



Q&A WEBINAR ON PROPOSED GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY (GFSS) INDICATORS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

JUNE 27, 2017

PRESENTERS

Kate West, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Anne Swindale, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Emily Hogue, USAID Bureau for Food Security

MODERATOR

Julie MacCartee, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Kate:

– wanted to let you know a little bit about what we're doing today and the layout of this webinar room just so that we're all on the same page. So, you can see in the middle is the question box. And like Julie said, the way that we're gonna communicate today, just because it's too many people to have on one phone line, is to please type your question into the chat box, and we'll be migrating them over to answer verbally in the center there. As well as answering some of the quicker ones in the chat box itself. We'll be recording the whole webinar today, as well as getting a transcript of all these questions and answers. So, for your colleagues that weren't able to attend, they'll be able to listen to that later. And even for your own reference, you can look back at the transcript for some of the questions and answers.

If you look at the top middle, just wanted to point out the web links that are there. We won't click on those for you because it'll take everyone to those websites. But you can click on them yourself. Just wanted to make sure that everyone had these websites. The first one is the review instructions, and that's the main landing page of this whole effort, for the GFSS external review of our indicators. Hopefully all of you have been to that website and have read the background information that's there, as well as – somebody did just click the link who is a host *[laughs]*. Please don't click the links as a host.

Anyway, on that website is the background information on this whole process of how we came to these proposed GFSS indicators, as well as a series of audio recordings that we hope all of you have listened to at this point which explained a little bit about how we came to develop each of the indicators for the various aspects of the results framework, or RF we might call it. And the reason we did that instead of a larger webinar is because it would be too long and not everyone is interested in all aspects of the indicators. So we broke them up into 18 little mini-recordings so you could just listened to the pieces you're interested in.

And then there was the survey. And that's where we are collecting everyone's feedback. I've had a few people e-mail me with their feedback on the indicators. And just want to mention that it's too many people for me to manage 1,000 e-mails. So please: if you do have feedback on the indicators, take the survey. The survey's designed so that you only need to provide feedback on the pieces you're interested in. You don't need to fill out the whole thing. So it can be a ten-second survey or a ten-minute survey, depending on what you're interested in. So please don't e-mail

me. That's too much to manage. Please fill out the survey and we'll definitely incorporate your feedback.

So that was the first link up there. And then of course the second link is the actual list of indicators, which is hosted online. So you can see the spreadsheet there with all of the details. And then the last link there is just a direct link to the survey itself, in case it was hard to find on the main webpage.

And then we just have an image in the bottom left of your screen of the results framework, just for a visual. I would recommend that you look at this as well as the proposed list of indicators, that second link I was pointing out, as we're discussing things, or as people have questions, in order to just have a reference for that.

Okay. So the idea with this Q&A webinar is that we're not going to go over all of our thinking on the entire process. As Julie mentioned, we have actually several interagency partners on the line here with us from Peace Corps, USDA, Treasury, OPEC. Unfortunately, MCC was not able to join today, but they've been an integral part of the process as well. And State. So we're really excited to have this collaboration over the last several months in coming up with this list of indicators. And they're all here on the line with us to help answer your questions. And so if you have a question particularly for an agency, feel free to indicate that in your question itself when you chat it. And we can have their perspective join in.

Okay. So, with that, just want to open it up to questions. You can ask questions about anything you want on the indicators. There's no real way to get everyone on the same page with organization, so go ahead and type your questions, and we'll be pulling the things that we think apply to a lotta people into the center to answer verbally. I'll read those out loud and then we'll have Anne and Emily and other interagency experts jump in to help us answer. And for some of the shorter questions or things that are more specific to your situation, we'll try to answer those directly in the chat box.

So go ahead and type your questions. And, again, if you wanna direct your question to a particular partner in our interagency group, feel free to indicate that.

So I see some people are typing here. And hopefully everyone was able to go read the background information and listen to the recordings that interested them before they joined this webinar. We're not gonna have the time to go over all our thinking. So that's what the audio recordings are for. So please go ahead and reference those if you want some more background information. This is really just to answer any remaining questions before the review period closes at the end of June.

I see we've got – Edwin was typing. All right. So I'll go ahead and read this one out loud. Julie, you can move it over for us to keep track of. This is from Edwin Farre. Could you type where you're from? Just so we know if you're from a USAID mission or interagency partner. He's from Ghana. Okay. Great. Mission in Ghana or partner in Ghana – I'm not sure. Anyway, his question is: "Just to confirm that gross margin is not part of the GFSS indicators, but yield is included. Do you have a specific measurement approach?" I see he's from the World Cocoa Foundation in Accra. Thanks, Edwin.

Anne:

Hey, Edwin. This is Anne Swindale. Great to hear from you again. That's a very good question. We would not be recommending any different approach for yield than we have for gross margin, since yield is essentially two of the five data point for gross margin. So any guidance that we have issued before about how to measure area and how to measure total production would be relevant to measuring the yield indicator.

