



FEED THE FUTURE INDICATOR REDESIGN WEBINAR

WEBINAR AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

JULY 14, 2016

PRESENTERS

Lesley Perlman, USAID/Bureau for Food Security

Anne Swindale, USAID/Bureau for Food Security

Elizabeth Bontrager, USAID Bureau for Global Health

MODERATOR

Julie MacCartee, USAID/Bureau for Food Safety

Julie MacCartee:

Good morning, afternoon, or evening, everyone. This is Julie MacCartee, knowledge management specialist with the USAID Bureau for Food Security, and you won't hear me speaking much today, except during the Q&A portion later. I will be helping facilitate today, so you'll see my name in the chat box.

So if you couldn't hear me before, hopefully you can hear me now. We're about to get started with our webinar on the Feed the Future indicator redesign. Very quickly, I can see that everyone is using the chat box to communicate. That's excellent. That's how you can ask your questions today and communicate with your fellow participants and the presenters. In addition, on the bottom left of your screen, in that little file share box, you will see a downloadable PDF copy of today's presentation, so feel free to download that. In addition, the Indicator Handbook and the Ag Indicators Guide are linked in that links box on the left.

Today's webinar is being recorded, and so we will take that recording and share it with you after this event, in case you need to review any portion of it or want to share it with your colleagues.

All right. So I'll quickly introduce our three speakers today and then pass it off to them. We will have Anne Swindale, who is senior program advisor for monitoring and evaluation with the USAID Bureau for Food security, Lesley Perlman, M&E specialist with the USAID Bureau for Food Security, Elizabeth Bontrager – all right, I'm working on that one – with the USAID Bureau for Global Health, a nutrition advisor. So our three speakers are on hand today in our webinar control room in Washington, DC, and I will pass it over to Lesley.

Lesley Perlman:

Thank you for that – oh, good. I'm glad you can hear me. I told you I was louder. So I want to welcome you all to the Foreign Assistance Indicator Redesign webinar, covering the Feed the Future indicators. I'm going to get moving, since we have a lot to cover and we're already a bit delayed.

So as you can see in the agenda, we're first going to go over an overview of the indicator redesign, and then follow that up with a discussion of the new FTF indicators, the changed FTF indicators, the archived or deleted indicators, and then the reporting schedule for the new or changed indicators, and the last piece will be a Q&A period to answer any burning questions that you may have, which I'm sure you will.

Okay, so the indicator redesign was really guided by the following principles. It was focused on data use, and so the process was driven by what indicators and what data is used for policy development, strategic planning, and external reporting?

We looked at the data that were collected and the data that were really used to guide these processes. And we're also focused on improved data quality, so all foreign – all standard foreign assistance indicators are now classified as required as applicable, meaning if they pertain to your mission level objectives, IMs will need to collect and report on them. And this is aimed to improve consistency and completeness of reporting across the FTF indicator structure.

Additionally, more flexibility was built in, so in addition to the annual indicators which we had before, there are now milestone and multi-year indicators, and also, custom indicators are encouraged to better tell the stories at the mission, project, and mechanism level.

So the Department of Foreign Assistance, in collaboration with USAID and State, began working on this indicator redesign last summer. So it's been quite a long process. We established 14 working groups in sector thematic areas. So it covers not just FTF, but the entire framework of foreign assistance indicators. But for this webinar, we're just going to be covering the FTF indicators here. In addition, there are some new SPSD categories for indicators. So for FTF, you will now EG.3 for agriculture and HL.9 for nutrition, and this is reflected not just in these SPSD areas, but we have new indicator numbering for all our indicators.

And we also ended up with a reduction in the total number of indicators, which we are a little bit happy about. So hopefully that will make it a bit easier. Okay, Anne, do you want to take over the next bit?

Anne Swindale: Sure.

Anne Swindale: Okay. Good morning, afternoon, and evening, everybody. I do hope that you're able to hear me, and it looks like you can. So as Lesley just mentioned, the Feed the Future indicators still do reflect two of the major program areas under standardized program structure and definitions, or SPSD, nutrition, which was 3.1.9 funding, and agriculture, or 4.5 funding, including nutrition sensitive agriculture. And we still will use the Feed the Future monitoring systems, our beloved FTFMS, as our first line data collection mechanism of these indicators.

What has changed is what indicators are reported where. Previously, all indicators reported in FTFMS were also required to be reported in the PPR. However, now the FTF indicators are divided into two groups, those that are reported only in FTFMS, and those that are reported in FTFMS and the PPR database, otherwise known as next generation FACTS Info.

All of our zone of influence population based survey indicators and all of our national and regional level indicators – for example, agricultural gross domestic product or intra-regional trade are now only required to be reported in FTFMS. This isn't to say that an operating unit can't include its indicators in the PPR. In fact, when the FY16 PPR is submitted, operating units are going to be asked to select a set of standard and custom indicators which they will use to report progress under their country or regional development and cooperation strategy.

And if an operating unit feels that Feed the Future's Zone of Influence population based survey indicator or a national or regional indicator is a key indicator that it would like to use to demonstrate progress under their CDCS or RCDS, you can certainly include it as a custom indicator in the PPR, but we here for Feed the Future and the FS are not going to be requiring that those data are entered into FACTS Info anymore.

The ZOI and national regional indicators are still categorized as required as applicable or optional or – although optional used to be what we call standard, but we changed it to optional, because F calls indicators standard, so it was introducing a little bit of confusion.

The _____ mechanism level indicators, activity level indicators, are still required to be reported at the FTF and in the PPR, and you can still export the PPR report from FTFMS that sums data across implementing mechanisms to get operating unit totals, which can then be entered into the PPR. After the operating unit adds in any additional results that might have been achieved by activities funded by other funding streams – for example, global climate change – and adjusting the OU totals to account for any double counting of beneficiaries across implementing mechanisms, if that is possible. We understand it may not always be possible.

