Performance Indicator Reference Sheet - PIRS

SHOUHARDO III PLUS Activity
CARE Bangladesh

May 2023

Revised September 2023

Submitted March 21, 2023

(Revised Submission Date: 05/09/2023)

M&E Plan Attachment: Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS)

Indicator summary by type/ result area and type by data source

SHOUHARDO III Plus Indicators	
Annul Monitoring	
20	
BHA (FFP)	Custom
11	9

Goal	0	1	1
Intermediate Result 1	4	10	14
Intermediate Result 2	2	3	5
Total	6	14	20
	Routine Monitoring	Participants Based Survey	Total Indicator

INDICATORS BY RESULT AREA

LEVEL	TOTAL
Goal	1
Intermediate Result 1	14
Intermediate Result 2	5
Total	20

Contents

Goal: Improved gender equitable food and nutrition security and resilience of the vulnerable people living in the Char and Haor in Bangladesh by 2024

Indicator Title: RESIL-a Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index [ZOI-level]

DEFINITION:

The Ability to Recover from Shocks and Stresses Index is based on estimation of the ability of households to recover from the typical types of shocks and stressors that occur in the program areas, such as loss of a family member, loss of income, hunger, drought, flood, conflict or similar events, based on data regarding recovery from the shocks and stressors households experienced in the year prior to the survey and their perceived ability to meet food needs the following year.

The base "ability to recover" index is calculated based on the responses to two questions after the respondent is asked about his/her household exposure to and the severity of a series of 16 types of shocks and stressors that might have occurred during the previous year:

1. Would you say that right now, your household's ability to meet your food needs is:
    - Better than before these difficult times? (assigned a value of 3)
    - The same as before these difficult times? assigned a value of 2)
    - Or worse than before these difficult times? (assigned a value of 1)

AND

2. Looking ahead over the next year, do you believe your household's ability to meet your food needs will be:
    - Better than before these difficult times? (assigned a value of 3)
    - The same as before these difficult times? (assigned a value of 2)
    - Or worse than before these difficult times? (assigned a value of 1)

The responses to the two questions are combined (additive) into one variable that has a minimum value of 2 and a maximum value of 6.

The 16 shocks and stresses are: too much rain, too little rain, erosion of land, loss of land, sharp increase in the price of food, someone stealing or destroying belongings, not being able to access inputs for crops, disease affecting crops, pests affecting crops, theft of crops, not being able to access inputs for livestock, disease affecting livestock, someone stealing animals, not being able to sell crops, livestock or other products at a fair price, severe illness in the family, death in the household.

Since each survey household did not experience the same types of shocks/stressors of the same severity, it is necessary to create a "shock exposure corrected" index to measure ability to recover.

A measure of shock/stressor exposure and severity is created that takes into account the shocks or stressors to which a household is exposed out of the total number of shocks or stressors, and the perceived severity of the shock on household income and food consumption.

Perceived severity is measured using two variables: impact on income security and impact on food consumption. The variables are based on respondents' answers to the questions, "How severe was the impact on your household economic situation?" and "How severe was the impact on household food consumption?" which are asked of each shock or stressor experienced. The possible responses are:

- Not severe (assigned a value of 1)
- Somewhat Severe (assigned a value of 2)
- Severe (assigned a value of 3)
- Extremely Severe (assigned a value of 4)

The responses to the two questions are combined into one severity variable that has a minimum value of 2 and a maximum value of 8 for each shock and stressor.

The Shock Exposure Index (SEI) is then a weighted sum of the incidence of experience of each shock (a variable equal to one if the shock or stressor was experienced and zero otherwise), weighted by the perceived severity of the shock. The SEI ranges from 0 to 128 (if all 16 shocks/stressors were experienced by the households at the highest level of severity).

Finally, the shock exposure-corrected Ability to Recover from Shocks and Stresses Index (ARSSI) is calculated to create a measure of ability to recover that corrects for any differences between households in their shock exposure and is therefore comparable across them. To do so, a linear regression of the base ability-to-recover (ATR) index on the SEI is run, yielding the amount by which an increase of 1 in the shock exposure index can be expected to change the ability to recover index.

The estimated empirical equation is:

$$ATR = a + b * SEIATR = a + b * SEI$$

We can expect the coefficient on SEI, the "b", to be a negative number such that the higher is shock exposure, the lower is the ability to

recover.

The coefficient 'b' is then used to calculate the adjusted ARSSI for each household using the following equation:

$$ARSSI = ATR + b * (Y - SEI)ARSSI = ATR + b * (Y - SEI),$$

where Y is the mean across households of the SEI. As such, the ATR index value of a household with shock exposure below the mean would have a downward adjustment of its value and the opposite for a household with shock exposure above the mean.

RATIONALE:

The Ability to Recover from Shocks and Stresses Index acts as a proxy for actual recovery (which is complex to capture in a population- based survey). It is associated with positive coping behaviors in the face of shocks and stresses, which indicates that a household is resilient to shock and stresses and thus is in a much better position to recover from them [1] [2]. This indicator falls under Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems in the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) results framework.

[1] Jones, L. & Tanner, T. Reg Environ Change (2017) 17: 229. Available at https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10113-016-0995-2

[2] Maxwell, D., Constas, M., Frankenberger, T., Klaus, D. & Mock, M. 2015. Qualitative Data and Subjective Indicators for Resilience Measurement. Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group. Technical Series No. 4. Rome: Food Security Information Network. Available at: http://www.fsincop.net/fileadmin/user_upload/fsin/ docs/resources/FSIN_TechnicalSeries_4.pdf

UNIT: Score ranging from 2-6	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Gendered Household Type: Male and Female Adults (M&F), Adult Female No Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male No Adult Female (MNF), Child No Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
➢ *LEVEL OF COLLECTION:*	Data for this indicator are collected from the population of households in the ZOI (i.e. the targeted sub- national regions/districts where the USG intends to achieve the greatest household- and people-level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition.)
➢ *WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:*	National statistics offices under the LSMS-ISA+ national data systems strengthening activity or M&E contractors
➢ *DATA SOURCE:*	Primary data are collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI using the Feed the Future Survey Methods Toolkit (https://agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-zoi-survey-methods).
➢ *FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:*	Data should be collected at baseline, and during each subsequent ZOI-level population based survey thereafter. ZOI refers to three types of ZOIs: 1) the target or aligned country ZOI (i.e. the targeted sub-national regions/districts where the USG intends to achieve the greatest household- and individual-level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition), 2) Office of Food for Peace development program areas, and 3) Resilience to recurrent crisis areas.
➢ *BASELINE INFO:*	A baseline is required, and the value is from the FTF phase two baseline ZOI survey.
REPORTING NOTES	

FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

1. USAID Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators – [COUNTRY NAME]"
   mechanism in the FTFMS.

2. Enter the year that data were collected in the field under the Indicator Comment. If field data collection spanned two years, enter the year field data collection began.

3. Enter the value for the overall indicator and for each GHHT disaggregate category under the appropriate ZOI/area category (Target or Aligned Country ZOI, FFP development program area, or Resilience to recurrent crisis area).

4. Enter the total number of households in the ZOI/area and for each GHHT disaggregate category in the appropriate ZOI/area category (Target or Aligned Country ZOI, FFP development program area, or Resilience to recurrent crisis area).

For example, a GFSS Target Country entering data from the Feed the Future ZOI baseline survey would enter:

5. Sample-weighted ARSSI score for households in the Target Country ZOI
6. Total number of households in the Target Country ZOI
7. Sample-weighted ARSSI score for M&F households in the Target Country ZOI
8. Total number of M&F households in the Total Country ZOI
9. *Sample-weighted ARSSI score for FNM households in the Target Country ZOI*
10. *Total number of FNM households in the Target Country ZOI*
11. *Sample-weighted ARSSI score for MNF households in the Target Country ZOI*
12. *Total number of MNF households in the ZOI*
13. *Sample-weighted ARSSI score for CNA households in the Target Country ZOI*
14. *Total number of CNA households in the Target Country ZOI*

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

15. *ZOI-level indicators are not included in the PPR master indicator list. Missions may include them in PPR reporting as custom indicators.*

Intermediate Result 1: Increased equitable access to income for both women and men, and nutritious food for men, women, boys, and girls

Indicator Title: EG.3-2 Number of individuals participating in USG food security programs [IM-level]

DEFINITION:

This indicator is designed to capture the breadth of our food security work. This indicator counts participants of Feed the Future-funded programs, including those we reach directly, those reached as part of a deliberate service strategy, and those participating in the markets we strengthen. We expect Implementing Partners (IPs) to track or estimate the number of individual participants across different interventions within their own project and to report numbers of participants reached, not number of contacts with the project or project- supported actors.

This indicator counts, with some exceptions listed below, all the individuals participating in our nutrition, resilience, and agriculture and food system activities, including:

- Adults that projects or project-supported actors reach directly through nutrition-specific and community-level nutrition interventions, (e.g. parents and other caregivers participating in community care groups, healthcare workers provided with in- service training on how to manage acute malnutrition), but not children reached with

nutrition-specific or community-based interventions, who are counted under indicators HL.9-1 and HL.9-2 instead;

- People reached by productive safety nets, community-based micro-finance and diversified livelihood activities through our assistance;
- Members of households reached with household-level interventions (households with new access to basic sanitation through our work, households receiving family-sized rations);
- Smallholder and non-smallholder producers that projects or project-supported actors reach directly (e.g. through an irrigation training, through a loan provided, through distribution of drought-tolerant seeds to specific farmers);
- Proprietors of firms in the private sector that we help strengthen (e.g. agrodealers, aggregators, processors). Employees of these firms are also counted if they are reached directly with a USG-assisted service such as training;
- Producers who directly interact with those USG-assisted firms (e.g. the producers who are customers of an assisted agrodealer; the producers from whom an assisted trader or aggregator buys), but not customers or suppliers who are not producers;
- Participants whose main source of income is labor (e.g. Laborers/non-producer diversified livelihood participants);
- People in civil society organizations and government whose skills and capacity have been strengthened by projects or project- supported actors;
- School-aged children who are recipients of USG school feeding programs;

In cases where activities work with multiple individuals in a household, this indicator counts all activity participants in the household, not all members of the household. However, in the case of sanitation services and family-sized rations, all members of the household receiving the sanitation facility or ration can be counted here.

An individual is a participant if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided or facilitated by the activity. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as a participant. An intervention is significant if one can reasonably expect, and hold OUs and IMs responsible for achieving progress toward, changes in behaviors or other outcomes for these individuals based on the level of services and/or goods provided or accessed. Producers with increased access to goods, services and markets for their products and who purchase from or sell to market actors that have been strengthened as a result of our activities are considered to have received a significant intervention.