What is different – I'm sure you noticed – is that in the GFSS results framework now, we are going to be measuring yield both at a implementing partner level, or at least you partners will be measuring yield in an implementing partner level. But we are also going to complement that with yield of our targeted commodities at the zone-of-influence level to better enable us to track our theory of change from what our implementing partners are doing through to the population at the ZOI level that we are trying to assist.

Kate:

Great. Thanks, Anne. Much to Anne's dismay, gross margin is not – no longer included.

Anne: But to everyone else's enjoyment and happiness.

Kate: *[Laughs]*. Right. Yes. Thanks, Edwin. I see a few other people are typing some questions. So we'll just wait till they pop up. I see Peter perhaps, and Cynthia. Just wait for those to come through.

Also please let us know if you had any trouble accessing the survey or the audio recordings or the proposed list – the spreadsheet itself – online. We didn't hear that there were any issues, but if you did have any, please do let us know so we can correct those.

Yeah, and go ahead: you can put in your question even while someone else is talking. And that way we can have 'em cued up, no problem.

Anne: This is Anne again. I also wanted to add that you don't have to only input questions. You can also provide feedback and your opinion on any of the indicators so that we have it. The survey is one way we are collecting your feedback. But we are also collecting feedback via the chat. So if you just wanna give us your opinion about an indicator, please feel free to do so.

Kate: Yeah. So like Anne said, in the survey or through this webinar. But not by e-mailing me *[laughs]*.

Okay. We have question from Cynthia here. This is Cynthia Donovan from MSU. Thanks for joining. So her question is: "In the past, the population-based Feed the Future survey results and data sets were very delayed. Given the need to link IM and PBS indicators, will the PBS be available more quickly?"

Emily: Hi, Kate. This is Emily. I'll answer that question. Although, back to Cynthia, I'd have question if you have a definition for "quickly" *[laughs]*. Yes. It's a good point.

And there will be a lag between the annually reported indicators from the implanting partners and the survey results, just in the sense that, for these sorts of survey processes, it takes time to gather the data, clean the data, analyze it, and get the numbers finalized and approved by all the parties that have to approve it. We have been working ever since the beginning on our process for speeding up that process, but in a way that ensures that data quality is not affected. So I don't have a definitive answer for you in terms of how much more quickly we will be able to get them done. We are working right now on a process.

We've actually changed our approach. Instead of trying to do all the surveys in the same year and have, say, a 2015 data point and a 2017 data point or whatever they may be, we're actually moving to a rolling basis so that we can better sit with the individual countries' needs. And so all the data points won't come in at the same time, which obviously means you may not have the PBS indicators – we're still looking at about three years between each survey. Just because that's the standard that we've found to make the most sense, and internationally recognized standard, including what the World Bank does, just to see the changes in those indicators that're needed and not waste money to keep collecting every year.

So we'll do them every three years. And then we'll periodically assess how those annually reported project-level results are comparing with the impact-level or objective- and goal-level results, to see if we're on track. But we also are working on some methods in the interim that're not coming through that population-based survey per se, to use geospatial methods or other data collection methods, proxy-type methods, so we can just have quick check-ins. And those are in process. We'll have more on those as the next year or two unfold, in terms of what we will be able to do through those types of tools.

Please let me know if I didn't – oh, I see you responded to my question. "'Quickly' is at least within six months of survey data collection." No. Years is long. Usually about a year is what we aim for. So, not six months but not two years. So, right in the middle. Well, sort of in the middle. One year.

Anne:

Let's take Cassie and Bess together.

Emily:

Okay. So, reading those questions, "At what point would IPs start to use these new GFSS indicators? Does it take effect from today forward on new procurements?" And then Bess: "Can you explain how the GFSS indicators impact the current FTF indicators? Is this a separate suite of indicators which IMs will need to take into account when designing new projects? Will current projects need to amend their indicators to align with the GFSS, like dropping gross margin? How will this impact FTFMS?"

Do you wanna respond? Or I can – okay. I'll start off. And, Anne, you jump in. Yeah, because of all the changes that're going on with the GFSS, and just changes as we're trying to set up – define the target countries for the GFSS and develop country plans, strategic plans with them, we got to a point where we realized this would not be feasible to roll out and report on these indicators this year. So for this fall, you would not be expected to report on the indicators. In the FTFMS, it also takes some time to adapt the FTFMS and enter all the new indicators. So there will be a process after this reporting season. For this reporting season, you would continue to use the existing indicators. And then after this fall, we would transition and add in the GFSS indicators.

Anne, you wanna add to that?

Anne:

In terms of what to do with the current FTF indicators, we need to actually still discuss this among ourselves. In the past, if we had brand-new indicators being introduced and an implementing mechanism is like in their last year of operation, then it doesn't really make a lot of sense to try to ask those mechanisms to try to adjust their reporting systems. But if you've got a least two or three years left in an implementing mechanism and it is possible to have them adjust to reflect new indicators, we definitely advise that so that the results that you're achieving are captured in the indicators.