Now this is very, very important. All of the annual implementing mechanism level indicators are now required as applicable. I repeat, all of the IM level indicators are now required as applicable. The Bureau for Food Security will assign these indicators to every Feed the Future operating unit, and they will be pre-populated into FACTS Info. If a Feed the Future implementing level indicator is not applicable to an operating unit's programming because the OU has not activities that would contribute results to the indicator, then the operating unit can opt out of reporting on it with a short written justification in FACTS Info.

Also reported in FTFMS and the PPR, if selected, are three cross-linked optional indicators which reflect activities and results under social assistance, private sector opportunity, and climate change and adaptation program areas in the

SPSD, and we'll be describing these indicators briefly later in the presentation.

So here we can – you can see a summary of the types and numbers of FTF indicators in our revised handbook. We have a total of 49 direct Feed the Future, or 52 when you include the cross-linked indicators. So there's still quite a few. We've got a big story that we're trying to tell. But we have, believe it or not, streamlined them to a certain extent. And so now I'll hand it back over to Lesley.

Lesley Perlman:

Thank you, Anne. Okay. So we're now going to go over all the new indicators, just so you can hear a brief description about what they are. And we'll pay particular special attention to the nutrition indicators, as they are new, or all of them are new.

Okay, so here's the list of all the new FTF indicators through this indicator redesign. I'm not going to leave them all here, but since you can download this presentation at a later time, you'll have them to list, or have them to look at.

Okay, so the first one is EG3-1, and this is number of households benefiting directly from USG assistance under Feed the Future. This is a combination of two previous indicators we had, which was the number of rural households and number of vulnerable households. And both of these before were optional. You could report on them if you chose. Now that we have one indicator, and as Anne mentioned, it's required if applicable, we actually get a count of the household reach of FTF across the whole initiative, which we hope will lead to more _____ later reporting.

Please note that the disaggregations for this are both duration, so households new or continuing if they were being served in the previous year, and the disaggregation of location, which is split into rural and urban/peri-urban. Again, this is a indicator at the IM level, so at the implementing mechanism level.

Please note there is a potential for double counting in this indicator. This can be collected say through number of farmers applying, but for instance, if both a man and a woman from one household are counted under number of – are both countered under the farmers applying indicator, we need to be careful only to report one household. Likewise, if a farmer is trained and counted under the short term training indicator, and then that farmer is also counted under the farmers applying indicator, that household should also be only counted once. So you just want to have a look at where this data's coming from.

Okay. And now off to Anne again. Thank you, Anne.

Anne Swindale:

It's not exactly hot potato that we're playing, but – we just didn't want to bore you with the same voice all the time. So our next new indicator, the percentage of female direct beneficiaries of USG nutrition sensitive agriculture activities consuming a diet of minimum diversity – that is a very long title – is obviously an indicator for nutrition-sensitive activities, which are agriculture activities with explicit nutrition-related objectives and outcomes. For example, an objective to improve diet diversity.

This indicator is designed to capture a result that can be achieved through any or all of the three agriculture to nutrition pathways, the production, owned production to consumption pathway, the income to consumption pathway, or the women's empowerment to consumption pathways. In the indicator reference sheet in the handbook, you can find a link to more information on these agriculture to nutrition pathways, which are really important programming tools for people to use, if you're not aware of them already.

This contrast with the nutrient rich value chain indicator that was introduced last year, which actually only reflects the production to consumption pathway, so we actually are really excited about this new indicator, because as I said, we do feel that it allows all – a much larger range of nutrition sensitive activities using different kinds of approaches to achieve important: nutrition outcomes to be able to report successes of their activities.

Now a diet of minimum diversity is defined as having consumed five of ten specific food groups, which are defined in the indicator reference sheet, on the previous day. And consumption of five of these ten food groups has been validated through extensive research to be a legitimate proxy for the likelihood that a woman is consuming a more micronutrient-adequate diet. In other words, if a woman consumes five of these ten food groups the previous day, there's a higher likelihood that her diet is adequate in important key micronutrients.

Research undertaken by the SPRING Project on how to collect data for the nutrient rich value chain commodity indicator found that many implementing partners were actually already collecting data on diet diversity for beneficiaries, so we felt comfortable adding this indicator, which captures such an important outcome in a number of ways to the list of required as applicable indicator.

The definition of direct beneficiary under the indicator, because it's female direct beneficiaries, is basically the same as our definition of direct beneficiary overall under the initiatives, for now, which means it's somebody who has direct contact with significant interventions, in this case, agriculture-related interventions, such as training, technical assistance, facilitation of input access, and not just that some woman passed by and briefly observed and attended a meeting or observed a farmer field day, and didn't receive any other real focused support. And I don't

think any implementing partner or operating unit would want to be held accountable for changing the diet diversity of a woman who just came once, observed a meeting, and left, or for tracking that person down.

The new implementing mechanism level indicator is complemented by a new zone of influence population-based survey level nutrition indicator, which measures the prevalence of women of reproductive age overall in the zone of influence who are consuming this minimum diet diversity. After the 2017 interim ZOI surveys, we are going to replace the current women's dietary diversity score indicator with this minimum dietary diversity indicator, and the advantage of this new indicator is it actually allows us to compute a prevalence, to say what percent of women in our zones of influence are consuming this minimum – diet of minimum diversity, as opposed to simply saying on average, women are consuming 3.2 food groups, which is what we're able to say with the current women's dietary diversity score.

And now the hot potato will be passed over to Elizabeth, who will walk you through the remainder of the really new and exciting nutrition indicators that are being introduced.

Elizabeth Bontrager: Thank you, Anne, and hello, everyone. I would like to start with a quick note to say that these nutrition indicators that you'll see today were revised or developed in parallel with the development of an M&E plan for the multi-sectoral nutrition strategy, with a working group made up of individuals from Bureau of Food Security, Food for Peace, and Global Health Nutrition.

So this first indicator that you see on your screen may look familiar from its title, the number of children under five reached by USG supported nutrition programs, but you will see a couple of changes in terms of disaggregation by intervention. It's – this new indicator is an improvement on the previous PPR indicator that measured the number of children under five reached. The previous version counted the number of contacts rather than the number of individual children, and it did not disaggregate by intervention.