Individuals who are trained by an IM as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy (e.g. cascade training) that then go on to deliver services directly to individuals or to train others to deliver services should be counted as participants of the activity—the capacity strengthening is key for sustainability and an important outcome in its own right. The individuals who then receive the services or training

delivered by those individuals are also considered participants. However, spontaneous spillover of improved practices to neighbors does not count as a deliberate service delivery strategy; neighbors who apply new practices based on observation and/or interactions with participants who have not been trained to spread knowledge to others as part of a deliberate service delivery strategy should not be counted under this indicator.

Value chain facilitative and/or market-system activities may use a two-step process to identify and count participants:

1. The first step involves identifying which private sector firms have been assisted by the activity during the reporting year, and counting the number of proprietors of those firms.
2. The second step, which is only applicable to firms that buy from or sell to producers, is to count the number of producer customers or suppliers of each assisted firm.

The total number of participants for that activity is then the sum of the proprietors of the assisted firms and their producer customers/suppliers. For example, an IP working to strengthen the certified soy seed market within a defined market shed in the ZOI could use data on the number of certified soy seed sales by assisted firms during the reporting year to estimate the number

of farmers purchasing certified soy seed (by using a conservative assumption that one sales equals one farmer applying), and then report thatnumber as the number of producer participants. All assumptions underlying the indicator estimates should be documented annually in an Indicator Comment in FTFMS.

Data provision by assisted firms can be facilitated by entering into written agreements that include reporting and nondisclosure requirements and by showing assisted firms how the information provided is useful and used. Counting producer participants may be more straightforward if the value chain activity is also facilitating extension strategies, e.g. agrodealer agents that require knowing where the customers live and farm.

While other Feed the Future indicators, such as "financing accessed", "value of sales," and "individuals applying improved practices" also capture the number of enterprises that contributed results to the indicator, this indicator only counts individual people, i.e. the farmer (not the farm), and the proprietor (not the firm).

This indicator does not count the indirect beneficiaries of our activities. An indirect beneficiary is someone who does not have direct contact with the activity but still benefits, such as the population that uses a new road constructed by the activity, neighbors who see the results of the improved technologies applied by direct participants and decide to apply the technology themselves (spillover), or the individuals who hear an activity-supported radio message but don't receive any training or counseling from the activity. In part, this is because accurate tracking of indirect beneficiaries is challenging by its nature, despite the fact that spillover is a core component of the Feed the Future theory of change. In general, spillover is captured in Feed the Future through measuring changes in population level indicators (e.g. percent applying improved technologies and management practices) and linking those to the work activities are doing directly.

Note that this indicator cannot be summed across years for a project total, since "new" and "continuing" participants are not disaggregated, and thus this will only show a total of individuals reached in any one reporting year.

USAID: Each IP should report on the number of individuals participating in their specific IM. Then the OU should report on the Mission- wide total number of unique participants reached across all IMs. This will require estimating and removing double counting and overlap among IMs. Please see reporting notes below.

Interagency: Each activity / grant / project should report on the number of individuals participating in that activity / grant / project that year. In the case where more than one activity / grant / project exists per country / post, then the overall number of individuals participating in the country should also be reported, after any double-counting is removed. Please see reporting notes below.

RATIONALE:

Understanding the reach of our work and the breakdown of the individuals participating by type, sex, and age will better inform our programming and the impacts we are having in various sectors or in various demographic groups. This understanding can then make us more effective or efficient in reaching our targeted groups. Understanding the extent of spillover and scale is also very important, but this will be assessed as a part of the ZOI survey and performance and impact evaluations rather than through annually reported IM-level indicators. This indicator is an output indicator and is linked to many parts of the Global Food Security Strategy results framework.

UNIT:	DISAGGREGATE BY:
Number (of people)	➢ Sex: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)* ● Male; ● Female; ● Not applicable *(e.g. for household members counted from household-level interventions)*; ● Disaggregates Not Available

	➢ Age Category: *the unique number of individuals should be entered here (i.e. no double-counting of individuals across disaggregate choices here)* ● School-aged children (only to be used for counting those reached by USG school feeding programs; report the total reached with school feeding regardless of actual age); ● 15-29; ● 30+; ● Not applicable *(e.g. for household members counted from household-level interventions)*; ● Disaggregates Not Available *Note*: Children under five reached with nutrition interventions are counted under HL.9-1 ➢ Type of Individual: *double-counting individuals across types is permitted here* ● **Parents/caregivers**; ● **Household members** (household-level interventions only), *such as new access to basic sanitation and/or receipt of family rations*; ● **School-aged children** *(i.e. those participating in school feeding programs);* ● **People in government** *(e.g. policy makers, extension workers, healthcare workers);* ● **People in USG-assisted private sector firms** (e.g. agrodealers, traders, aggregators, processors, service providers, manufacturers) ● **People in civil society** *(e.g. NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations, community volunteers)* *While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count their proprietors under the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate and not the "Civil Society" disaggregate* ● **Laborers (Non-producer diversified livelihoods participants)**; ● **Producer: Smallholder (see definition below);** ● **Producer: Non-smallholder;** ● **Producer: Aquaculture;** ● **Producer: size Disaggregates Not** Available *Producers (e.g. farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers) should be counted under one of the "Producers" disaggregate, not the "Private Sector Firms" disaggregate* *Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feedthe Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock.* ● **Type of Individual Not Applicable** ● **Type of Individual Disaggregates Not Available**
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better.

MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity-level, activity participants
WHO COLLECTS DATAFOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	Firm records, activity records, training participant lists, or through census or sampling of participating firms/farms/families/individuals, etc.
FREQUENCY OFCOLLECTION:	Annual
BASELINE INFO:	• "Zero" for individual IMs newly starting; • "Current number of individuals participating" for IMs with ongoing work that will now include this indicator; "Summation of all reported baseline values" (after removing double-counting) for the OU overall reporting

REPORTING NOTES

FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

- Enter the unique number of individuals participating under the "Sex" and "Age Category" disaggregates, and FTFMS will sum up the overall total. Then enter the number of individuals under the "Type of individual", where double-counting is permitted.
    - The total under the "Sex" disaggregate should match the total under the "Age Category" disaggregate, but may not match the total under the "Type of Individual" disaggregate if double-counting was included there.

- Under each Disaggregate category, the "Not applicable" option can be used when breaking the number of individuals down by that disaggregate category is not necessary, such as in household-level interventions (see example below).
- Under each Disaggregate category, the "Disaggregates Not Available" option can be used if that piece of information is not known about the individual. However, it is required where possible to disaggregate by sex and age, so please use this option sparingly and only when necessary.

***** IMPORTANT NOTE *****

- ***USAID:*** Each Implementing Mechanism (IM) should count the individuals with whom it works with and report that number under their IM in FTFMS, being careful to enter the unique number (no double-counting) under the "Sex" and "Age Category" disaggregates. Then, the USAID Mission should aggregate across IMs to report an overall Mission-wide total, after removing any double counting of individuals being reported by more than one IM, and report that total under the Mission's placeholder IM titled "High-level Indicators – [COUNTRY NAME]", using the same disaggregate categories.

- ***Interagency Partners:*** After entering the "number of individuals participating" for each of your activities / grants / projects in FTFMS, then enter an overall agency-level number of "individuals participating" in each country where you work that sums up all of your participants and removes any double counting under the "Total Participants" entry listed under each country in FTFMS.

REPORTING EXAMPLES:

- ✓ **Example 1**: In Malawi there is a group of 30 caregivers/mothers are part of a Care Group that provides training and support on breastfeeding, childcare, nutrition, etc. This Care Group is also used as an entry point to reach those same caregivers/mothers to do agricultural training on improved practices for their groundnut crop. In this case, the same people are receiving two intervention types.
    - The Implementing Partner should list the unique number of caregivers/mothers (which is 30) disaggregated into their "Sex" and "Age Category". The total under the "Sex" disaggregate would be 30, and the total under the "Age Category" would be 30, i.e. they should match.
    - Then, under the "Type of Individual" category, they would enter the number 30 under both the "Mothers/Caregivers" type and the "Producers" type, since this group of 30 people is both. Even though adding up these types would look like 60 people, we allow double-counting here, and will be able to take the unique number of individuals (the 30 people) from the "Sex" and "Age Category" disaggregates.

- ✓ **Example 2**: Food for Peace (FFP) provides family-sized rations and the mother of one family is the direct recipient who picks up the ration, which she takes back to feed her whole household, which has 5 members including her. In this case, all members of the household should be counted, since they will all be receiving the ration; but breaking down that number by sex or age is likely not feasible, so we have provided a "Not applicable" option to use under this Disaggregate category.
    - To enter the data from this example where the woman's household had 5 members including her, enter the number 5 in the "Not applicable" option under the "Sex" and under the "Age Category" disaggregates. It is not necessary to breakdown the household members by their sex or age.
    - Then under the "Type of Individual" disaggregate, enter 5 under the "Household members" option.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

Only the Mission-wide total (which removes any double-counting from the summation of all contributing IMs) as reported under "High-level Indicators – [COUNTRY NAME]" is reported into the PPR.

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

The SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity maintains a database of participants and stakeholders who are categorized as poor or extremely poor, and who will directly benefit from the program's interventions, such as goods or services, during the reporting fiscal year. The following beneficiary groups and data points will be considered for analysis:

- Participants who have received vaccination and seed selling services through LSP.
- Participants who have taken part in LSP training.
- Participants who have benefitted from the banana stem haylage.
- Farmers who have undergone orientation on modern agricultural technologies.
- VSLA participants, including adolescents aged 10-19.
- Pregnant women who have received maternal nutrition counseling.
- Lactating mothers who have received IYCF counseling.
- Individual households that have received counseling on nutrition-sensitive food production.
- Participants who have attended comprehensive homestead gardening sessions.
- Girls' Forum participants, including adolescents aged 10-19.
- Male Champions groups participants.
- VDC participants.
- Multi-Purpose Cash Transfer participants who have received emergency response.
- Any adolescent participant who has received program intervention will be considered under the age category of 15-29.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **WHO COLLECTS:** Implementing partners
- **FROM WHOM:** Project MIS database
- **METHOD:** Routine monitoring
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION** and
- **REPORTING :** Quarterly

Indicator Title: GNDR-2: Percentage of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources [IM-level]

DEFINITION:

This performance indicator, "Percentage of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources" is a cross cutting U.S. government foreign assistance indicator (indicator GNDR-2), developed to measure performance related to increasing access to productive economic resources by women. The indicator reference sheet for GNDR-2 can be found under the cross cutting program category for gender, on the U.S. Department of State's Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators website (https://www.state.gov/f/indicators/). For ease of reference, the indicator definition for GNDR-2 can also be found below. Feed the Future Implementing Partners (IPs) and Post teams have the option of reporting directly on GNDR-2 using data that is aligned with the standard GNDR-2 definition, or, to reduce IP burden, can use data from one of the three Feed the Future performance indicator listed under "REPORTING NOTES" below.

U.S. government foreign assistance indicator definition for GNDR-2: Productive economic resources include: assets - land, housing, businesses, livestock or financial assets such as savings; credit; wage or self-employment; and income.