However, dropping the previous indicators is something, again, that we leave up to the implementing partners. This is after FY18, after the GFSS indicators have been rolled out. Because they often still are important and useful to monitor progress of

your individual activities. They're often contractually required and results are tagged against them. So, keeping them as custom indicators is definitely something that we have recommended in the past and would probably recommend moving forward.

Another point on custom indicators is that we plan to really use, a lot more and a lot better, the custom indicators that implementing mechanisms are reporting on, recognizing that they are telling really critical parts of your theory of change at an implementing mechanism level. So we will be programming FTFMS moving forward so that you can directly enter custom indicator targets and results, and even have custom disaggregates added to standard indicators. For example, the ability to disaggregate your results by geographic area, which is often something that's really useful and important to look at. So we're going to work on the FTFMS to make it much easier to compile those custom indicators and get much more value out of them.

Emily:

Great. We have a question from Andrew about the wealth asset index, a very good question. He asks: "For the wealth asset index, where can we find info on the assets that would be counted?" You had looked in the DHS guidance but it does not include livestock, which is extremely important in your area. So that is a very good point. We do plan to build off of the DHS modules that have been contextualized to the countries, but we do realize that they often do not include productive agricultural productive assets. And so that is something that we will be working to modify to include for the survey modules to collect and then calculate the indicator based on the inclusion of those productive assets that're agriculture-based. So you can look at the DHS modules. That's the best place to look for now.

We're going to be adapting these over the next bit of time as the target countries are rolled out and the plans are developed over the next year or so. We're going to be modifying those and working with partners to do that.

Anne:

Especially the more recent DHS modules should include the questions both on land and on livestock. Earlier DHS modules may not have them, but later ones should. So I would definitely, as Emily says, start by looking at an individual country DHS questionnaire.

Kate: Great. We have a question from Peter. Hi, Peter. He's saying that "I notice most of the data elements that we have been collecting are covered," but he's not seeing the cost of inputs or cost of doing business, which he thinks is important.

Emily: So, to Peter's point, he is absolutely correct. Those are very important things. The reason we didn't choose to include them – we've moved from gross margin to yield just because of the complexity, especially for a standard indicator, that we have to apply to all projects, or that should be using the indicator if they're working on productivity. That doesn't mean that you can't report on it or can't track it. And certainly if a project has a way or a mission has a way to track certain elements of either the cost of doing business or inputs. So that would be where you could use this new function of the custom indicators and add it in. So you could continue to report on gross margins, or you could have an adapted version and report on those things that are important. We're just not requiring it of everyone because it was such a burden and so difficult for partners to be able to do on a standard basis across the initiative.

Anne: And also we recognized for quite a while that we made a decision in how we defined that data point with the view to minimize burden on implementing partners by restricting it only to recurrent cash input costs and not trying to value family labor, other unpaid inputs, nor capital investments like in irrigation, etcetera. But having made that decision, it really did reduce the utility of that data point and sometimes introduce distortions because farmers who are basically applying the same amount of inputs, but some are paying for them and some are not, come up with different gross margins. So there was also a limitation to that data point in particular, that we grew to recognize became more important, I think, over time, with the gross margin indicator.

Emily: All right. Looks like we just – oh, go ahead, Kate.

Kate: Sorry. Can I just add? Just wanted to add that, to your point about still perhaps wanting to measure aspects of gross margin or other custom things, we're still working out exactly how that's gonna look in FTFMS. However, one idea, for example, with gross margin, is just to leave the indicator there as it is, but it simply would no longer be required as a standard one, but it would still function the same

way in the system for you to fill it out if you wanted to still measure that for your project. So just wanted to put that out there. But the rest of the newer custom indicators we're still working exactly how that's gonna look in the system.

Emily:

Thanks, Kate. So we'll try to dive into – Albert has a few questions. Very good questions. And thank you for always keeping us gainfully employed, Albert.

[Laughter]

He has a number of comments on the national content indicators. "There are a number of indicators that have to be measured at the national level and they seem to be new indicators that our government may not be collecting those indicators. What should we do?" So, to answer that question first, with the context indicators, we are looking to collect those if they are available. And sometimes I wanna use a different word than "collect," because we're not talking about primary collection. We're talking about using the data that are available through – that would've been collected already in our secondary data sources.

If the government – a lot of those are either SDG indicators, which the government should be moving to collect them because they are SDG indicators. There may be a lag in that, we know. And we're also working on a number of areas, partnerships with FAO and the World Bank to help governments to be able to collect those indicators. But there are some also that're coming through the DHS. And they may not be available on the same time frame as a PBS, as you point out. It really is trying to pull those indicators in – the values for those indicators, and the data, so that we can try to understand our programs in the context of the indicators. But it is really whatever is available.

And then of course you have partnerships with the governments where you're working, and so continuing to try to help promote the generation of the data through the national system – that has been an emphasis of the initiative for a while, and trying to help strengthen the ag and rural statistical systems.