In this case, children are counted as reached through interventions that target them as individuals, and in the case of the behavior change disaggregate, those that target adults, such as mothers and caregivers. However, we do not count exposure to mass media BCC, because the evidence suggests that this is not enough to change behavior alone.

And children should not be counted as reached during pregnancy. You will see that we have a separate PPR indicator that enumerates the number of pregnant women reached.

The most important and perhaps most difficult part of this indicator is the disaggregation. The level of detail that we're asking you for will allow USAID to determine where its resources are going and the priority interventions that we are using to address under-nutrition and to reduce child mortality. We want to think of this indicator first in terms of the whole – that is, like the old indicator, how many total children were reached.

With the old version, you also had to include a variety of interventions and activities, and you had to avoid double counting of the same children or through different implementing partners. With this new version, we want to know not only how many children were reached, but also what did you reach them with. Therefore, we're asking you to report the numbers of children reached by these individual interventions.

Double counting across disaggregates is fine and to be expected. For example, one child may have received both vitamin A supplementation and BCC activities. Where it's to be avoided, however, is in the overall total number reached. Partners can double count within an intervention, but then must eliminate the double counting across interventions. If projects providing nutrition interventions overlap geographically, then the mission will need to estimate the overlap and eliminate the double counting.

The second of the new indicators is the number of children under two who are reached with community level nutrition interventions through USG supported programs. This is the first of two indicators that are intended to measure – to capture the 1,000 days period from pregnancy to age two. Community level nutrition interventions involve multiple repeated contacts, SBCC or maternal/infant/young child nutrition practices, and links to preventive and curative health and nutrition services. They may also include wash, provision of specialized food products, and promotion of home gardens.

We do not want you to count population level campaigns such as vitamin A distribution, as these are captured under the under five indicator, and we want to capture more intense community level activities through this indicator.

And just to note, there's no concern about double counting between this indicator and the previous one, since the objectives of the two are different, and they will never be aggregated or considered to reflect the same thing.

HL9.3 is the number of pregnant women reached through nutrition interventions through USG supported programs, and this is the second of two indicators to measure the 1,000 days period. Much like the children under five indicator, for this one, we're also asking you to report first, how many children were reached

by nutrition programs total, and B, what kind of programs were received through the disaggregates included here. We want you to report the number of women reached by each individual intervention, and then to eliminate double counting of these participants through the same methods that I discussed earlier.

We're also asking you in this case to disaggregate by age of woman, whether under 19 or over, coming out of some evidence about the relationship between nutrition and family planning and adolescent pregnancy.

HL9.4, number of individuals receiving nutrition-related professional training through USG supported programs. This indicator is replacing the former one that you may remember, the number of people trained in health and nutrition, and this one is substantially different. It's intended to capture the capacity building component of the nutrition strategy and to highlight USAID's efforts to create a more sustainable human resource system in nutrition in our priority countries.

This indicator is intended to capture health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, policy makers, researchers, students, and non-health personnel who receive training in nutrition. This indicator does not include direct community level beneficiaries, such as mothers receiving counseling on maternal, infant, and young child nutrition.

And finally, HL9.5, a national multisectoral nutrition plan or policy is in place that includes responding to emergency nutrition needs. This indicator is intended to reflect the nutrition strategy's goal of increasing multisectoral programming and coordination. One piece of these efforts may include a national multisectoral nutrition plan, and specifically, we're interested in capturing those that also acknowledge the need for emergency nutrition capacity.

This plan should be a written document that has been officially endorsed by the government, including commitments from relevant line ministries, and should include the four criteria that are outlined on the slide, promotion of infant and young child feeding, detection and management of acute malnutrition, vitamin A supplementation and measles vaccination, and access to safe water and sanitation and hygiene practices. This will be a binary indicator in which missions will indicate yes for every year in which the plan is valid and no in years in which no valid plan is in place.

Now I'm handing it back –

Lesley Perlman:

Thank you, Elizabeth. I also want to say that Elizabeth is going to have to jump out of the webinar early, so if you do have pertinent questions related to these health and nutrition indicators, please put them in the chat box as you can. I also

want to know – I saw a couple of questions. We do, yes, indeed, have a new indicator handbook. Woohoo. We are very excited, as we do get about these things. It is on the Feed the Future website and Agrilinks. So it covers these changes.

Okay, so now we're going to go over quickly the changes to these IM level indicators. Okay, so some have bigger changes, which we will discuss here. We'll discuss each of those indicators. Others have minor changes that won't affect data collection or analysis or comparability. So for instance, we standardized the use of as a result of USG assistance, putting that as the suffix for output indicators, and with USG assistance as the suffix for outcome indicators, just as a way of really – because the output indicators, we consider that the USG does have more direct control of outcome indicators. We look more towards our contribution.

I also listed here, we have the program areas and elements under the new SPSD structure, so this is the structure under which we're working now.

There are also some other minor changes in the title or definitions to clarify meaning, and you can all find these in appendix two in the new handbook. So like every change that we put in there is in that appendix, so you will be able to look and see. We were trying to be very mindful of data collection burden as well as comparability throughout the whole process.

Okay, so now we're going to go back to Anne to discuss the list of indicators with major changes. We're going to split that up.

Anne Swindale: – we added a new data point to gross margin.

Anne Swindale: It's better? Okay. So we've added a new data point to gross margin, which is the number of direct beneficiaries of the value chain disaggregated by sex. You'll recall right now you're required to enter five data points for the gross margin indicator, the total production, value of sales, volume of sales, purchased input costs, and units of production, hectares, number of animals, etcetera. And we find these data points to be extremely useful for a number of different kinds of analyses, but one real sticking point, especially when we're looking at gender, was not having – not knowing how many beneficiaries were benefiting under these activities, and especially the disaggregation by sex.

You do already report the number of beneficiaries of value chain activities under the incremental sales indicator, but we don't have a one to one correspondence between the commodities that are reported under incremental sales and those that

are reported under gross margin. So because we've had this disconnect, we needed to include this data point under gross margin, rather than simply adding a sex disaggregate to the incremental sales data point.