Programs include:

- micro, small, and medium enterprise programs;
- workforce development programs that have job placement activities;
- programs that build assets such as land redistribution or titling; housing titling; agricultural programs that provide assets such as livestock; or programs designed to help adolescent females and young women set up savings accounts.

This indicator does NOT track access to services, such as business development services or stand-alone employment training (e.g., employment training that does not also include job placement following the training).

The unit of measure will be a percentage expressed as a whole number:

- Numerator = Number of female program participants
- Denominator = Total number of male and female participants in the program

The resulting percentage should be expressed as a whole number. For example, if the number of females in the program (the numerator) divided by the total number of participants in the program (the denominator) yields a value of .16, the number 16 should be the reported result for this indicator. Values for this indicator can range from 0 to 100.

The numerator and denominator must also be reported as disaggregates.

RATIONALE:

The lack of access to productive economic resources is frequently cited as a major impediment to gender equality and women's empowerment, and is a particularly important factor in making women vulnerable to poverty. Women comprise 43 percent of the agricultural labor force in developing countries, yet face persistent barriers limiting their access to productive economic resources. Closing the gap in women's access to productive economic resources is necessary for Feed the Future to achieve the objective of inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth. Ending extreme poverty, a goal outlined in the U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy, the Sustainable Development Goals, and USAID's Vision to Ending Extreme Poverty, will only be achieved if women are economically empowered.

GNDR-2 can be used to report on applicable activities under objectives in the Feed the Future Results Framework that are designed to increase access to productive economic resources. As a cross-cutting gender indicator, this indicator can also be used to report on applicable activities under any of the Program Categories in the SPSD. Information generated by this indicator will be used to monitor and report on achievements linked to broader outcomes of gender equality and female empowerment and will be used for planning and reporting purposes by Agency-level, bureau-level and in-country program managers. Specifically, this indicator will inform required annual reporting or reviews of the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy and the Joint Strategic Plan reporting in the APP/APR, and Bureau or Office portfolio reviews. Additionally, the information will inform a wide range of gender-related public reporting and communications products, and facilitate responses to gender-related inquiries from internal and external stakeholders such as Congress, NGOs, and international organizations. This indicator is linked to the Global Food Security Strategy results framework CCIR 3: Increased gender equality and female empowerment.

UNIT: Percent expressed as a whole number	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** None
TYPE: Output	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better

MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity-level, activity participants
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	Depends on the data source of the indicator(s) used to quantify the GNDR-2 indicator
FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION**:**	Annually
BASELINE INFO:	Baseline is zero

REPORTING NOTES

SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING ON GNDR-2 BY FEED THE FUTURE ACTIVITIES: USAID/BFS consulted with USAID's Senior Gender Advisor in the Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning/Office of Policy on ways to facilitate reporting and reduce IP burden. Based on those consultations, Post teams may use data from the following Feed the Future performance indicators to report on indicator GNDR-2 (Note that custom indicators may also be used to report on GNDR-2.):

Indicator *EG.4.2-7 Number of individuals participating in USG-assisted group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs [IM-level]*:

a. For the numerator, use data on the number of female participants.

b. For the denominator, use the sum the number of male and female participants. Do not include "disaggregates not available".

Indicator *EG.10.4-7 Number of adults with legally recognized and documented tenure rights to land or marine areas, as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]*:

a. For the numerator, use data on the number of female participants from the female sex disaggregate.
b. For the denominator, use the sum of the male and female participants under the sex disaggregates. Do not include "disaggregates not available".

Indicator *EG.3.2-27 Value of agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]*:

a. For the numerator, use data on the number of enterprises with all female proprietors.
b. For the denominator, use the sum of the number of enterprises with all female proprietors and the number of enterprises with all male proprietors. Do not include enterprises with a mix of male and female proprietors or "disaggregates not available".

To avoid double counting, IPs that are reporting on more than one of the indicators listed above should use data from the indicator with the **largest number of participants in the denominator**.

FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

Enter the following data points from the Feed the Future performance indicator used to report on GNDR-2, and FTFMS will automatically calculate the percentage:

1. Number of female program participants (GNDR-2 numerator)
2. Number of male and female program participants (GNDR-2 denominator)

Information on which indicator was used to report on GNDR-2 (Feed the Future indicators and/or custom indicators) should be included as an indicator comment each year in the FTFMS.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

- Where more than one IP is reporting on GNDR-2 in FTFMS, Post teams should attempt to eliminate double-counting in the numerator and denominator prior to calculating the indicator value and entering data in the PPR.

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

This indicator will be considered female participants who received trainings and input support for Demonstration of Homestead Production and VSLA female participants.

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Project-level.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR?** Implementing partners
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Project MIS database
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION and REPORTING :** Quarterly

Indicator Title: EG.3.2-26 Value of annual sales of producers and firms receiving USG assistance [IM-level]

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the value in U.S. dollars of the total amount of sales of products and services by USG-assisted farms and firms during the reporting year within USG-supported agricultural commodity value chains or markets. This indicator also collects additional data points on the value of sales in local currency, the number of activity participants, including the number of producers and the number of assisted private sector firms, and, if applicable, the volume of sales (preferably in metric tons) for agricultural commodities (i.e. seed; food, non-food and feed crops; livestock and livestock products, fish).

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

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

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

Only count sales in the reporting year that are attributable to the USG, i.e. where the USG assisted the individual farmer or firm, or the market actor with which they are engaged directly, and for those value chains/commodities/markets which the USG supports. Sales do not have to take place within a specific geographic area, such as the ZOI.

For assisted farms, sales refer to the value and amount of production that is sold, regardless of where the sales take place.

For assisted firms, sales include the value of goods and services at the point of sale, not when the sale was contracted. Data should be collected directly from all firms who are receiving USG assistance.

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

It is essential that a Baseline Year Sales data point be entered. If data on the total value of sales by participant farms or firms prior to USG-funded activity implementation is not available, do not leave the baseline blank or enter '0'. Use the earliest Reporting Year Sales actual as the Baseline Year Sales.

The number of participants in USG-funded activities often increases over time as the activity rolls out. Unless an activity has

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

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

Products:

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

Services:

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

RATIONALE:

Value (in US dollars) of sales from assisted producers and firms in targeted markets is a measure of the competitiveness of those actors. This measurement also helps track strengthened and expanded access to markets and progress toward engagement by farmers and firms throughout the value chain. Improving markets will contribute to Objective One of Inclusive and Sustainable Agriculture-led Economic Growth, which in turn will reduce poverty and thus achieve the goal. This indicator relates to *IR 2: Strengthened and Expanded Access to Markets and Trade* in the GFSS results framework.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
US Dollar	FIRST LEVEL Type of product or service: choose from list SECOND LEVEL Type of producer/firm (firms are non-farm enterprises): Producer - smallholder, Producer – non-smallholder, Firm – microenterprise, Firm - Small and medium enterprise, Firm- Large enterprise or corporation. *Smallholder Definition: While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land or equivalent units of livestock, i.e. cattle: 10 beef cows; dairy: two milking cows; sheep and*

	goats: five adult ewes/does; camel meat and milk: five camel cows; pigs: two adult sows; chickens: 20 layers and 50 broilers. The farmer does not have to own the land or livestock. *Firm Size Definition. For firms, microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.* THIRD LEVEL Sex of producer or proprietor(s): Male, female, mixed *For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.* Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed *For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups*
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity level, those producers and firms directly assisted by USG
WHO COLLECTS DATAFOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partner
DATA SOURCE:	Data from assisted producers and firms may need to be collected separately. Ideally, this indicator will be collected directly from a census of all participant farms and firms, from recorded sales data and/or farm/firm records. A sample survey-based approach for participant producers within the geographic area reached by the assisted market is also acceptable. Implementing partners or missions should work with assisted firms to ensure that appropriate information is provided.
FREQUENCY OFCOLLECTION:	Annually
BASELINE INFO:	Baseline data reflects value of sales in the year prior to programming and should be collected through records of assisted firms and/or a sample survey of producers via recall.
REPORTING NOTES	
FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES: If a sample survey of participating producers is used to collect data for this indicator, the sample weighted estimate of total baseline or reporting year sales value and volume for all producers under each commodity must be calculated using appropriate	

sample weights before being entered into FTFMS.

Data should be entered in FTFMS disaggregated to the lowest level—i.e. by product/service then by type of producer/firm then by sex and by age under each commodity and type of enterprise.

Partners should enter the **total volume of sales** (metric tons are preferred but partners can select their own units), the **total number of participants** (assisted producers or assisted firms), and the **total value of reporting year sales in USD**.

For example, to report on the value of sales from assisted smallholder farmer in the rice value chain, partners should enter the following information for the reporting year:

Product/Service: Agricultural Commodity: RiceType of Producer/firm: Producer – smallholder

Total value of sales (in US dollars)

- total value of rice sold from plots cultivated by female program participants in US dollars;
- total value of rice sold from plots cultivated by male program participants in US dollars;
- total value of rice sold from plots cultivated by 15-29 year old program participants in US dollars;
- total value of rice sold from plots cultivated by 30+ year old program participants in US dollars.

Total volume of sales

- total volume sold from plots cultivated by female, rice-producing program participants in [selected unit];
- total volume sold from plots cultivated by male, rice-producing program participants in [selected unit];
- total volume sold from plots cultivated by 15-29 year old rice-producing program participants in [selected unit];
- total volume sold from plots cultivated by 30+ year old rice-producing program participants in [selected unit].

Number of participants

- total number of female, rice-producing program participants;
- total number of male, rice-producing program participants;
- total number of 15-29 year old, rice-producing program participants;
- total number of 30+ year old, rice-producing program participants.

To report on value of sales of assisted small enterprises selling fertilizer spraying services to producers, enter the following data points.

Product/Service: Production Support ServicesType of Enterprise: Firm - Small enterprise

Total value of sales (in US dollars)

- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises in US dollars
- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises with all male proprietors in US dollars
- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises with all female proprietors in US dollars
- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises with male and female proprietors (i.e. mixed) in US dollars

- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises with all proprietors aged 15-29 years in US dollars
- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises with all proprietors aged 30+ years in US dollars
- total value of fertilizer spraying services sold by participant small enterprises with proprietors from both age groups (i.e. mixed) in US dollars

Volume of sales

- n/a

Number of participant enterprises

- total number of participant small enterprises with all male proprietors
- total number of participant small enterprises with all female proprietors
- total number of participant small enterprises with male and female proprietors (i.e. mixed)
- total number of participant small enterprises with all proprietors aged 15-29 years
- total number of participant small enterprises with all proprietors aged 30+ years
- total number of participant small enterprises with proprietors from both age groups (i.e. mixed)

Note: Convert local currency to U.S. dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

- FTFMS reporting requires specific commodity to be selected. For PPR reporting, commodities are clustered into commodity groups and reported under these groups.

