties to keep records of the horticulture crops, because it can consume any time in the season

May be a limitation could be not tracking what got wasted in addition to what was consumed, sold and produced

One issue relates to the need to coordinate data collections with these harvest times

Lack of consistency in terms of units of measurement for various products

Answers (10)

I believe that measuring this will require a more extensive series of questions than may be currently envisioned, and will probably need to be added outside the dietary intake schedule.

Contextual factors (culture, location) vary in each region

I do not see a problem with this. At the implementing partner level, they can include in their regular data collection tools.

Farmers have a very difficult time quantifying what they keep for home consumption, versus what is sold, where it is quantified in monetary terms and easier to measure.

No problem...will be collected through annual beneficiary surveys and am glad the recall period is short.

Slide 21 For the number of farmers indicator, do the technology type disaggregates cover the breadth of your value chain activities? Is there anything that should be added to this list? Are there disaggregates that can be collapsed?

Another option could be Business Skills such as record keeping or crop budgeting

The list is quite extensive. Issues may arise regarding defining what are "cultural practices" exactly? This is vague.

Soil-related fertility and conservation bundles together practices that are oriented to increase productivity (improved fertilization) and the sustainability of the production (soil conservation practices). We should split them to stress sustainability

Perhaps something specific about aflatoxin/biocontrols could be added?

Suggest using the term "improved seed" instead of "crop genetics," which is a loaded term in some countries.

This is my comment on the question
What do you foresee might be unique challenges associated with collecting the amount of a nutrient-rich commodity set aside for home consumption?

I believe that measuring this will require a more extensive series of questions than may be currently envisioned, and will probably need to be added outside the dietary intake schedule.

I do not see a problem with this. At the implementing partner level, they can include it in their regular data collection tools.

Farmers have a very difficult time quantifying what they keep for home consumption, versus what is sold, where it is quantified in monetary terms and is easier to measure.

Most farmers in Africa, Latin America & Asia where FTF works would not understand this and not be able to report on this. There would be a bias away from poor farmers to better-educated food producers would report it, hence a sample size & bias issue.

No problem...will be collected through annual beneficiary surveys and am glad the recall period is short.

Main issue seasonal crops in a 12 month period, trust on HH recall.

Farmers have difficulties to keep records of the horticulture crops, because it can consume any time in the season.

may be a limitation could not be tracking what got wasted in addition to what was consumed, sold and produced.

One issue relates to staggered harvest times AND the need to coordinate data collections with these harvest times.

Lack of consistency in terms of units of measurement for various products.

Contextual factors (culture, location) vary in each region.

For the number of farmers indicator, do the technology type disaggregates cover the breadth of your value chain activities? Is there anything that should be added to this list? Are there disaggregates that can be collapsed?

Another option could be Business Skills such as record keeping or crop budgeting.

The list is quite extensive. Issues may arise regarding defining what are "cultural practices" exactly? This is vague.

Soil-related fertility and conservation bundles together practices that are oriented to increase productivity (improved fertilization) and the sustainability of the production (soil conservation practices). We should split them to stress sustainability.

Could include new ways of accessing finance previously not available to a population.

Perhaps something specific about aflatoxin/blast control could be added?

Suggest using the term "improved seed" instead of "crop genetics," which is a loaded term in some countries.

This is my comment on the question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Expected Timing to Begin Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Poverty</td>
<td>Upcoming interim PBS survey (baselines for FFP programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of WRA...NRVCC</td>
<td>Upcoming interim PBS survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of kids 6-23 mo...NRVCC</td>
<td>Upcoming interim PBS survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total quantity of NRVCC ...set aside for home consumption</td>
<td>FY15 for new activities, encouraged for FY14 activities w/o indicator baseline if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of farmers who have applied</td>
<td>FY15, but can report in FY 2014 if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of hectares</td>
<td>FY15, but can report in FY 2014 if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of policies</td>
<td>FY15, FY 2014 (actuals &amp; targets under separate indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of individuals...long-term training</td>
<td>FY15, but can report in FY 2014 if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people...risk-reducing practices</td>
<td>FY 2014 (no substantive change in indicator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment, Question, & Answer Time!