The next question is – well, "If it's not done at the same time as a PBS, how do we reconcile this?" We can't really reconcile it. We just do the best we can with the available data and try to understand how changes in our indicators that might be from different time periods for the zone of influence, if we're collecting them through a different mechanism, could be changing, and how that fits in the context of what's going on with the national-level indicators.

In a lot of countries, we'll also – and there will be more information coming out very soon for those that're at the missions about this, but in many countries we're actually pushing to not do a standalone population-based survey through a contractor.

If possible, we'll build into the existing national data system in countries – many of the countries where we'll be working are countries that have a Living Standards Measurement Study-Integrated Survey in Agriculture, or an LSMS-ISA, which is a survey project that is led by the World Bank in partnership with partner governments, and includes a number of other donors and food security partners to help make those data collection efforts happen. When possible, we'll try to build into that survey infrastructure. And so, hopefully in some cases, that won't be such an issue because we will be building into the national data system. But if the data are from different points, we just work with what we have, in terms of: that's all we can do to reconcile.

For the poverty level having moved – you wanna go ahead?

Anne:

Yeah. What we're going to do with that, Albert, is: just like we did at the interim, we asked that the first interim reports had poverty at both the \$1.25 and the \$1.90 level because we recognize that, globally, with the new 2011 purchase power parity index, globally the international comparison indicator has moved to \$1.90. But we knew that having established our baselines with \$1.25, it was still important to continue to track that. So at the interim, we should have, in all of our interim reports, both \$1.25 and \$1.90. And then in the end line, we will again ask that the indicator be quantified using both of those thresholds so that, moving forward for GFSS countries that are moving forward, we could then continue at \$1.90.

I don't know if you've gone up to the World Bank website recently, but you can't even get data anymore on the \$1.25 threshold at 2005 PPP. It doesn't even appear in the World Bank data bank. So we all do need to move to the \$1.90. It is the SDG indicator for poverty at \$1.90. So I'm assuming eventually that the Kenya government will also move to it.

Emily: All right. Great.

Kate: We have our next question here on age disaggregates. And actually I was hoping Danielle from Peace Corps could also talk about this, 'cause I think this was a concern that they had. Edwin's question is that he noticed age disaggregates currently at 15 to 29, 30-plus, etcetera, for the number of individuals in the ag system. And he's asking why not do 30 to 59 and 60-plus, since normally we want to know if older farmers are likely to also adopt and apply technology. And does this require farmer profiling?

I know we did have a few conversations about the age disaggregates. And, Danielle, feel free to jump in from your Peace Corps perspective on this. Unless I'm mixing you up with MCC. One of you had a concern about the age.

Danielle: Yeah. This is Danielle from Peace Corps. I think we capture age in, unfortunately, a variety of different categories at Peace Corps. And I agree with the question that it might be useful to separate these age categories so that we can capture that individual data. So that is something I hope that we can consider.

Emily: This is Emily. And thank you, Danielle, for that. And Peace Corps has been a very strong partner with us on developing these indicators and thinking through all of the uses and the needs for the indicators. So, thank you for that. In the broader interagency group, you've been a great partner.

I would say, to Edwin's point, the reason we are not asking for other age groups is just because of the burden. Absolutely you can report on it, and if you're already collecting it, you can add it, as Anne was saying about the custom disaggregate function as well that we are developing in the FTFMS. You would be able to report the disaggregates for those other age groups. We just don't wanna require anything else as a standard indicator because of the burden we know that it causes to the implementing partners. So for right now it would not be a required disaggregate. The disaggregates that we list are only those that're the required disaggregates and standard indicators. But of course if it's important in your context, you can include it in your data entry in the FTFMS.

Kate:

Okay. Great. We have a next question from Kenneth Zulu. And he's saying his project, the Feed the Future Southern Africa Seed Trade Project, supports FTF-aligned countries in Southern Africa and SADC to implement harmonized seed regulations. "We currently have two indicators for tracking policy formulation and implementation at both national and regional levels, which have not been included in the new GFSS results framework. Can you please explain why these have been dropped?" So, why have we dropped the policy indicators?

Anne:

So, Kenneth, what we decided in terms of indicators that are relevant for regional missions: that it made sense for us to wait until the GFSS strategic guidance for regional programming under the strategy was issued. And then based on the strategic guidance, we could then work on the regional indicators. So we have no regional-focused indicators at all yet, not because we're not going to have them. Just because we thought it wasn't quite time to identify them without having the guidance strategy for regional missions.

But I am glad to hear that you find those two indicators, especially the one that tracks at a national level the implementation of the regionally agreed on policy – I'm very glad that you are finding that useful. 'Cause it was a result of quite a conversation with the regional missions on what kinds of indicators would be useful for you to track your programming and show your results. So that's good feedback. Thank you.

Kate: Great. Do we have any other questions here? Don't see any in the chat box yet. Or comments, as Anne said, if you just wanna give your feedback generally. Or any of our interagency partners want to add anything in general or about any of the questions we've addressed so far.