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

The participants of the SHOUHARDO III Program who are engaged in field crop production, including maize, chili, sweet gourd, rice, and vegetables, as well as those involved in IGA on-farm and CHD (goat, poultry (duck/hen)), are the focus of the program.

- For calculating Value of annual sales, SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity will consider only commodity products (e.g.-maize, chili, sweet gourd , rice, vegetable, goat and Duck/Hen).
- SHOUAHRDO III Plus Activity will calculate Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants.
- In SHOUHARDO III Plus Program, the unit measure for Total Volume of Sales will use in metric ton (data of sale volume will collect from sampled beneficiary farmer/field in kg which eventually will convert to metric ton) and in case of livestock it will be in number.

A third-party firm will conduct the PaBS survey, and the weighted result will be used for indicator reporting.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **WHO COLLECTS**: Third party survey contractor
- **FROM WHOM**: Project participants under FC, IGA on-farm and CHD.
- **METHODS**: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)
- **PREFERED METHOD**: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)

Indicator Title: Custom- Mean decision making score (Index) for woman in household level		
DEFINITION: This indicator provides information on women's decision-making ability and participation in household decision-making. It encompasses a range of choices, such as deciding how to spend money earned by oneself, selling crops, purchasing small items like groceries and toiletries, buying clothes for oneself and children, buying or selling major household assets like land and livestock, purchasing or selling jewelry, using loans or savings, paying for children's education expenses, medical expenses for herself or children, expenses for family planning (contraceptives), moving to shelter during disasters, actively participating in local arbitration decisions, investing credit funds/savings, providing childcare, ensuring continued education for both boys and girls, and participating in social activities, including NGOs.		
CALCULATION: Information will be collected on the following women's decision-making options on key decision area. To measure this indicator, a value will be assigned to each respective area.. 4 = Can decide with husband or other adult male member in the family 3 = Can decide alone 2 = Husband makes decision after discussion with wife 1 = Not involved in decision 0 = Not applicable The mean score of decision making will be calculated from the total surveyed women participants		
UNIT: Mean score	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** Women lives with husband	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): OUTCOME	**Cumulative/Non Cumulative:** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** (+)
DATA COLLECTION METHOD: Sampling Frame: Participants of Value Chain, Agri-Others COG, IGA-Off Farm and Mothers with children U5 month. Frequency of collection: Annual Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS) Data collection instrument(s): Structured Questionnaire Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor		
DATA QUALITY ISSUES: Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A		
MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A		
FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A		

Sub-IR 1.1 Inclusive and sustainable agricultural production

EG.3.2-24: Number of individuals in the agriculture and food system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [activity/implementing mechanism (IM) level]

DEFINITION:

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

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

The indicator tracks those individuals who are changing their behavior while participating in U.S. government-funded activities. Individuals who attended training or were exposed to a new technology do not count under this indicator unless the individual actually applies what he or she learned. For example, if an agriculture extension agent attends a gender-sensitive agriculture extension training, he can be counted under this indicator once he applies what he learned by changing the way he reaches out to and interacts with the female farmers to whom he provides extension services.

Improved management practices or technologies are those promoted by the implementing partner (IP) as a way to increase agriculture productivity or support stronger and better functioning systems. The improved management practices and technologies are agriculture related, including those that address climate change adaptation or climate change mitigation. IPs promoting one or a package of specific management practices and technologies report practices under categories of types of improved management practices or technologies. The indicator should count those specific practices promoted by the activities, not just any improved practice. Even then, baseline values could be quite high, especially if a wide range of practices is included in the list of promoted practices. If that happens, IPs should look at the disaggregated prevalence of individual practices to identify ones that are already widely applied and remove those from the list (and from plans to promote) and recalculate the indicator without the already common practices.

This indicator captures results where they were achieved, regardless of whether interventions were carried out, and results achieved, in the Zone of Influence (ZOI).

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

- Crop genetics: Improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding, higher in nutritional content (e.g., through biofortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice and high-protein maize), and/or more resilient to climate impacts (e.g., drought-tolerant maize or stress -tolerant rice); and improved germplasm.
- Cultural practices: Context-specific agronomic practices that do not fit in other categories, e.g., seedling production and transplantation; and cultivation practices such as planting density, crop rotation, and mounding.
- Livestock management: Improved livestock breeds; livestock health services and products such as vaccines; improved livestock handling practices and housing; improved feeding practices; improved grazing practices; improved waste management practices; improved fodder crop; and cultivation of dual-purpose crops.
- Wild-caught fisheries management: Sustainable fishing practices; improved nets, hooks, lines, traps, dredges, and trawls; and improved hand gathering, netting, angling, spearfishing, and trapping practices.
- Aquaculture management: Improved fingerlings; improved feed and feeding practices; fish health and disease control; improved cage culture; improved pond culture; pond preparation; sampling and harvesting; and management of carrying capacity.
- Natural resource or ecosystem management: Management practices/technologies are promoted with the intention of supporting the sustainable functioning, protection, and management of the natural system and its resources, including soil, water, and biodiversity. These practices or technologies can be land- or water-based and may support producers' productivity directly or indirectly. Some examples include: biodiversity conservation; maintaining or strengthening of ecosystem services, including stream bank management or restoration, reforestation, or afforestation; participatory land use planning; strengthening sustainable use of natural resources (e.g., sustainable fisheries management); woodlot management; and conservation agriculture principles like no till. Community-based, or Indigenous, customary, and traditional management including governance, practices, and user arrangements over land and water areas.
- Pest and disease management: Integrated pest management; improved fungicides; appropriate application of fungicides; improved and environmentally sustainable use of cultural, physical, biological, and chemical insecticides and pesticides; crop rotation; and aflatoxin prevention and control.
- Soil-related fertility and conservation: Integrated soil fertility management; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g., soil organic matter and mulching); improved fertilizer; improved fertilizer use practices; inoculant; and erosion control.
- Irrigation: Drip, surface, and sprinkler irrigation; and irrigation schemes.
- Agriculture water management—non-irrigation-based: Water harvesting; sustainable water use practices; and practices that improve water quality.
- Water resources management (WRM): Practices and technologies are those that improve on-farm water management and efficiency and expanded use of sustainable irrigation approaches, including multiple-use dimensions, as part of broader water resources planning, governance, and finance. This includes incentivizing and expanding access to profitable and efficient

irrigation practices and technologies; promoting on-farm soil, land, and water conservation practices; and supporting improved and equitable WRM within sustainable food production systems. Additionally, practices and technologies that improve water quality, quantity, and flow to enhance agricultural productivity, sustainability, and resilience, while reducing vulnerability to flooding, drought, and chronic water insecurity should be counted. These may include restoration of degraded watershed lands, advancing sustainable land-use practices coupled with efforts to secure tenure, and the use of both green and gray infrastructure. Green infrastructure, such as vegetative buffer strips or wetland construction, utilizes nature-based solutions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, often providing multiple cost-effective benefits. Gray infrastructure refers to conventionally engineered systems, such as dams, seawalls, roads, pipes, or water treatment plants.

- Climate mitigation: Technologies selected because they minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; and practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g., drip irrigation, upgrades of agriculture infrastructure and supply chains).
- Climate adaptation/climate risk management: Technologies promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk to climate impacts and/or minimizing the severity of climate impacts. Examples include adoption of drought- and flood-resistant varieties, adoption of shorter-duration varieties, adjustments to agricultural calendar, crop diversification, agroforestry, and integrated fisheries/agriculture systems; improving wild fisheries management to adapt to a changing climate; use of index insurance and other financing tools, use of weather and climate information, and adoption of risk-management practices; supporting sustainable intensification on higher-quality agricultural or pastoral lands, while protecting and restoring nearby natural ecosystems on vulnerable or marginal lands; etc.
- Post-harvest handling and storage: Improved transportation; decay and insect control; temperature and humidity control; improved quality control technologies and practices; sorting and grading; and sanitary handling practices.
- Food loss and waste (FLW): Reducing food loss (pre- and postharvest) and waste (post farmgate) throughout the food systems from production, processing, and handling to distribution, storage, retail, and consumption is another example of a “climate mitigation” practice, and can include things like: use of natural biocontrol agents (e.g., Aflasafe®) and Good Agricultural Practices (GAP); pasteurization, cold chain, and food preservation techniques (e.g., canning or salt preservation); proper handling practices (e.g., use of personal protective equipment (PPE) such as head/hair cover and raw meat separation); moisture meters and hermetic storage; and applying circular economy methods (e.g., production of Black Soldier Fly Larvae for animal, fish feed or human protein supplements, composting, and using inedible parts of the food (e.g., vegetable stalks and coconut shell/fibers) as feed, compost, for fabric or other textile applications).
- Food safety: Technologies and practices promoted with the explicit objective of preventing and controlling biological, chemical, and physical food safety hazards from production, processing, and handling to distribution, storage, and retail. Examples include use of natural biocontrol agents (e.g., Aflasafe®) and GAP; pasteurization, cold chain, and food preservation techniques (e.g., canning); proper handling practices (e.g., use of PPE such as head/hair cover and raw meat

separation); moisture meters and hermetic storage; application of Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) principles and other risk assessments, including digital traceability; and sanitary and phytosanitary certification.

- Value-added processing: Improved packaging practices and materials, including biodegradable packaging; food and chemical safety technologies and practices; and improved preservation technologies and practices.
- Marketing and distribution: Contract farming technologies and practices; improved input purchase technologies and practices; improved commodity sale technologies and practices; and improved market information system technologies and practices.
- Digitally-enabled: Technologies that incorporate some form of digital technology, including software (such as databases, mobile apps, websites, artificial intelligence, blockchain, and Geographic Information System (GIS) software) and/or hardware (mobile phones, computers, radios, sensors, satellites, autonomous systems, and 3D printers). Examples include individuals using a cloud-based supply chain management system, an Internet-enabled soil sensor, a mobile app that facilitates input purchases, or pest monitoring service that uses artificial intelligence.
- Other: Improved mechanical and physical land preparation; non-market- and non-climate-related information technology; improved recordkeeping; improved budgeting and financial management; improved capacity to repair agricultural equipment; and improved quality of agricultural products or technology.

This indicator endeavors to capture the individuals who have made the decision to apply a particular management practice or technology, not those who have had to do so as a condition of employment or an obligation. For example, if a manager in a company that distributes agriculture produce decides to use refrigerator trucks for transport and plans the distribution route using GIS information to maximize efficiency, both practices that are promoted by the U.S. government-funded activity, the manager is counted as one individual; the five drivers of the newly refrigerated trucks who are driving the new routes are not counted. If the manager and co-owner together decided to apply these new practices, they are counted as two individuals. Another example would be if a franchise offers a new fertilizer mix developed with U.S. government assistance and makes it available to franchisees, yet those franchisees make the decision whether or not to offer it. In this case, both the decision-maker(s) at the franchise level and the franchisees who decide to offer it get counted as individuals applying a new management practice.