We've received a number of questions about how to count animals in the denominator for gross margin per animal. This is over the past year or so. And so we wanted to provide a clarification for this, that it varies depending on what the value chain is. For live animal and meat value chains, you should be putting as the unit of production the total number of animals in the herd. However, for dairy or milk and egg value chains, you should only be counting the number of animals that were producing the value chain commodity during the reporting year.

And then finally, in our indicator reference sheets, we explain how to extrapolate to the total number of beneficiaries, because each of these data points are supported to reflect the total across all your beneficiaries when data for gross margin indicator is collected through a sample survey.

We also received feedback on the number of fulltime equivalent jobs created with USG assistance indicator, saying that the definition that said to count the number of FTE employs in the previous month was too limiting. And so we've changed it so that you basically count over the reporting year, the 12 months, what's the total number of FTEs, in order to report against this jobs indicator.

Next, the number of individuals who've received short term training, while the definition for this indicator says that there's no minimum length of time required to consider something as training, we did add an option for operating units to align their definition of training under this indicator with the TrainNet definition, so that the same results can be reported in both systems.

We also added a requirement that the two disaggregates right now that's disaggregated by type of individual and by sex by layered rather than reported separately. So that means, for example, now you will report the number of producers that were trained disaggregated by sex, the number of people from private sector firms trained disaggregated by sex, etcetera, rather than simply reporting the number of producers, private sector firms, and then separately, the number of males and the number of females.

We also made minor, very minor changes, to the long – what used to be called the long term training indicator by changing the title to swap out the term long term training with degree granting, because if you look at the indicator definition, it specifically restricts reporting under this indicator for people who are being supported to receive degree granting agriculture and food security training. So we're basically aligning the title with the definition.

The second thing is that we added to the types of degree that are listed, the types of degree granting _____, vocational and associate degree as well, and we do thank _____ from Haiti for input on both of these indicators, that I think have helped refine them.

We also changed to align better the title in the number of micro, small, and medium enterprises receiving – it used to be loans as a result of USG assistance, but in fact, the definition is broad. It includes both cash and in kind credit and loans, so somebody who received in kind inputs on credit to be paid back at the end of the season, either with cash or in kind, can be counted under this indicator. And we felt that term loans might imply that it only had to be cash. So we changed it to make it clearer.

We have the same change to the definition in terms of categorizing the size of micro-enterprise, is it's categorized based on the number of full-time equivalent employees, and so we made the same change to the definition about expanding it from in the last month to in the previous 12 months. And we also, just very minor, so that you could see it more easily, included this enterprise size in terms of FTEs in the disaggregate category, just to make it easier for you. And now the hot potato back over to Lesley, and I'll go back to my answering in the chat box.

Lesley Perlman:

Thank you, Anne. Yes, it's me again. Okay. I'm going to continue going over some of the changed indicators. So EG3.1-5, the number of public/private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance. So in the _____ we provided additional explanation for what counts as a public/private partnership under this indicator. We also excluded community groups from the list of private sector partners.

Okay, and for EG3.2-7, the number of technologies or management practices under research, under field testing, are made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance, so we made a couple of clarifications in the indicator definition. So it is not required that a technology pass through all three phases to be reported under this indicator. So if your intervention is looking at field testing and then making technology available for transfer, you can start right at recording under phase two. You don't need to go through phase one.

And also we clarified that phase three counts technologies that are able to be transferred to an end user. It does not count the number of technologies that were actually transferred. So if they're able for – able to be transferred.

Okay, and so now our favorite indicators. Well, this is my favorite, actually, _____ gross margins. But – so for EG3.2-17, and this is number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices with

USG assistance, and EG3.2-18, number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices with USG assistance.

So we added a new disaggregate under these two indicators, and that is the commodity disaggregate. So we can actually – are looking to get an idea of how many farmers, how many hectares are working under a specific commodity.

Please note for activities that are promoting something like sustainable intensification or similar crop diversification strategies where it will be really difficult to calculate the area under – if you have like a lot of inter-cropping going on, and it will be difficult to calculate the area under specific commodities, you can choose the disaggregates not available category under the commodities disaggregate to alleviate some of that issue.

We've also separated out climate mitigation and adaptation into two separate disaggregates. So we have climate mitigation as one disaggregate and climate adaptation as two, which – and these are quite – two quite different areas, though grossly oversimplified by lumping into one, but climate mitigation is actually looking at the sequestration of global greenhouse gases, and climate adaptation is looking at those interventions that develop people's ability to adapt to climate change. So the key is really the difference between them.

And so finally, we clarified that a technology with multiple benefits can be reported under multiple technology type categories, depending on how and what purpose the activities promoted to the beneficiary farmers. For instance, if you have an implementing that is looking at working toward climate change adaptation, and as well – using cultural practices to do so, you can put those number of farmers and hectares under both technology types.

Okay, so for EG3.2-20, the number of for profit private enterprises, producers' organizations, water users' associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations that applied improved organization level technologies or management practices with USG assistance. We did not shorten this title. I think we added a little bit to it. But we replaced new technologies with improved technologies in both the title and definition, and we also included the term organization level in the title, which matched closer to what the definition was before, which we're really looking at the improved capacity of these organizations.

And we dropped the disaggregate of duration for new and continuing assistance: too hard to collect, and it wasn't all that meaningful.

Okay. For the next indicator, EG3.2-23, the value of targeted agriculture commodities exported with USG assistance, we modified that title slightly, so it's

still essentially the same thing. We clarified when a commodity should be counted as exported, what's the actual port of export, and we dropped the destination disaggregate, as that was very hard to collect as well. So thank you for all your feedback for all these indicators.

Okay, so those are the major changes that went over – that were – that came about during this indicator redesign. So again, those are all found in the new handbook and in the change table in appendix two.