Emily: This is Emily. I have just a question to the group, since we have a lot of our partners from the field on. One thing that we did try to do was still include a number of standard indicators for the implementing partners to report on, but really only those that we know systematically and routinely we use for processes, whether it's internal learning processes or if it's for external communication type products. But the effort was taken to shift a little more of the burden to collecting data at the zone-of-influence or even national level, and take some of the burden off the implementing partners.

And I'd just like to see if anybody has any thoughts on that shift: if it seems to be helpful, if you feel like we're missing big parts of either output or lower-level outcome indicators, or even higher-level outcome indicators that you think should be reported on systematically across the initiatives. Any thoughts on that would be appreciated.

And if you don't have any, I think Julie may have a joke which we could –

[Laughter]

Julie: What do farmers use to make crop circles?

Participant: I don't know. What do they use, Julie?

Julie: A protractor.

Emily: I should've guessed, except I couldn't remember what the word was for protractor.

[Laughter]

Kate: You have these at the ready, Julie? Also, remember: we have Treasury and State and Peace Corps and USDA on with us here, if anyone has questions particularly for them and their participation in the interagency process.

If you don't have questions, guys, we're gonna have to just let you go early *[laughs]*. See a couple people typing here.

Also please let me know, as people are typing here – it seems like everyone understood that, in these spreadsheet of indicators, there were three separate tabs to look at: the performance indicators, which are the ones where we set targets and consider ourselves accountable for, and then the context ones, like Albert was asking about, that are more for monitoring our environment. And then there were – the last tab we're calling placeholder indicators. And those will eventually become either performance or context, but those are more recognized gaps where we know that we need to measure these things but we're not sure of the best way. So we'd really particularly appreciate your feedback on those ones if you have any suggestions for the best way to address some of the more complicated ways of measuring things.

All right. We have a question from Cheung from Food for Peace here in Washington. Hi, Cheung. And she's asking, "While I know why NRM, or natural resources management, is important, how will BFS use the NRM disaggregate?" She's just saying: sorry, she didn't hear if that was already addressed. No, I don't think we addressed that yet. So: how will we use the NRM disaggregate? Do you mean in the hectares indicator, Cheung, and also in the individuals applying new technologies, I guess? I think so. Yes. "Hectares has the new NRM disaggregate." Yeah.

Emily:

This is Emily. We'd use it in the same way we use any of the indicators, from a learning standpoint of assessing – in that particular case, we're looking to see how NRM technologies might be spreading or being used more expansively, which is an indication that we're successful in getting some of the climate smart approaches out there. It's also: we'll use it as a representation for external reporting on that particular indicator.

We had a lot of discussions actually with different members of the NRM team here in USAID, and with the partners in the interagency, about what would be – without creating a good deal of extra burden for reporting, how we could use that indicator. Or develop an indicator for that crosscutting intermediate result. And this seemed like a very effective and efficient approach in taking those disaggregates that're already being reported and looking at something that's really important, which is how much of the land we're working with is under improved technologies or practices that are better managing our natural resources.

Kate:

Great. Hopefully that answered your question, Cheung. We have a question from Carol here. Actually this is a good point. Carol Stoney says that in the description column of the new indicators spreadsheet, it says "See current FTF handbook." It references that in the far right notes column. She's asking: "Does that mean the version on the FTF website? Or is there a newer version under preparation?"

So, when I put the reference of "See current FTF handbook," that's the current version up on the website currently. And that link is found on FeedTheFuture.gov. Or we can add that link up in the weblinks box there. I'll add that here in a security, just to make sure you have the correct one. And that's just to – either the indicator is the same exact as our current Feed the Future standard indicator, and we just want you to see the current definition of it, or it's going to be slightly modified from that, and we're just referencing the current definition as a basis. So it does say whether it's brand-new, it's modified, or it's the same, over in the far-right column of the spreadsheet. So you should be able to tell there.

Also on the survey, if you take the survey, each indicator has a link to the handbook that'll take you exactly to the page of that definition. So you can kind of reference those as you're taking the survey as well, if you'd like. However, once we get these

GFSS indicators finalized, then we will be going through and making indicator definition sheets for each of these, just like we normally do, and making a brand-new GFSS indicator handbook. So that will be coming over the next few months, once we get these finalized.

And that would then replace the current FTF handbook. Hopefully that answers your question, Carol. There's a lot of information, I know, in the indicator spreadsheet. Lots of columns and everything for disaggregates and who's collecting and all that. So hopefully it's not confusing and you can – we meant it to just provide as much information as possible.

Okay. And then Albert is asking – so there are some indicators being measured at the ZOI, like households with high social capital or handwashing, and how will these indicators be used if there are no activities directly addressing these indicators?

Anne:

Albert, this is Anne. The indicators from the SO up to the goal are going to be required across all of our target countries. But indicators at the IR level, whether they're ZOI or implementing partner, are required as applicable. So if you are not implementing any activities that are addressing that particular intermediate result, then you would not be required to report on them. However, if you are working on resilience, it's quite likely that you will be trying to strengthen social capital, as it's been shown to be one of the very important capacities to develop for resilience. But at the IR level, all of the indicators will be only required as applicable.