It is common for U.S. government-funded activities to promote more than one improved technology or management practice to farmers and other individuals. This indicator allows the tracking of the total number of participants that apply any improved management practice or technology during the reporting year and the tracking of the total number of participants that apply practices or technologies in specific management practice and technology type categories.

- Count the participant if they have applied a management practice or technology promoted with U.S. government assistance at least once in the reporting year. Count the producer participant who applied improved management practices or technologies regardless of the size of the plot on which practices were applied.

- Count each participant only once per year in the applicable "Sex" disaggregate category and "Age" disaggregate category to track the number of individuals applying U.S. government-promoted management practice or technology type. If more than one participant in a household is applying improved technologies, count each participant in the household who does so.
- Under the "Commodity" disaggregate, count each participant once under each commodity for which they apply a U.S. government-promoted management practice or technology type. For example, if a participant uses U.S. government-promoted improved seed for the focus commodities of maize and legume, count that participant once under maize and once under legumes.
- Count each individual once per management practice or technology type once per year under the appropriate "Management practice/technology type" disaggregate. Individuals can be counted under a number of different "Management practices/technology types" in a reporting year.
    - For example:
        - If a participant applied more than one improved technology type during the reporting year, count the participant under each technology type applied.
        - If an activity is promoting a technology for multiple benefits, the participant applying the technology may be reported under each relevant "Management practice/technology type" category. For example, a farmer who is using drought-tolerant seeds could be reported under "Crop genetics" and "Climate adaptation/climate risk management," depending on what purpose(s) or benefit(s) the activity is being promoted to participant farmers. For example, if a private enterprise invested in newer, more efficient machinery to process or otherwise improve the raw product that is also intended to reduce emissions intensities, this practice would be counted under "Value-added processing" and "Climate mitigation."
        - Count a participant once per reporting year regardless of how many times he or she applied an improved practice/technology type. For example, a farmer has access to irrigation through the U.S. government-funded activity and can now cultivate a second crop during the dry season in addition to the rainy season. Whether the farmer applies U.S. government-promoted improved seed to her plot during one season and not the other, or in both the rainy and dry season, she would only be counted once in the "Crop genetics" category under the "Management practice/technology type" disaggregate (and once under the "Irrigation" category).
        - Count a participant once per practice/technology type category regardless of how many specific practices/technologies under that technology type category he or she applied. For example, a project is promoting improved plant spacing and planting on ridges. A participant applies both practices. He or she would only be counted once under the "Cultural practices technology type" category.

IPs may use sales data from assisted firms for some kinds of inputs to estimate the number of producers for indicators EG.3.2-24: Number of individuals in the agriculture and food system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance (activity/IM level), and EG.3.2-

25: Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance (activity/IM level) if they use clearly documented assumptions that are regularly validated through spot surveys or similar methods. For example, an IP working to strengthen the certified soy seed market within a defined market shed in the ZOI could use data on the number and volume of certified soy seed sales by assisted firms during the reporting year to estimate the number of farmers applying certified soy seed (by using a conservative assumption that one sales equals one farmer applying) and hectares under certified seed by assuming a periodically validated planting density. All assumptions underlying the indicator estimates should be documented annually in an indicator comment. However, if an agrodealer gives away seed packs with the purchase of other inputs as a promotion, more validation would be necessary for the IP to assume farmers purchasing the other input are also applying that seed.

If a lead farmer cultivates a plot used for training, e.g., a demonstration plot used for Farmer Field Days or Farmer Field School, the lead farmer should be counted as a participant applying improved practices/technologies for this indicator. In addition, the area of the demonstration plot should be counted under indicator EG.3.2-25. However, if the demonstration or training plot is cultivated by a researcher (a demonstration plot in a research institute, for instance), neither the area nor the researcher should be counted under this indicator or indicator EG.3.2-25.

Participants who are part of a group or members of an organization that apply improved technologies on a demonstration or other common plot should not be counted under this indicator, the area of the common plot should not be counted under indicator EG.3.2-25, and the yield should not be counted under indicator EG.3-10, -11, -12: Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USG assistance (activity/IM level). For cultivated cropland, these three indicators (EG.3.2-24, EG.3.2-25, and EG.3-10, -11, -12) only capture results for land that is individually managed.

This is a snapshot indicator, which is designed to capture individual applications only for the reporting year. Individuals who applied a U.S. government activity-promoted management practice before the intervention constitute the baseline. Individuals that continue to apply the U.S. government activity-promoted management practice during the project period get counted for applying the technology in any subsequent years they apply that technology, even if they were not directly touched by the intervention in the reporting year (if the IP continues to track information on former participants). However, this also means that yearly totals cannot be summed to count applications by unique individuals over the life of the project.

However, there are some cases where group members can be counted under this indicator. For example, as a result of participating in a U.S. government-funded activity, a producer association purchases a dryer and then provides drying services for a fee to its members. In this scenario, any member that uses the dryer service can be counted as applying an improved management practice under this indicator.

Note that the list of practice/technology type disaggregates is broader under this indicator than the list of practice/technology type disaggregates under indicator EG.3.2-25 because this indicator tracks applications of improved practices/technologies beyond those that are applied to a defined land or water area.

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

Improved management practices and technological change and adoption by different actors throughout the agricultural system will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity and supporting stronger and better functioning systems. This indicator falls under IR 1: Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable in the GFSS Results Framework.</td></tr>
<tr><td>UNIT</td><td>DISAGGREGATE BY</td></tr>
<tr><td>Number</td><td>FIRST LEVEL

Value chain actor type:

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

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

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

SECOND LEVEL

Sex: Male; female; neither; disaggregates not available

Age: 15–29; 30+

Management practice or technology type: Crop genetics, cultural practices, livestock management, wild-caught fisheries management, aquaculture management, natural resource or ecosystem management, pest and disease</td></tr>
</table>

	management, soil-related fertility and conservation, irrigation, agriculture water management non-irrigation based, water resources management; climate mitigation; climate adaptation/climate risk management; marketing and distribution; post-harvest handling and storage; food loss and waste; food safety; value-added processing; digitally-enabled; other Commodity (see list on Agrilinks (https://agrilinks.org/FTFinDIS): Activities promoting sustainable intensification or those where multiple commodities are involved (e.g., transportation), where counting participants by commodity is complicated and/or not meaningful are not required to disaggregate participants by commodity, and should use the "Not applicable" category under the "Commodity" disaggregate.
TYPE: Outcome	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- ***LEVEL OF COLLECTION:*** Activity-level, activity participants
- ***WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:*** Implementing partners (IPs)
- ***DATA SOURCE:*** Sample survey of activity participants; census of private sector/government participants; activity records; farm records; reports from activity partners; association records; company/organization records
- ***FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:*** Annually reported.
- ***BASELINE INFO:*** The baseline is the number of participant producers and other actors applying improved management practices or technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.

REPORTING NOTES:

FEED THE FUTURE REPORTING IN DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SOLUTION DIS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

Please note the commodity(ies) must be selected in Feed the Future reporting in DIS to open the cells for data entry. The specific commodity needs to be selected for producers in Feed the Future reporting in DIS. Other value chain actor types need to select "Not applicable" in the commodity selection box on the "Select Indicators and Commodities" screen in Feed the Future reporting in DIS.

If a participant sample survey is used to collect data for this indicator, the sample weighted estimate of the total number of activity participants for each Management Type and for the "Sex," "Age," and "Commodity" disaggregates must be calculated using appropriate sample weights before being entered into Feed the Future reporting in DIS.

For example, an activity is working with smallholder farmers to increase the application of drought-tolerant maize to increase productivity, as well as increase climate adaptation and increase the use of certified seed in soy. The IP would enter the number of individuals under each category as follows after selecting the maize and soy commodities:

Value chain actor type: Smallholder producer

Sex of participant:

- Total number of female smallholder farmer activity participants who are applying drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.
- Total number of male smallholder farmer activity participants who are applying drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.

Age of participant:

- Total number of 15–29-year-old smallholder farmer activity participants who are applying drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.
- Total number of 30+ year-old smallholder farmer activity participants who are applying drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.

Management practice:

- Total number of smallholder farmer activity participants who applied crop genetics practices/technologies (i.e., drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both).
- Total number of smallholder farmer activity participants who applied climate adaptation practices/technologies (i.e., drought-tolerant maize).

Commodity:

Maize:

- Total number of smallholder farmer activity participants who applied drought-tolerant maize.

Soy:

- Total number of smallholder farmer activity participants who applied certified soy seed.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FEED THE FUTURE REPORTING IN DIS AND PERFORMANCE PLAN AND REPORT (PPR) (U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) ONLY):

- Feed the Future reporting in DIS requires the commodity to be selected. For PPR reporting, specific commodities are not disaggregated; commodities are clustered into commodity groups and reported under these groups.
- The Feed the Future Reporting in DIS PPR Module will produce aggregated totals for the indicator and for each disaggregate and commodity group for entry in FACTS Info.

Environmental Contextualization: This indicator is included in the EMMP, therefore it's expected that during the reporting year the beneficiaries will adopt at least one of the following improved technologies and management practices - Pest management, Soil-related (fertility and conservation), Water management, Climate mitigation. Mentioned that SHOUHARDO III plus will not provide training to farmers on improved management practice or technologies. In SHOUHARDO III, the farmers were provided training and awareness rising sessions on pest management practices, based on the USAID / Bangladesh PERSUAP and climate change adaptive agriculture and they will be encouraged to use organic fertilizer, locally made compost and IPM practices.

PaBS survey (conducted by third party) result extrapolated using MIS data

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **WHO COLLECTS**: Third party survey contractor
- **FROM WHOM**: Direct participants of activities to improve agricultural productivity.
- **METHODS**: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)
- **PREFERED METHOD**: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION and REPORTING:** Annual

Indicator Title: EG.3.2-25: Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [activity/implementing mechanism (IM) level]

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the area in hectares where U.S. government-promoted improved management practices or technologies were applied during the reporting year to areas managed or cultivated by participants of a U.S. government-funded activity. Management practices counted are agriculture related, land- or water-based management practices, and technologies in sectors such as cultivation of food or fiber, aquaculture, fisheries, and livestock management, including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. Improved management practices or technologies are those promoted by the implementing partner (IP) as a way to increase producer's and agroecological/natural system productivity and/or resilience.

The application of both intensive and extensive agriculture-related management practices and technologies in different landscapes are captured under the "Type of hectare" disaggregate. The "Type of hectare" disaggregates are: crop land, cultivated pasture, rangeland, conservation/protected area, freshwater or marine ecosystems, aquaculture, and other.[1] Intensive interventions are those where higher levels of inputs, labor, and capital are applied relative to the size of land. Extensive interventions are those where smaller amounts of inputs, labor, and capital are applied relative to the size of land. For example, an intervention working to increase the production of fingerlings in aquaculture is considered intensive, while using improved grazing practices for livestock in a rangeland landscape would be considered extensive. Those interventions carried out on crop land, cultivated pasture, and aquaculture are considered "intensive." Those carried on rangeland, conservation/protected areas, and freshwater or marine ecosystems are considered "extensive." The same area cannot be counted under more than one "Type of hectare" disaggregate category.

