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Monitoring Scale-up

What do we measure?

How do we measure it?
• Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

• Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

• Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
• Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

• Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

• Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
Monitoring Scale-up: FTF Scaling indicators

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

• Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

• Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
To be counted under FTF indicators, beneficiaries must have significant direct contact with the activity.

To decide between direct or indirect:

- Think about the service delivery mechanism and its intentions.
- Think about being held accountable for changes and targets.
Monitoring Scale-up: Scaling Indicator Universe

# Farmers and others
# Organizations

# Hectares

Direct beneficiaries throughout the value chain

Direct beneficiary small-holder producers applying land-based technologies only
A Gap in Feed the Future M&E?

- Current system does not report **indirect, spread, and zone-level agriculture** results
- Option to add to the FTF Results Framework

Provide your suggestions to the FTF M&E team!

Anne Swindale
aswindale@usaid.gov
Learning about Scaling: Evidence Gaps

• What are the most binding constraints in promoting technology adoption and the most effective interventions for dealing with these constraints?
• What are characteristics of effective, efficient and sustainable vehicles for promoting adoption … among the poor, women, and socially marginalized?
• What have been the gender impacts of specific technologies?
• What trade-offs result from the increased use of a specific technology in the way that farm labor and land are used?
Select Feed the Future Impact Evaluations:

- **Liberia Urea Deep Placement Technology**
  - Impacts on productivity and income
  - Emphasis on differential outcomes by sex and level of vulnerability

- **Uganda E-verification and Effective Marketing of Agricultural Inputs**
  - Impacts on adoption rates and agricultural productivity

- **Mozambique Mobile Money technology**
  - Impacts on how farmers store, save, and send money, especially on agricultural inputs;
  - Impacts on farmers’ ability to overcome seasonal cash constraints
Scaling M&E Plans

• Describe **how**, from **where**, with what **frequency** and from **whom** will Mission obtain data to monitor and annually report on the uptake of targeted technologies?

• Will M&E plans of **existing** projects and activities be used or are **new** plans required?

• Are **additional FTF standard** or **custom indicators needed** to adequately manage, report results, and assess the contribution of our scaling efforts to population or sector level results?
• Revised FTF Indicator Handbook

• Feed the Future Agricultural Indicators Guide

THANK YOU!