Emily:

We see Cassie has a question then following Albert's. "The indicators for objective 2, IR 5 and 6, appear to be focused on outcomes. Will USAID be developing indicators for tracking outputs for these?" Actually, there are a couple of indicators that we would consider our outputs related to IR 5 and 6. And what we did try to do this time – we have reduced dramatically the number of output indicators that are in the standard set, and trying to include only those that we know we're using for external reporting or very critical learning processes.

Of course, implementing partners can always report on custom output indicators. But I'll point you to a couple of indicators that would be or might be applicable to

the resilience IRs. The main one that we've long had is the number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets, which has always been an initiative indicator. And we're keeping that one. Then there are a couple of others that would be relevant for resilience programs, even though they are not specific to resilience. And that is the number of households participating in USG food security programs.

That is not specific to any of the objective areas. It is just, across the board, trying to get a count or an idea of the footprint of the initiative and the projects and how many people they're working with. So those that are participating in resilience programs and households participating would be collected under that.

I would also say: it could be that the number of technologies and phases of development and dissemination could also feed in if there are technologies that are being developed specifically for – they're climate smart; they are focusing on risk reduction. Then those would be applicable also to IR 5 and 6. Beyond that, we've tried to make the output indicators fairly expansive or broad in their utility across the objective areas.

Emily:

But those are definitely areas where having good custom indicators that are tracking important outputs very specific to your activity would enter the equation. And so there you would be looking and working – missions and implementing partners – to ensure that you are tracking outputs that are critical to your intervention, to be able to manage and adapt your program.

And speaking of custom indicators, I'll go on to Andrew's question: "How are non-output benefits of livestock to be captured? Value of traction, manure, nutrient recycling, ecosystem services. Anything that's simple to measure, but in some systems, a significant benefit of livestock product." I think that is another example that: assuming that you are able to identify a realistic way of measuring those benefits for those systems and for those activities where that is an important objective of what the activity is doing, then it would be appropriate to include a custom indicator to try to measure it.

But to include it as a standard indicator – first of all, as you said, difficult to measure and not applicable across the board. We are trying, with our standard indicators, to identify things that really do apply to the large majority of any activity that would be working under that particular result.

Emily:

And then Carol Stoney has a question next: "Can you provide more information about the resilience system indicator?" And we could give you a lot of general information right now, Carol, but in actuality, I think it would be better to follow up with you on that. And we'll have more information coming out. We'll talk to – we have a couple of indicators that are in process. There's research ongoing with some organizations that have been doing research into resilience systems measurement. And those are under development.

So we'd be able to give you more specifics, but I'd like to follow up with our Center for Resilience, specifically on what the expectations are at present for that indicator, and even timeline for rollout. We haven't discussed that actually in a couple of months, so I couldn't give you a most-recent-information update.

Kate:

And, as a side note, I posted the link to the current Feed the Future handbook over in that web links box in the top middle. So feel free to click on that afterwards, and then it will take you to the current handbook that I believe Carol was asking about.

And then Beth actually has an interesting question. She's asking: "Just to confirm that the value of annual sales indicator is effectively replacing the value of incremental sales indicator. We assume this implies that we're no longer comparing baseline sales to fiscal year results for this indicator."

Anne:

So, Beth, under the GFSS moving forward, you are correct that the indicator itself will now be just simply the value of reporting year sales, that data point from incremental sales. However, we are going to continue to require baseline values for the indicator. So baseline reporting year sales, just like you have to do under incremental sales. And we will be continuing to require number of beneficiaries participating in the value chain so that we are able then to do a lot of important

analyses, including give a estimate of what incremental sales are because it is useful to have.

But we recognize some of the real challenges with having it be the actual indicator. And that is why we decided to have the indicator be the value of the reporting year sales. But we will continue to require the data points that we need in order to be able to calculate incremental sales and talk about changes in per-beneficiary sales, etcetera.

Kate:

Great. Hopefully that answered your question, Beth. Cheung, I think you – I don't know if you heard this part earlier on the call, but Cheung is asking: "To clarify, gross margins will be dropped in next fiscal year from FTFMS." So Anne can talk about the gross margin that she answered a little bit about before, but just to reiterate: there are not gonna be changes with these indicators this year, in FTFMS. So, for this fall, which collects the FY17 reporting, there will not be changes in FTFMS to include any of these new indicators 'cause we're not done yet. These changes will apply the following year to the system. So gross margin will still be there as an indicator this year in FTFMS.

But then the following year, you're right that it will be dropped as a standard indicator. We're focusing on yield instead. But as Anne mentioned earlier, we understand it still can be important, depending on the projects. And so you should continue to keep it as a custom indicator if it applies and if you want to use that measure.