This indicator captures results where they were achieved, regardless of whether interventions were carried out, and results achieved, in the Zone of Influence (ZOI).

A management practice or technology can be applied under a number of different hectare types. For example, improved grazing practices could take place in cultivated pasture, rangeland, or conservation and mixed-used landscapes, and climate adaptation/climate risk management interventions can be applied in all hectare types.

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

- Crop genetics: Improved/certified seed that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content (e.g., through biofortification, such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize), and/or more resilient to climate impacts (e.g., drought-tolerant maize or stress-tolerant rice); and improved germplasm.
- Cultural practices: Context-specific agronomic practices that do not fit in other categories, e.g., seedling production and transplantation and cultivation practices such as planting density, crop rotation, and mounding.
- Livestock management: Improved grazing practices; improved fodder crop; and cultivation of dual-purpose crops.
- Wild-caught fisheries management: Sustainable fishing practices.
- Aquaculture management: Pond culture; pond preparation; and management of carrying capacity.
- Natural resource or ecosystem management: Management practices/technologies are promoted with the intention of supporting the sustainable functioning, protection, and management of the natural system and its resources, including soil, water, and biodiversity. These practices or technologies can be land- or water-based and may support producers' productivity directly or indirectly. Some examples include: biodiversity conservation; maintaining or strengthening of ecosystem services, including stream bank management or restoration, reforestation, or afforestation; participatory land use planning; strengthening sustainable use of natural resources (e.g., sustainable fisheries management); woodlot management; and conservation agriculture principles like no till. Community-based, or Indigenous, customary, and traditional management including governance, practices, and user arrangements over land and water areas. An area is considered under improved natural resources management when any one of the following occurs: management planning and actions are informed by local site assessments; stakeholder participation and other best management practices occur; human and institutional capacity is developed; management plan actions are implemented; monitoring and evaluation is established or improved; adaptive management is demonstrated; or on-the-ground management impacts are demonstrated. Note that if management practices and technologies are applied on biologically significant areas, they can also be reported under EG.10.2-2.
- Pest and disease management: Integrated pest management; improved fungicides; appropriate application of fungicides; improved and environmentally sustainable use of cultural, physical, biological, and chemical insecticides and pesticides; crop rotation; and aflatoxin prevention and control during production.
- Soil-related fertility and conservation: Integrated soil fertility management; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels, such as soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g., soil organic matter, mulching); improved fertilizer; improved fertilizer use practices; inoculant; and erosion control.
- Irrigation: Drip, surface, and sprinkler irrigation and irrigation schemes.
- Agriculture water management—non-irrigation-based: Water harvesting; sustainable water use practices; and practices that improve water quality.
- Water resources management (WRM): Practices and technologies are those that improve on-farm water management and efficiency and expanded use of sustainable irrigation approaches, including multiple-use dimensions, as part of broader water resources planning, governance,

and finance. This includes incentivizing and expanding access to profitable and efficient irrigation practices and technologies; promoting on-farm soil, land, and water conservation practices; and supporting improved and equitable WRM within sustainable food production systems. Additionally, practices and technologies that improve water quality, quantity, and flow to enhance agricultural productivity, sustainability, and resilience, while reducing vulnerability to flooding, drought, and chronic water insecurity should be counted. These may include restoration of degraded watershed lands, advancing sustainable land-use practices coupled with efforts to secure tenure, and the use of both green and gray infrastructure. Green infrastructure, such as vegetative buffer strips or wetland construction, utilizes nature-based solutions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, often providing multiple cost-effective benefits. Gray infrastructure refers to conventionally engineered systems such as dams, seawalls, roads, pipes, or water treatment plants.

- Climate mitigation: Technologies selected because they minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; and practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g., drip irrigation).
- Climate adaptation/climate risk management: Technologies promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk to climate impacts and/or minimizing the severity of climate impacts. Examples include adoption of drought- and flood-resistant varieties, adoption of shorter-duration varieties, adjustments to agricultural calendar, crop diversification, agroforestry, and integrated fisheries/agriculture systems; improving wild fisheries management to adapt to a changing climate; use of index insurance and other financing tools, use of weather and climate information, and adoption of risk-management practices; supporting sustainable intensification on higher-quality agricultural or pastoral lands, while protecting and restoring nearby natural ecosystems on vulnerable or marginal lands; etc.
- Food loss and waste (FLW): Reducing food loss (pre- and post-harvest) and waste (post-farmgate) throughout food systems from production, processing, and handling to distribution, storage, retail, and consumption is another example of a “climate mitigation” practice, and can include things like: use of natural biocontrol agents (e.g., Aflasafe®) and Good Agricultural Practices (GAP); pasteurization; moisture meters and hermetic storage; applying circular economy methods (e.g., production of Black Soldier Fly Larvae for animal, fish feed or human protein supplements, composting, and using inedible parts of the food (e.g., vegetable stalks and coconut shell/fibers) as feed, compost, for fabric or other textile applications). The number of hectares could be the hectares where biocontrol is applied to reduce mycotoxin contamination (and thus reduce post-harvest losses); hectares that apply GAP to reduce pre- and post-harvest damage to crops, such as application of irrigation or integrated pest management methods to reduce pest damage, using hermetic storage and drying, moisture detection for agricultural products produced from X hectares to reduce damage and spoilage (pre- and postharvest losses); for livestock, the equivalent of hectares in terms of using best animal husbandry practices to prevent losses (death in livestock and livestock products such as meat, diary, etc.) at pre- and postharvest stages, which includes, but is not limited to, animal health (vaccination, treatment, and disease prevention); dairy pasteurization and cold chain investment. For FLW management, that would be the number of hectares equivalent for Black Soldier Fly farms (or other circular economy methods, such as composting) that are used to manage FLW to prevent it from ending in a landfill emitting methane. Additionally, the post-farm gate practice that will be used to protect tons per hectare from being lost or wasted, such

as cold storage, proper food handling practices (such as use of personal protective equipment and raw meat separation), and food preservation and processing techniques (such as canning, salt preservation, dehydration, freeze drying, etc.) to reduce agricultural products and nutritional quality losses and waste can be counted here.

- Food safety: Technologies and practices promoted with the explicit objective of preventing and controlling biological, chemical, and physical food safety hazards during pre-harvest. Examples include use of natural biocontrol agents (e.g., Aflasafe®) and GAP.
- Digitally-enabled: Technologies that incorporate some form of digital technology, including software (such as databases, mobile apps, websites, artificial intelligence, blockchain, and Geographic Information System (GIS) software) and/or hardware (mobile phones, computers, radios, sensors, satellites, autonomous systems, and 3D printers). Examples include hectares under an improved fertilizer formulation based on digitally-enabled soil maps, hectares with improved contour bunding based on geospatial analysis of agricultural areas (including weather, vegetation, and moisture), and hectares covered by a digitally-enabled index insurance.
- Other: Improved mechanical and physical land preparation.

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

- If a participant applied more than one improved technology during the reporting year, count that area on which the participant applied those technologies under each relevant "Management practice" type applied under the relevant "Hectare" type. However, count the area only once in the applicable "Sex," "Age," and "Commodity" disaggregate categories under the relevant "Hectare" type. This will not result in double counting for the total in Feed the Future reporting in Development Information Solution (DIS).
- If an activity is promoting a single technology for multiple benefits, the area under the technology may be reported under each relevant category under the "Management practice/technology type" disaggregate. For example, drought-tolerant seeds could be reported under "Crop genetics" and "Climate adaptation/climate risk management," depending on what purpose(s) or benefit(s) the activity was promoted.
- If a participant cultivates a plot of land more than once in the reporting year, the area should be counted each time one or more improved management practices/technologies are applied. For example, because of access to irrigation as a result of a U.S. government activity, a farmer can now cultivate two cycles of crops instead of one. If the farmer applies U.S. government-promoted technologies on his or her plot for the two cycles, the area of the plot would be counted twice under this indicator. Note that the farmer would only be counted once under indicator EG.3.2-24: Number of individuals in the agriculture and food system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance (activity/IM level).

If a lead farmer cultivates a plot used for training, e.g., a demonstration plot used for Farmer Field Days or Farmer Field School, the area of the demonstration plot should be counted under this indicator. In addition, the lead farmer should be counted as one individual under indicator EG.3.2-24.

The indicator should count those specific practices promoted by the activities, not any improved practice. Even then, baseline values could be quite high, especially if a wide range of practices is included in the list of promoted practices. If that happens, IPs should look at the disaggregated prevalence of individual practices to identify ones that are already widely applied and remove those from the list (and from plans to promote) and recalculate the indicator without the already common practices.

This is a snapshot indicator, which is designed to capture application on hectares only for the reporting year. Hectares where a U.S. government activity-promoted management practice was applied before the intervention constitutes the baseline. Hectares where the U.S. government activity-promoted management practice is applied during the project period get counted in any subsequent years where that technology is applied. However, this also means that yearly totals cannot be summed to count application on unique hectares over the life of the project.

IPs may use sales data from assisted firms for some kinds of inputs to estimate the number of producers for indicator EG.3.2-24 and indicator EG.3.2-25 Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance (activity/IM level) if they use clearly documented assumptions that are regularly validated through spot surveys or similar methods. For example, an IP working to strengthen the certified soy seed market within a defined market shed in the ZOI could use data on the number and volume of certified soy seed sales by assisted firms during the reporting year to estimate the number of farmers applying certified soy seed (for example, by using a conservative assumption that one sales equals one farmer applying) and hectares under certified seed by assuming a periodically validated planting density. All assumptions underlying the indicator estimates should be documented annually in an indicator comment. However, if an agrodealer gives away seed packs with the purchase of other inputs as a promotion, more validation would be necessary for the IP to assume farmers purchasing the other input would also apply that seed.

Demonstration plots cultivated by researchers (a demonstration plot in a research institute, for instance) should not be counted under this indicator, nor should the researcher be counted under this indicator or indicator EG.3.2-24. The area of a demonstration or common plot cultivated under improved practices or technologies by participants who are part of a group or members of an organization should not be counted under this indicator, the participants should not be counted under indicator EG.3.2-24, and the yield should not be counted under indicator EG.3-10, -11, -12: Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USG assistance (activity/IM level).

For cultivated cropland, these three indicators (EG.3.2-24, EG.3.2-25, and EG.3-10, -11, -12) only capture results for land that is individually managed. If more than one participant is involved in cultivating the same plot of land, the area of the plot should be divided by the number of participants cultivating it. The divided area where the individual applied improved management practices and technologies should then be reported under the appropriate sex and age categories.

Additionally, for “Type of hectare: rangelands”, “conservation/protected areas”, and “freshwater or marine ecosystems” that are communally or group-managed can be reported under this indicator. These cases should be reported in the association-applied category under the “Sex” and “Age” disaggregate. Association-applied would be applicable for landscapes where communities or

organizations develop and adhere to policies regarding management, harvest, protection, etc. Only extensive, agriculture-related management practices and technologies should count as association-applied, and not association-applied management practices and technologies on crop lands, cultivated pasture, or aquaculture.