So finally, I'm just going to briefly go over the cross-linked indicators. So these are cross-linked to other SPSD categories. They are considered optional under Feed the Future, so – but consider this as far as best practice. So if you are – if an implementing mechanism is collecting results that relate to these, it is recommended, but they are considered optional. So you'll see –

Anne Swindale:

– so that you can blame me if it's too soon. Okay. So for the new indicators, most of them as you can see from this list of the – basically, all of the implementing mechanism, straight nutrition indicators, plus the household benefiting, we would like you to set targets for these indicators in FY16. In other words, in the year you're about to report on now, you can set – you should set targets for this for the next three years, '17, '18, and '19, and then start to report against these indicators in FY17. We always welcome and encourage reporting this year, if it is possible. So for example, especially the households benefiting, if you were already reporting on one or the other of the indicators, then we hope that it would be fairly simple for you to transfer the information that was already being collected under those indicators into the new – the households benefiting indicator, so we can capture it there.

The female direct beneficiaries minimum dietary diversity indicator, this one, because we already have at least one nutrition sensitive agriculture indicator, we said that this one can be reported only by new activities. It does not need to be integrated into existing activities, whereas the six indicators above do need to be integrated into existing activities and any systems with reporting to start in FY17.

This one, the direct beneficiaries minimum diet diversity, needs to be incorporated only in new activities. They should establish the baselines and targets in 2017, 2016 if possible, but we recognize it's the 14th of July, and so it may be a little bit difficult to get that done, but – and then to start reporting in 2018 or 2017, if that is possible.

And the prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity, we actually, in our guidance for the 2015 population based survey _____ asked that missions collect the information on diet diversity in a way that

allows the computation of both women's diet diversity score and this new prevalence of minimum dietary diversity. So the baselines for this indicator basically have already been selected in the 2015 interims, if missions followed our guidance.

On the changed indicators, the new disaggregates that Lesley's just described, we require – we will require reporting against them starting next year, FY2017, but certainly encourage and welcome reporting in 2016, if you are able to do so. And then for the remaining ones, which have pretty minor changes in their definitions, to start reporting – well, continue to report against them, or start reporting against them in FY2016. In other words, this year.

So that's the end, and now we're to comment, question, and answer time. We've been typing and trying to respond to some of the questions as we went along, but maybe we should just now start trying to answer some of them verbally.

Julie MacCartee: I think that sounds great. Just testing to make sure that my audio is coming through, as it wasn't before. Sound good? All right. So we had a couple of questions that I think are kind of more broad and relevant to everyone. _____ just asked if an implementing partner has one of the dropped indicators, will we still report on it for FY16, or are they eliminated effective immediately?

Anne Swindale: No, you'll be able to continue to report on any of the dropped indicators if you have already been reporting against them for an implementing – if you're an implementing mechanism and you have any of these dropped indicators, and you're reporting against them, you'll still report against them in FTFMS through end of your activity. You don't have to drop them. Lesley? No. Oh.

Anne Swindale: I thought she had something to add to that.

Julie MacCartee: And then we had a couple of questions about the old PEERs, can we get guidance on how to best handle baseline data that was collecting using the old PEERs, where the indicator definition has changed even slightly? And also, what would you advise for a project that has done PEERs based on former indicators? Can you kind of elaborate _____ on _____ how to deal with that issue?

Anne Swindale:

That is a good question. Well, we obviously can't go back and change baselines, so I think in these situations, the best thing that we all can do is document as clearly as possible what the changes are. So I'll answer sort of the second part of that question first. With the PEERs, what I would do in your M&E plan is to edit the existing PEERs to show how it has changed. You can use our change table that's included in the handbook to be able to document how the indicator that you're reporting on has changed, and then basically make the change moving forward, having documented that there may be a slight disconnect between the way it had been reported previously and the way that the baseline was collected, and how you're reporting on it moving forward.

I'm trying to think about the changes that we made to identify where it could result really in a significantly different number, and I'm having a hard time thinking of whether – where the change – any change is really that significant, with the exception perhaps of the jobs indicator, because if you had a firm that actually hired people for a period of time that was more than a month previous, then you could have a much greater number of jobs with this change than you had previously. You wouldn't have needed to have collected a baseline for that indicator. But there certainly will be a disconnect in previous years' reporting that is important to capture. And Elizabeth, did you have something you wanted to add or clarify or anything?

Elizabeth Bontrager: No.

Anne Swindale:

Sometimes across the table people are like making little signals, and so we don't know whether – so I'm not sure – please let us know if that didn't answer your question. It was a really good one, and we really should have thought that through before the webinar so we had a response prepared.

Julie MacCartee:

Sorry about that. Didn't mean to pull up those bullets. Not sure what happened there. But Anne, _____ to mute your mic when you're not speaking, because someone mentioned they were having a bit of an echo. And I would just like to call out, there were three different people who asked about the timing of when we needed to start reporting on the updated indicators. There was a slide that Anne presented on the timing, so I just wanted to assume that those have been answered, but if you are still confused about the timing for when to report on the new definitions, please let us know in the chat box.

All right. We've had a lot of good questions come in here. They're coming in rapid fire, so I'm looking through them. Let's see. We had a question from _____

who asked if EG11-6 is different from GCC indicator 4.8.2-26. Is that something – I'll let Lesley look that one up.

Lesley Perlman: Okay. So from what I recall – I don't have the GCC indicator 4.8.2-26 in front of me, but from what I know about EG11.6, this is actually a combination of two GCC indicators. So if you remember previously, we had number of people using climate information to improve resilience, and then we also had number of people using or implementing risk reducing actions. So these – actually, two indicators were combined into one. So I think the EG4.8.2-26 or whatever was one of those. So this is – this is why it wouldn't be comparable to the data before.

Julie MacCartee: One quick clarifying question that just came in. You said we may keep them for 2016 reporting, but may we drop them for 2016 reporting? All right. I'm getting some shaking heads.