Emily:

It looks like Kenneth has a question about the indicator – there's an indicator that we have had which is about organizations that have applied improved technologies or management practices. And this round, for the GFSS indicators, we were looking to just have the number of individuals who've applied improved technologies and practices, and the question is asked: "Why can't we have both in some projects like ours that work with more with institutions than individuals?"

So this is a very good question and a good point, and something we've actually been discussing and debating as we've been developing the indicators. What I could say

for right now is that we will take your point into consideration as something that we know that this might be wanted by others. The issue really that we were grappling with – we were trying to just cut the number of indicators across the board to only have those things that're absolutely essential. Now, again, you could report that as custom. But if we wanna be able to report across things in an aggregate form for the initiative, the customs aren't necessarily very helpful for that purpose.

Another point though is: we do have a placeholder right now for a context indicator about organizational and individual performance that could also be useful to you in terms of as: you're working with organizations and institutions tracking their capacity and performance over time. But in terms of just being able to count those that're applying new practices and technology. We will take your point under consideration, Kenneth. Thank you for making it. And as we work through the comments we get from this external review, it will be noted and discussed, and we'll see where we go. Thank you.

Kate:

Yeah. Just to reiterate what Emily was saying at the end there, you guys, as partners and mission staff and everyone in the field, really are the experts and have really important feedback for us to consider in developing these indicators. We don't want to have measures that are overly burdensome or impossible. And, as Anne mentioned before, we're not gonna have an ability to measure every single thing that you could measure with your GFSS efforts. This is really to reduce to just those things we need centrally to report at initiative-wide levels. And the rest of it will be up to you to add custom indicators or management indicators to execute your programs successfully. So thanks for everyone's input.

We're waiting for a couple more questions. But wanted to give another chance: anyone from the interagency have any comments just in general, Treasury or State or USDA or anything, that they'd wanna jump in?

Ellie:

Yeah. Hi, Kate and everyone. This is Ellie from USDA. I'd love to jump in with a couple comments. First, I just wanna give a public kudos to USAID and your what I think has been excellent management of this process. I've really enjoyed, from the USDA side, working with you. And I think we've taken advantage of all your deep

expertise in a lot of these areas informing these indicators and building on the strengths of FTF in the process. So thank you for your leadership of this process.

And I also wanted to mention, again from my perspective as part of this interagency, the comments we're getting today are so valuable. From my view, these are the exact types of suggestions and questions we were hoping to get in this broad feedback process. It's a public feedback process, and I think our net was cast pretty wide. We're very open to feedback from any type of organization, anyone working in food security really globally. So the comments today have been great.

If anyone thinks of more questions, more suggestions, we have the rest of the week. Friday is the deadline, right? So we would welcome even more feedback from anyone in the webinar today or any of your colleagues or associates also working in food security. These have been really high-quality comments so far, and I think they'll help us refine the indicator list and finalize it. Thanks, all.

Kate: Thanks, Ellie.

Emily: A public thanks to Ellie too. Because I think she's made about – we've had weekly meetings, our interagency working group, and I think she's made nearly all of them, if not all of them, and has been a very loyal member. So thank you, Ellie.

Ellie: My pleasure.

Kate: All right. We have a question here from Albert, speaking to Kenneth's point: "The move to a market system approach – we'll see programs work a lot more with firms, and having indicators at level would be useful. Just to comment that indicators that help measure market systems would be very useful."

Anne: But also: just in case you didn't notice it, in addition to changing from incremental sales to total reporting year sales, we've also changed the definition of that indicator

and expanded it beyond small holder farmers only. And that's a really important and useful change to the indicator. So now it is sales across the value chain, where you're working and your results will be disaggregated by levels of the value chain. So your private sector firms – and we've actually had some comments received already suggesting that even private sector firms as a disaggregate is too aggregated and suggesting that we further disaggregate that into suppliers and processors and traders. So we're going to be collecting sales across the assisted value chain, and I think that that is also going to help address what you raise, Albert.

Kate: Thanks, Albert. We actually also have a comment on the landing page website from Andrew Clark from Pendleton, Oregon. I'm not sure exactly which organization he's from. So if you do have any issues accessing the website _____, you can make comments there. But he actually was making a comment on the results framework and says, "It seems to me that there's a significant component missing from this framework, i.e., strengthening the ability of nations producing excess agricultural goods to fulfill SPS requirements for international trade." And there's a whole back and forth which we can go into detail with answering, but I didn't know if Ellie from the USDA or Anne wanted to talk about SPS issues missing from our framework. SPS meaning sanitary-prido-sanitary.

Ellie: This is Ellie. Anne, do you have any background on that?

Anne: It is actually included in our results framework. As Andrew correctly points out, working in that area can be essential to strengthen and expand access to trade. And so under IR 2, we would expect to see activities that are aiming to address that need in order to facilitate exports by our partner countries. We also have indicators that then monitor increases in exports of our partner countries that can definitely be linked. And I can think of some actual examples in our current Feed the Future work where increases in export of particular commodities has definitely been facilitated by strengthening SPS systems.