Type of hectare disaggregates defined as:

- Crop land: Land used for the production of crops for harvest, regardless of whether the crop that was cultivated was harvested or lost. Include home gardens in this category.
- Cultivated pasture: Land where forage crops are primarily grown for grazing.
- Rangelands: Land on which the native vegetation (climax or natural potential plant community) is predominantly grasses, grass-like plants, forbs, or shrubs suitable for grazing or browsing use.
- Conservation/protected areas: Terrestrial areas that are protected because of their recognized, natural, ecological, or cultural values. The protected status may fall into different categories and include strictly protected to those that allow for some limited human occupation and/or sustainable use of natural resources, such as agroforestry, collection of non-timber forest products, etc.
- Fresh-water and marine ecosystems: Aquatic areas that include freshwater, such as lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, springs, and freshwater wetlands, and water with higher salt content, such as salt marshes, mangroves, estuaries and bays, oceans, and marine wetlands.
- Aquaculture: Areas dedicated to the breeding, rearing, and harvesting of aquatic animals and plants for food.
- Other: Areas that do not fit into these categories. Please describe the "Hectare" type in the indicator comment.

RATIONALE:

Improved management practices on agriculture land, in aquaculture, and in freshwater and marine fisheries will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity. This indicator tracks successful application of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity, agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate change. In the GFSS Results Framework, this indicator reports contributions to IR 4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches.

UNIT:	DISAGGREGATE BY:
Hectare	**FIRST LEVEL** Type of hectare: ● Crop land ● Cultivated pasture ● Rangeland ● Conservation/protected area ● Freshwater or marine ecosystems ● Aquaculture ● Other **SECOND LEVEL** Sex: Male; female; neither; association-applied; disaggregates not available Age: 15–29; 30+; association-applied Management practice or technology type (see description, above): Crop genetics; cultural practices; livestock management; wild-caught fisheries management; aquaculture management; natural resource or

	ecosystem management; pest and disease management; soil-related fertility and conservation; irrigation; agriculture water management—non-irrigation based; water resources management; climate mitigation; climate adaptation/climate risk management; food loss and waste; food safety; digitally-enabled; other Commodity (see list in Feed the Future reporting in DIS): Activities promoting sustainable intensification or those where multiple commodities are involved where counting hectares is complicated and not meaningful are not required to disaggregate by commodity, and should use the "Disaggregates not available" category under the "Commodities" disaggregate.
TYPE: Outcome	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity level; only those hectares affected by U.S. government assistance, and only those newly brought or continuing under improved technologies/management during the current reporting year.
WHO COLLECTS DATAFOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	Sample survey of activity participants, activity or association records, reports from activity partners, farm records
FREQUENCY OFCOLLECTION:	Annually reported
BASELINE INFO:	The baseline is the area under improved management practices and technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.
REPORTING NOTES	

FEED THE FUTURE REPORTING IN DIS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

Please note that the commodity must be selected in DIS when aligning the indicator to open the cells for data entry.

If a participant sample survey is used to collect data for this indicator, the sample weighted estimate of the total number of hectares across all participants for each "Management practice" type and "Sex," "Age," and "Commodity" disaggregate under each "Type of hectare" must be calculated using appropriate sample weights before being entered into Feed the Future reporting in DIS.

Missions and IPs need to select the "Type of hectare" first before reporting the number of hectares under the "Sex," "Age," "Commodity," and "Management practice" disaggregates. For those that select "Other" under "Type of hectare," please include in the indicator comment a description of the type of landscape and whether the intervention is intensive or extensive.

For example, an activity is working with smallholder farmers to increase the application of drought-tolerant maize with the intention of promoting increased climate adaptation and increase the use of certified seed in soy. The IP would enter the number of hectares under each category, as follows, after selecting the maize and soy commodities and the crop land "Type of hectare":

Type of hectare: Crop land

Sex of participant:

- Total area cultivated by female smallholder farmer activity participants under drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.
- Total area cultivated by male smallholder farmer activity participants under drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.

Age of participant:

- Total area cultivated by 15–29-year-old smallholder farmer activity participants under drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.
- Total area cultivated by 30+ year-old smallholder farmer activity participants under applying drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both.

Management practice:

- Total area cultivated by activity participants under "Crop genetics" practices/technologies (i.e., drought-tolerant maize, certified soy seed, or both).
- Total area cultivated by activity participants under "Climate adaptation" practices/technologies (i.e., drought-tolerant maize).

Commodity:

Maize:

- Total area cultivated by activity participants under drought-tolerant maize.

Soy:

- Total area cultivated by activity participants under certified soy seed.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FEED THE FUTURE REPORTING IN DIS AND PERFORMANCE PLAN AND REPORT (PPR) (U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) ONLY):

Feed the Future reporting in DIS requires a specific commodity to be selected. For PPR reporting, commodities are clustered into commodity groups and reported under these groups. The DIS PPR Module will produce aggregated totals for the indicator and for each disaggregate and commodity group for entry in FACTS Info.

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

The project defined specific sub-technologies under each Field Crop Technology Type. For this indicator, the program will count hectares of only for those field crop participants (the participants who have been reached in SHOUHARDO III Program) who will practice at least three Technology types during the current reporting year.

To measure this indicator, the program has defined specific sub-technologies under each Field Crop Technology Type. Only those field crop participants who have been reached in the SHOUHARDO III Program and who practice at least three Technology types during the current reporting year will be counted in terms of hectares.

Field Crop Technology Type	Sub- Technology
Crop varieties (genetics)	Improved seeds (certified/truthful labeling)
Cultural Practices	Improved Seedling production and transplantation Planting distance Bed preparation Mulching Integrated Crop Management (ICM)
Pest management	Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Recommended pesticides
Soil-related (fertility and conservation)	Use of recommended fertilizer dose Use of organic manure including compost Green manure Crops residue management
Climate mitigation	Minimum/Zero tillage practices Crop rotation Early planting
Climate Adaptation	Use of drought tolerant crop Use of flood resistant rice varieties Use of climate adaptive technologies
Marketing and distribution	Use of ICT for market production Use of online platform for product marketing
Post-harvest Handling & Storage	Sorting and grading Storage for fare price
Value-Added Processing	Improved packaging practices Improved preservation technologies and practices
Others	Use of farm mechanism Record keeping Business planning

Environmental Contextualization: This indicator is included in the EMMP, therefore it's expected that during the reporting year the beneficiaries will adopt at least one of the following improved technologies and management practices - Pest management, Soil-related (fertility and conservation), Water management, Climate mitigation. Mentioned that SHOUHARDO III plus will not provide training to farmers on improved management practice or technologies. In SHOUHARDO III, the farmers were provided training and awareness rising sessions on pest management practices, based on the USAID / Bangladesh PERSUAP and climate change adaptive agriculture and they will be encouraged to use organic fertilizer, locally made compost and IPM practices.

PaBS survey conducted by third-party firm and the weighted result will be used for indicator reporting.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **WHO COLLECTS**: Third party survey contractor.
- **FROM WHOM**: Project participants under FC, IGA on-farm and CHD.
- **METHODS**: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION and REPORTING:** Annual

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of households reported increased income.		
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the percentage of households that have increased income as a result of SHOUHARDO III plus activity. The income will be increased through engaging in a range of food production activities, such as vegetable production, cereals, fish, poultry, and livestock production as well as engaging in off-farm business.		
CALCULATION: Numerator: The number of farmers/producers who reported an increase in income during the reporting year. Denominator: The total number of farmers/producers. The overall estimate of the indicator will be weighted based on the sample.		
UNIT: Percentage	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** N/A	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**Cumulative/Non-Cumulative:** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):** (+)
DATA COLLECTION METHOD: Sampling Frame: Value chain (VC), Agri-Others and IGA-Off Farm COG participants Frequency of collection: Annual Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS) Data collection instrument(s): Structured questionnaires Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor		
DATA QUALITY ISSUES: The data will be collected through questioning the participants, who will provide their opinions based on their memory since PEP participants do not keep records of their firm's income. Therefore, the accuracy of the data will depend on the experience of the interviewer and their ability to ask questions effectively.		
MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A		
FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A		

Indicator Title: EG.3-10,-11,-12 Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USG assistance [IM-level]

DEFINITION:

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

Yield is calculated automatically at the commodity level in FTFMS from the following data points, reported as totals by commodity across all activity participants, and then disaggregated by farm size for crops or production system for livestock, then by sex and age of the producer:

1. Total Production (TP): Kg, mt, number, or other unit by participants during the reporting period (see preferred units below);
2. Total Units of Production (UP): Area planted in ha (for crops); Area in ha (for aquaculture ponds); Total number of animals in the herd for the reporting year, which can be calculated by collecting the number of animals in the herd at the beginning of the reporting year plus any additional including, births, purchases or those acquired by any other means during the reporting year OR collecting the number of animals in the herd at the end of the year plus the number of animals that died or were offtaken (for live animals); Maximum number of animals in production (for dairy or eggs); Cubic meters of cages (for open water aquaculture) for participants during the reporting year.

Yield is Total Production (TP) / Units of Production (UP), i.e. TP / UP per commodity.

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

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

The preferred units for TP by commodity type are:

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

The required units for UP by commodity type are:

- Crops: hectare
- Tree crops: hectare is recommended[2] 17T
- Pond aquaculture: hectare of surface area
- Cage aquaculture: cubic meter of cage
- Dairy: maximum number of milking animals during the reporting year
- Eggs: maximum number of producing hens during the reporting year
- Livestock: total number in herd, flock, or other group during the reporting year

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

Rangelands (pastoral, transhumant, agro-pastoral, silvo-pastoral, and extensive grasslands)

- Livestock and livestock-crop systems in which production is ***extensive with low stocking rates*** (typically <10 TLUs per hectare) and there is ***a degree of herd mobility in the grazing system*** beyond the farm for at least part of the production cycle.
- Typically in arid and semi-arid zones, with rainfall dependent (forage) growing seasons less than 180 days per year.

Mixed crop-livestock (ruminants, pigs and poultry and small stock such as rabbits and guinea pigs and animals kept principally for traction including oxen, buffalo and equids)

- Integrated crop and livestock production where ***crop and livestock systems rely on one another for inputs and exist in a fixed rural location***, typically a small holding or farmstead. For example, a system where at least some of the livestock feed comes from crop residues and by-products produced on-farm.

Urban/peri-urban (including poultry, small scale dairy, small and large ruminants, pigs, micro-stock, small scale fattening operations)

- Livestock are kept in ***close proximity to human population centers.*** Land holdings are small ***and/or include confined, caged and landless production systems***
- Small to medium scale, variable levels of intensification (from a single animal to a mid-sized enterprise such as a small peri-urban cow dairy or small-scale fattening operator).
- Production may target home consumption, local markets or both.