Anne Swindale: So we had a number of shaking heads around the table in answer to that question, whether the indicators that we're dropping at a central level should also be dropped at an individual activity level. And I think all of our instincts, shaking our heads, was to say at an individual activity level, the set of indicators that you define together are being used to report the performance and to manage your program's activities. You've set targets against them, etcetera. And so I think in principal, you'd want to stay with the set of indicators that you originally defined for your activity.

However, if really the only reason that a dropped indicator was included in an activity and in a plan was because it was required or applicable for reporting to us, and that the activity itself does not find any utility, or the mission, operating unit, does not find any utility for reporting on that indicator, then I think you can consider dropping it. We certainly allow and have allowed mechanisms to drop indicators over time when they realize that it's really not very useful to them, if they weren't required as applicable. So that's a little bit more of a nuanced answer I think than, as I said, our original reaction of all shaking our heads, saying, no, no, no, if you included it to begin with, you need to include it until the end of the activity.

Elizabeth, do you have any particular concerns around any of the nutrition indicators? It might be a little bit different there, because until we start getting comprehensive reporting on the new indicators, we probably don't want anybody to drop any nutrition – now she's nodding her head – any nutrition indicators

she's been – they've been reporting on, because then we won't be able to report anything on nutrition at all. Is that right?

Elizabeth Bontrager: Yeah. Exactly. My thought was that we – the reporting for nutrition through the PPR will change in FY17, but for this year, we'd want to maintain the same indicators that you've been using and that have been required over the last period.

Julie MacCartee: Okay. All right. Thank you very much to the M&E team for that response. We have just a variety of clarifying questions that have come in, so I'll start with kind of the farthest back ones that we received. From Beatrice, for FTE, do we still consider a minimum one month? *[Audio glitch]* that's how many days for one month?

Anne Swindale: – 20 days if a job _____ worked 5 days a week, the person worked 5 days a week, and the indicator reference sheet provides the information on how many days – 260 are required in order to be considered a full time equivalent. So I hope – I hope that answers your question.

Julie MacCartee: All right. And then Louis Kagga says that their activity emphasizes men, women, and youth, and data is disaggregated that way. However, when entering that data, the FTFMS does not cater for data from the youth. Shouldn't this be part of the system, as the youth play a very important role while implementing some of these activities, especially in developing countries?

Anne Swindale: Yes. Yes.

[Laughter]

Anne Swindale: You're absolutely right, Louis, and we actually considered adding a new disaggregate to many of these indicators, but because we anticipate, again, another review of our indicators as Feed the Future, the first round of Feed the Future concludes, we decided to leave that kind of change until the next round. But I anticipate that certainly for a critical subset of indicators, we will indeed be adding a youth disaggregate, because as you correctly point out, this is a very, very important focus.

We'll also have to have some discussion and solicit some input from people, and if you'd like to provide your input right now, it would be quite welcome. What are the – what is the most relevant youth age category to disaggregate by? We don't want to make it too, too complicated and be disaggregating in five year age groups, but there are sort of a range of youth categories. Is it under 35? Is it under 30? Is it under 25? But your question is absolutely right, and we definitely thought about that and decided to just leave it until the next round.

Julie MacCartee:

Sounds great. Thank you, Anne. Let's see. A few additional questions at the top here. We've been collecting your questions, and we have them in a little side document that we presenters can look at, and so we're sorting through them and figuring out in what order to answer them for you. We'll be answering them for up to about 20 more minutes, so please stick around if you would like. Okay. You are unmuted.

Anne Swindale:

Okay. In the interest of time, I'll just kind of run through some of the questions. We do have a list here. I don't know if we're going to get through all of them. So we have a question from _____, can we define improved technologies?

That's actually kind of a funny question. Our presumption is that the technologies that activities and project have chosen to promote are an improvement over the existing technologies or practices that farmers are currently using. So in my mind, it's not really up to us to define whether a technology is improved or not. It's not up to M&E. It's really an issue of the design of your activity and the technologies that the activity has chosen to promote need to represent something than better than what farmers are already doing.

We're not – I'm assuming not going out and just promoting that farmers continue to do exactly what they had been doing before. So I would say almost by definition, a technology or a management practice or a cultural practice that an activity is promoting by definition should be in some form or another an improvement over existing practice by the farmers or by the firm. So please let me know if that didn't answer your question _____ pass it back to you, but that's our assumption. If you're promoting it, it's improved.

Johanna said, wash indicators are almost not seen, except EG3.2-18. Do we have any? We do not currently have any wash specific indicators. There are – there is a wash element, and there are indicators associated with that element at the USAID level. So missions can certainly select wash indicators in their PPR, and they can ask their implementing partners to report on those indicators. That's

basically the same thing as we mentioned with the cross-linked. We highlighted three cross-linked indicators. But there's an ability to cross-link to any indicator that's relevant for a program that's contained in the _____ master list of indicators.

Within Feed the Future and within agriculture and nutrition sensitive agriculture, the use of agriculture funds to do wash programming, that's not something we've been doing a lot yet, but certainly if an ag expands, we will need to be considering what would be either an appropriate, very specific Feed the Future water indicator, or this cross-linking to water indicators that already exist, to the extent that they're reflective of the kinds of programming we would be doing with our funds.

So Ula says, I do not see indicator 4.5.2.13 in the new list. Has it been dropped?
It is –

Lesley Perlman: That is the number of overall households. Yes, it's been dropped.

Anne Swindale: So that indicator has been dropped, but basically merged into the new indicator –

Lesley Perlman: EG3.4 –

Anne Swindale: – of the number of households reached by Feed the Future. And because it has a rural and urban/peri-urban disaggregate, what you formerly were reporting under 4.5.2.13, number of rural households reached, would be reported under the rural disaggregate of the new indicator.

Aha, Benjamin, good question. Does the revised indicator handbook now include an indicator FTF01? It does not include a performance indicator reference sheet for that indicator, but it does include a description of what that indicator is supposed to report in the introduction to the handbook. It's kind of a funny indicator, because it's not an indicator in general that – it's not an indicator assigned to an implementing partner. It is one – an additional piece of information that we asked missions to provide to us, but it's in this kind of funny place of not really being an official Feed the Future indicator, but it is a piece of information that we request. But probably at some point in time, we're going to need to just shift it into being an official feed the future indicator and write a whole indicator reference sheet, etcetera.