Emily: And one other point just as we're talking about the results framework: one thing many of you may've already noted is that, with this results framework different from the original Feed the Future results framework, we stopped at the intermediate result level. We do not have sub-IRs. And we did that very intentionally because of just:

we feel that these levels are the levels that're needed to help countries develop their individual strategies. If you read the Global Food Security strategy, there are a number of illustrative types of activities that would feed into the IRs that give more specifics about what would be at that sub-IR level. But for the standard framework and indicators, we chose to stop at the IR level. And aren't you glad we did? 'Cause otherwise we'd have over 100 indicators if we tried to get indicators for all of those boxes [*Laughs*].

Kate: All right. Peter is asking: can he get more clarification on measuring market system? We all wish we could [*laughs*].

Emily: If he has a more specific question – I mean, we could talk just generally about what we've been trying to do. We have some indicators we noted that measure outcomes of good market systems as opposed to measuring whether or not the market system itself is necessarily growing. These are indications – or improving – indications. So there're a number under IRs 1 and 2 that would – the indicators under those we chose specifically because we thought that they are indicators of a healthy market system. We also have the new ag-GDP-plus indicator that is in development that is at a higher level, national level, trying to track what's going on with the overall sector and system. So the indicators under IRs 1 and 2, and to some degree 3 as well – I guess you could say any of them.

But if you have a specific question, Peter, we'd be happy to answer it. But beyond that, I think we'll just say that all the indicators were developed and selected for those IRs related to objective 1, keeping in mind that we're aiming for – many of our programs are focusing on market systems. And so they reflect that.

Anne: And to add to that, Peter, coming from Uganda, which has been one of our leading examples of missions in really working very hard at a market system level – and I know that you and your colleagues, the LEO project, and a number of people, have been working for a number of years to try to come up with indicators of strengthened market systems that are broadly applicable. There's been more than four years of research in this area.

And correct me if I'm wrong, but I understand it really has not resulted in that magic indicator of a strengthened market system that is broadly applicable across all contexts. Because the market system work is so context-specific, so dynamic, that we are also talking about ways that we are going to be able to have missions report on the results of their market-systems-strengthening work that accommodates the context specificity and the kinds of tools that you have used to diagnose and assess and continually monitor your market system work – that's a combination of standard indicators, custom indicators, and narrative and qualitative reporting.

Because many of the tools that have been identified for monitoring market systems are actually qualitative methods like most significant change and outcome monitoring and things like that. And have a way, perhaps through the portfolio review, perhaps through the key issue narrative, where you can tell and report this market-systems-strengthening story. And then we use a range of analytical techniques, including qualitative techniques, to pull out the common themes and the common changes that're being observed across our portfolio of market-systems-strengthening activities.

So, what do you think?

Kate:

And I'll just add, while Peter's tying there, that, yes, we are wrapping up here. I know we started late, so we did wanna go the full time. But if anyone has any other remaining questions in the last couple minutes here, please do type them. And of course you can always, if there are further ones, contact us. And please be sure to, if you haven't already, go ahead and take the survey and input any other feedback that you might have. Please input that into the survey. You'll notice that when you get into the survey, each indicator asks you which part of the indicator you're trying to give feedback on. Are you commenting on disaggregates, or that we're – *[audio cuts out]*.

Julie:

Hi. It sounds as though Kate might've dropped off the line. I'm guessing she will call back in.

[Laughter]

Also – this is Julie McCarty, VFS's webinar guru. I also welcome any feedback on this webinar, the process of it itself. Did you find this type of webinar useful? Technical issues at the beginning aside, was it helpful to you or not? I will put my e-mail address in the chat box, or you're welcome to just type in some feedback. If you like this type of webinar, if you want more, I'm always happy to receive webinar-oriented feedback. But we'll see if Kate comes back on the line.

Emily:

Katie?

Kate:

Yes. Hi. Sorry. _____ decided that it was over [*laughs*]. So, anyway, I'm not sure if you were in the middle of answering something else, but I see that _____ wrote back that they'll work on figuring out that issue.

Anyway, I was just saying: please take the survey. Please review the indicators and the _____ information we have on the website. Feel free to send this webinar recording. We'll pass it around once we have it here. As well as the transcript of the questions and answers that we went over today. You can pass that around to anyone. As Ellie from USDA mentioned, we're really interested in your feedback particularly those who implement food security programs on the ground. That's really valuable perspective to give, and we really appreciate everyone's time in doing that.

Julie put her e-mail address there as well. In case you have any questions, you can direct them through her or through me. Any last remaining questions or any other points that Anne or Emily or any of the interagency partners would like to make?

Anne:

I think we are good over here.

Kate:

Okay. Anyone else?

[Crosstalk]

Emily: Thank you all for joining and for hanging in there.

Kate: Yes. Sorry again for the delay. We really appreciate it. Thanks to everyone, and we'll look forward to more survey responses. You have until Friday. Thanks again. Have a great day.

[Multiple speakers saying goodbye]

[Line is silent after 1:03:05]

[End of Audio]