Can these changes be – Abel. Hi, Abel. Can these changes be communicated to Food for Peace activities by the missions, or will they have to wait for guidance from Food for Peace? They – that's a good question. Lesley, did you want to –

Lesley Perlman: We have been interacting with Food for – hi, everybody. Sorry. We're on the same headset now, so we're just switching it back and forth. We have been communicating with Food for Peace about these indicators, so they are updating their management system and their handbook and including these changes.

Anne Swindale: So there's a question from Louis on for the changed indicators, will it be made compulsory to enter the data? Because our fiscal year is ending in September, and in order to capture some of these new disaggregates, then the M&E system will have to change. It's unfortunate our activities are ending this September, and – if your activity is ending this September and you're in the close-out plan, no, you are not going to be required – and I think we – let me see if I can go back to the timing slide. All right. So when you're talking about the change, I think if you're in the last year of your activity and you're in your close-out plan, we'll give you a by for incorporating the changes of the indicators into your M&E plan. So no, you do not have to do that. That's fine.

Lesley Perlman: But we do encourage targets _____ new indicators for FY17.

Anne Swindale: But they're ending.

Lesley Perlman: Okay, then –

Anne Swindale: So you don't need to set FY17.

Lesley Perlman: No, they're done.

Anne Swindale: Shereen asks – says that they're a policy-focused program, and they understood that an appropriate indicator was being considered. Can I speak to this? We do have an existing policy indicator –

Anne Swindale: – which is still in the list, and no changes have been made to it. So it's the – there were changes made to it –

Lesley Perlman: In 2014.

Anne Swindale: – in 2014, when the phases – the biggest – one of the biggest changes was the phases of policy – that policies go through were changed, so that the last step or process was actually full and effective implementation, as opposed to implementation has begun. But those changes are now a couple of years old, and that's the only policy indicator that we have right now. Oh, big boy. Remind us again how polygamous households should be counted. I'd have to go and pull up that email exchange that we had about that.

So a household is considered as a separate household when people are living under a common roof and sharing a common eating pot. So people who live together and eat together are considered a household. And there are nuances with polygamous households in a lot of different cultures, but that is the basic fundamental way of looking at what defines a household, is a group of people who sleep together and who eat together.

We have examples of households where you've got a number of different wives, and the cooking rotates among the wives, and so a different wife will cook every day. That would then be considered a single household, as opposed to each wife cooking separately and feeding her children separately, and then maybe the husband rotates around the different households.

So Beatrice, you echo the question on public/private partnerships, what to count, and the link with other PPE indicators, that we have the cross-cutting indicators. I don't see what the original question was. We – there is quite a detailed description of what to count in the indicator reference sheet. Can you find, Elizabeth, the original PPE question to which Beatrice is referring, so I can –

Anne Swindale: Yeah, I don't – I'm sorry. I think we need a little bit more clarification of that, and particularly, is there something that is not clear in the indicator reference sheet that you particularly would like further clarification on?

Kate. When does the FTFMS reporting window open? We don't –

Elizabeth Bontrager: Early October.

Anne Swindale: Early October? Early October.

[Crosstalk]

Anne Swindale: As normal. We'll be sending out the FTFMS guidance soon, but yeah, I don't see any anticipated changes in the timing of – at least when it starts.

So Benjamin wants to find out where the FTF01 estimated number and percentage of Feed the Future beneficiaries, holding five hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, Benjamin wanted to know, if a farmer meets the number of cattle criteria, but has birds, goats, sheep exceeding the requisite number, does she or he still qualify as a smallholder cattle farmer?

Yes. In those situations, I would look at what your value chain is. As you specified here, it's the cattle value chain. And so if he meets the requisite number of cattle, then he's a smallholder cattle farmer under the cattle value chain, and you should report him or her as such.

And then Dick says, for polygamous families, can we count households per wife – houses per wife, and the men as just part of those households? It's not – unfortunately, it's not that straightforward, because you could have a wife have a separate dwelling, but everybody cooks and eats together, and in that situation, you would consider them a single household, not a bunch of different households. However, you have the other situation, where each wife has her own house and she cooks separately, in which case each of those households would be counted as a separate household. So it's a little more complicated than just counting houses, unfortunately.

Abdullah, we have got some new indicators. Do we need to report those for FY16? Are you asking about the new FTF indicators? As we – I'll go back to the reporting for new indicators slide. So none of the new indicators are required to be reported in FY16. We would be delighted if you could, but we do not require that, recognizing that it's a bit hard for people to set up the M&E systems to report on new indicators with one and a half months before – two and a half months before the end of the fiscal year.

Valentine, for the project that was still elaborating their M&E plan, do you advise to change now to the new indicators? Absolutely. I think any opportunity

that you have to integrate these sooner rather than later should be taken advantage of, absolutely.

And that in our little side box where Julie has been cutting and pasting questions seems to be – oh, she just pasted another one. Seemed to be all that we have, but keep them coming. And if you entered a question earlier in the webinar and it hasn't been answered yet, it's just because we've got so much going on in the chat box we may have missed it, so please just enter your question again, and that way, we can make sure that we get it.

So Pascal says what time programs should modify their tools in accordance with the new modifications? Hmm.

Lesley Perlman: I would say update their M&E plan in FY2017 with the new indicators.

Anne Swindale: So I don't know if you heard Lesley through the mic, but she was saying update your M&E plan in FY17 to align with the new indicators you are reporting. I'm not sure if that answers your question, Pascal, so please type some more if it did not answer it specifically.

Kelly asked do we have any guidance on custom indicators? My office is getting guidance from a mission that we should consider them, but there are two standard indicators that work, and the project will be less than \$1 million.

Lesley Perlman: I would say how well do the standard indicators cover the results and outcomes?

Anne Swindale: So I don't know if you heard Lesley. So the question is you say you have two standard indicators that work. If those two standard indicators are sufficient for you to be able to manage your activity and for the mission to be able to be – to oversee your activity and know whether you are on track to achieve the objectives the activity has set, then you may not need any additional indicators.

Lesley Perlman: She said they're okay but don't really tell our story.

Anne Swindale: Well, I often – narratives are really important, and I often talk about the importance of numbers and narratives. But if you don't have any numbers that

you feel – or if you feel there may be an indicator that captures a really important number that you'd want to be able to tell in that narrative, then you can consider it. It looks like your mission is just saying you should consider them, not necessarily requiring that you add custom indicators. So it's a balance. You say you're a small program, and so you have to be very parsimonious, I'm sure, in the indicators you select. And it's really up to – the question is do you have what you need quantitatively to both tell your story and, really important, because the important role of a custom indicator often is that it is more useful for managing the program, because it reflects the very specific types of interventions and approaches the activity is trying to – or the activity is using.

So usually, when we see custom indicators, or often when we see custom indicators, it's because they are more useful than the standard indicators for managing the activity and monitoring progress. So that is really what it would come down to me – for me, is if – do you feel you have an adequate set of quantitative indicators that allows you to adequately manage your activity and monitor progress towards your objectives?

So Noro asks also under EG3.2.6, smallholder farmers in the majority are not receiving cash, but the bank pays the input suppliers _____ deliver, and the farmers collect from these suppliers. Surely these should qualify.

Lesley Perlman: I'm not sure what 3.2-6 is.

Anne Swindale: We haven't memorized all of our new indicator numbers yet, so hold on. Is this the value of agriculture and rural loans?

Lesley Perlman: Yes, it's the value of agriculture loans as a result of USG assistance.

Anne Swindale: And so in this situation, so it's a financial institution providing a cash loan. Who pays the loan back to the bank? Does the farmer pay the loan back to the bank, or does the – so provide a little bit of information on –

Lesley Perlman: The farmer pays it back.

Anne Swindale:

So the bank gives money to an – the input supplier, who then provides the inputs to the farmer, and then the farmer pays the value of those inputs back to the bank? That's a little convoluted, but I would think that that would qualify. It's not much difference than the bank giving that amount of money to the farmer directly, who uses it to purchase inputs, and then pays the cash loan back to the bank. So I think I agree with you that that should qualify under the indicator. Add an explanation in your indicator comment box that says that this is what's going on, just in case there are any questions about that. Always be clear and document what you're doing. But I think it's reasonable to consider that a cash loan from a financial institution.

So Kate asks for number of farmers and hectares, when will the commodity disaggregate category be available? It's for FY16 reporting in FTFMS and in FACTS Info.

Valentin, can you please clarify again on who will be considered as trained? Okay, so we haven't changed the basic definition of who should be counted under the short term training indicator. Our basic definition is that we don't have – set any minimum number of amount of time for training. It's that the person has to have received training under a structure curricula designed to build new skills and capacities, and the training is sufficient so that the person has the capacity to apply what they've been taught after the training. And that means that you don't count people who just attend a farmer field day once to observe something. That's not a structured curriculum designed to improve skills and capacity.

So that definition has not changed at all. The only thing we did to make it easier for missions who – an implementing partner whose pointed out that they also have to report number of people trained into this TrainNet system, and TrainNet does set minimum – some minimum time, I think it's something like 16 hours, if it's non-consecutive, and at least one day if it's all at once, or – I don't have it off the top of my head, but they do have minimum amounts of time defined to count as training.

And for those missions that are – wanted to be able to align the training definition under TrainNet with the training definition under our indicator, we said that that was perfectly fine, that they could do that.

Abdullah, missing indicator means we do not need to report against that, right?

Lesley Perlman:

That's rural households.

Anne Swindale:

Okay, so Abdullah, this is the same – rural households reached, this has been integrated into the new households reached by Feed the Future indicator. So if you're already reporting against 4.5.2.13, you can just switch to the new indicator and report the 4.5.2.13 result under the rural disaggregate.

_____, no, we haven't changed the incremental sales indicator in this particular round. Yea. Unless you would like it to be changed, and have a suggestion of a way you would like it to be changed.

Anne Swindale:

We know it's still kind of a complicated indicator because of the baseline issue and the possibility of the average sales at baseline being from a group that may be a little bit different from the beneficiaries over time subsequently, but right now, we don't have any better fix than the fix that we've come up with, and so we haven't made any changes to that.

Michelle, are the indicators under 4.5 re-categorized under EG3? Yes. We used to report on indicators 4.5.2, which will now be EG3.2. So yes. They are – at least the ones that remain – we have dropped some in the _____ master indicator list, but yes, there is this whole new numbering that we're all going to have to –

Lesley Perlman:

To memorize.

Anne Swindale:

3.1.9, which was nutrition, now is HL.9 as well, so yes, we all have to learn new numbering.

Julie MacCartee:

Excellent. Thank you, Anne, for running through that long list of questions, and thank you to everyone who attended the webinar today for asking such useful, insightful questions, and for sharing with your colleagues.

We are officially at the end of our time now, so we're going to go ahead and wrap up. Thanks to those of you who have shared your email in the chat box for the recording. If you were on the original email that received the invitation to this list, if you're on the main FTFMS email list, you will definitely receive a recording and any of the resources we put together from this webinar. But if you were passed this along by a colleague and you don't think you're on that original list, do feel free to share your email address in the chat box, and I will collect those and make sure that you get the recording of this webinar. Great. Excellent. Lots of emails coming through.

Well, thank you very much. I'm going to say thank you to our presenters and Lesley and Elizabeth, and also to Kate West for being on hand with some additional information, and especially, thank you to our AV tech Adam for helping make sure this goes smoothly despite a few technical difficulties. It's always tough when we are coordinating multiple presenters and bringing all of you in from around the world, but we want to be able to use AidConnect as a way to communicate in useful ways. So thank you for allowing us to test it out on all of you.

All right. We'll be in touch, and have a great rest of the day. Thank you.

[End of Audio]