Intensive/ commercial production (large pig and poultry production units, also includes ruminant fattening, large dairying and large-scale dry lots)

- Operate at ***considerable scale and are highly commercialized*** with significant financial investments and technical inputs in specialized housing, feeding, animal health and marketing approaches.
- Animals are typically housed and fed formulated, nutritionally balanced rations.

(Scale of operation, level of technical inputs and capital investment distinguishes from the urban/peri-urban category).

Yield targets should be entered at the commodity level, then at the farm size (crops) or production system (livestock) level, and then at the sex and age level under each commodity. Targets do not need to be set for the TP and UP data points.

For the crop, fish, dairy and egg value chains, absolute yield values for yield at the IM-level and yield at the ZOI-level (which is indicator EG.3-h) aren't comparable due to different periods of recall and the methods of computation; however, trends in changes over time may be similar.

For cultivated cropland, these three indicators (EG.3.2-24, EG.3.2-25, and EG.3-10, -11, -12) only capture results for land that is individually managed.

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

- For tree crops, Number of hectares is recommended as UP, however, Number of trees can also be selected for UP. FTFMS does not have the capability to convert and aggregate across the different UPs.

RATIONALE:

Improving the yield for farm commodities contributes to increasing agricultural GDP, can increase income when other components of agricultural productivity are in place (e.g., post-harvest storage, value addition and processing, markets), and can therefore contribute to the IR of increasing sustainable productivity and the goal indicator of reducing poverty. Yield of farms, fisheries, and livestock is a key driver of agricultural productivity and can serve as a proxy of the overall productivity of these value chains and the impact of interventions when the trend is evaluated over a series of years, and/or appropriate covariates such as inter-annual weather conditions are included in the analysis. In the GFSS Results Framework, this indicator measures Intermediate Result 1: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches.

UNIT: Preferred TP units of measure: Crops: metric tons Pond aquaculture: kilograms Cage aquaculture: kilograms Milk: liters of milk Eggs: number of eggs Live animals: kilograms of animal offtake. *These TP units of measure are preferred, however, in FTFMS users can select a different unit of measure for TP under the drop-down box or select "other" if needed. If conversion factors are available, FTFMS will convert other units of measure to the preferred TP unit of measure.* Required UP units of measure: Crops: hectare Tree crops: hectare is recommended Pond aquaculture: hectare Cage aquaculture: cubic meter of cage Milk: maximum number of milking animals Eggs: maximum number of producing hens Live animals: total number in herd, flock, or other group.	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* For crops: FIRST LEVEL Commodity: see commodity list in FTFM SSECOND LEVEL Farm size: Smallholder, Non-smallholder THIRD LEVEL Sex: Male, female Age: 15-29, 30+ *While country-specific definitions may vary, use the Feed the Future definition of a smallholder crop producer, which is one who holds 5 hectares or less of arable land. The farmer does not have to formally own the land.* For aquaculture: FIRST LEVEL Commodity: see commodity list in FTFM SSECOND LEVEL Sex: Male, female Age: 15-29, 30+ For livestock, dairy, and eggs: FIRST LEVEL Commodity: see commodity list in FTFM SSECOND LEVEL Production system: Rangelands; mixed crop-livestock; urban/peri-urban; and intensive/commercial production THIRD LEVEL Sex: Male, female Age: 15-29, 30+
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Stable and/or increasing is better
MEASUREMENT NOTES:	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity-level, activity participants, targeted commodity/fisheries/livestock products
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	Participant farmer/fisher/rancher sample surveys[16]; data collection through producer organizations or farm records, routine activity records, as well as data collection through producer

	organizations or farm records.
FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:	Annually, recommended to collect as close to post-harvest to optimize recall
BASELINE INFO:	Baselines are required. Baseline data reflects the yield of targeted commodities in the year prior to programming. If that information is not available, yield information collected during the activity's first year can serve as baseline.

REPORTING NOTES:

FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

If a sample survey of activity participants is used to collect yield data points, the sample weighted estimate of the total across all participants must be calculated for each data point using appropriate sample weights before being entered into FTFMS.

Partners must also enter the number of participants in the activity, disaggregated by commodity and then sex and age of the participant producer. Participants should only be counted once under each commodity regardless of the number of production cycles for the commodity in the reporting year.

Data should be entered in FTFMS disaggregated to the lowest level. Partners should enter **total production (TP)**, **total units of production (UP)**, and **total number of participants**, disaggregated by commodity, then by farm size (for crops) or production system (for livestock, dairy, eggs), then by sex and by age. This procedure applies for each commodity. These disaggregations are required since the most meaningful interpretation and use of yield information is at the specific commodity level, including the comparison of yield obtained by female and male producers. FTFMS will calculate commodity-specific yield automatically.

For example, to report on the yield for maize for small-holder activity participants, partners should enter the following information for the reporting year:

Commodity: Maize

Farm size: Small-holder

Number of participants

- total number of female, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total number of male, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total number of 15-29 year old, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total number of 30+ year old, maize-producing small-holder activity participants.

Total production

- total production in mt on plots managed by female, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total production in mt on plots managed by male, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total production in mt on plots managed by 15-29 year old maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total production in mt on plots managed by 30+ year old maize-producing small-holder activity participants.

Units of production

- total hectares in production managed by female, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total hectares in production managed by male, maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total hectares in production managed by 15-29 year old maize-producing small-holder activity participants;
- total hectares in production managed by 30+ year old maize-producing small-holder activity participants.

Yield would then be calculated as mt / ha of maize.

To report on the yield of cattle managed in a mixed crop-livestock production system, partners should enter the following data points:

Commodity: Cattle, live

Production system: mixed crop-livestock production system

Number of participants

- total number of female, cattle-managing activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total number of male, cattle-managing activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total number of 15-29 year old, cattle-managing activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total number of 30+ year old, cattle-managing activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system.

Total production

- total kg of cattle offtake managed by female activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total kg of cattle offtake managed by male activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total kg of cattle offtake managed by 15-29 year old activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total kg of cattle offtake managed by 30+ year old activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;

Units of production

- total number of cattle in the herd (in the reporting year) managed by female activity participants in the mixed crop- livestock production system;
- total number of cattle in the herd (in the reporting year) managed by male activity participants in the mixed crop- livestock production system;
- total number of cattle in the herd (in the reporting year) managed by 15-29 year old activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system;
- total number of cattle in the herd (in the reporting year) managed by 30+ year old activity participants in the mixed crop-livestock production system.

Yield would then be calculated as kgs of offtake / total number in herd of cattle.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

Yield at the IM-level is no longer a PPR indicator. Target Country Missions should include, at a minimum, custom yield indicators in the PPR for the same commodities for which ZOI-level data are collected.

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

DATA SOURCE: A third-party firm will conduct the PaBS survey, and the weighted result will be used for indicator reporting.

DATA ANALYSIS: The survey sampling methodology will adhere to the proposed approach in the activity M&E plan. The SHOUHARDO III Plus program, aims to promote seven commodities (Maize, Chili, Sweet Gourd, Rice, Vegetables, Goats, and Ducks) among seven distinct groups of commodity farmers, who were previously reached in the SHOUHARDO III program. As a result, the sample selection process must be performed separately for two sampling frames - Value Chain and Agri-others - for each of the seven commodities

The program will track the number of participants for specific commodities in both the Value Chain and Agri-others categories, which were identified through a value chain analysis conducted by an external consultant. These commodities include:

- Value chain (Maize, Chili, Sweet gourd, Goat (livestock), Duck (poultry)
- Agri-Others (Rice and Vegetable)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **WHO COLLECTS**: Third party survey contractor.
- **FROM WHOM**: Project participants under FC, IGA on-farm and CHD
- **METHODS**: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION and REPORTING?** ANNUAL

Sub-IR 1.2 Increased opportunities for diverse economic activities and income sources

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of individuals income source increased.		
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the percentage of households that have increased income as a result of SHOUHARDO III plus activity. The income will be increased through engaging in a range of food production activities, such as vegetable production, cereals, fish, poultry, and livestock production as well as engaging in non-farm business. Participant's income will be increased due to increased production as a result of quality inputs along with adoption of improved management practices facilitated by LSPs, Government providers and Private sectors. Non-Farm income will be increased due to improvement of participants business service development including market linkages facilitated by the program.		
CALCULATION: This indicator counts a number of individuals who have been engaged in new off farm activities or increased income sources.		
UNIT: Number	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** Sex: Male, Female	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Output	**Cumulative/Non-Cumulative :** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):** (+)
DATA COLLECTION METHOD: Sampling Frame: Value chain (VC), Agri-Others and IGA-non Farm COG participants Frequency of collection: Annual Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS) Data collection instrument(s): Structured questionnaires Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor		
DATA QUALITY ISSUES: The data will be collected through questioning the participants, who will provide their opinions based on their memory since PEP participants do not keep records of their firm's income. Therefore, the accuracy of the data will depend on the experience of the interviewer and their ability to ask questions effectively.		
MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A		
FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A		

Sub-IR 1.3 Enhanced access for producers to inclusive markets

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of poor & extreme poor (PEP) households accessing markets.
DEFINITION: PEPs accessing any local markets to sell products or purchases inputs (seed, fertilizer, raw materials etc.).

CALCULATION: Numerator: Number of households who sell products or buy inputs from the local markets (sampled) Denominator: A total number of producers (samples). The indicator overall estimate will be sample weighted.		
UNIT: Percentage	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** N/A	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**Cumulative/Non –Cumulative:** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):** (+)
Data Collection Method: Sampling Frame: VC and Agri-Others COG participants. Frequency of collection: Annual Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS) Data collection instrument(s): Structured questionnaires Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor		
DATA QUALITY ISSUES • Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A		
MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: The activity will facilitate agricultural service and technologies through LSPs and facilitate linkage with input and output markets. At the end of each FY participants will be asked to know whether they have access to market. Sell products or purchases inputs are proxy of the indicator for accessing market.		
FURTHER GUIDANCE:		

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of farmers received service from USG supported Local Service Providers
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the Percentage of people (both PEP and Non-PEP) who received service from local service providers (LSPs) during the last 12 months. **Local Service Provider (LSP):** In line with service provisioning model, SHOUHARDO III program developed a seven type of local service providers (LSPs) in the program's hard-to-reach areas to get accessible different types of services for the community people (both PEP and Non-PEP). To strengthen service provisioning and quality service delivery, SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity continue facilitate skill development and linkage building initiatives with the following LSPs for ensuring sustain Agriculture on-farm and off-farm and health and nutrition services for those underserved people. 1. Community-based vaccinator (LSP) 2. Seed Agent 3. Fish Fry Hawker 4. Collector 5. Shanchoy Sathi/Village Agent (VA) 6. Private Community Skilled Birth Attendants (PCSBA) 7. Blue Star Provider

LSP Services:
Vaccinator/ Seed Agent/ fish fry hawker are developed for ensuring agricultural support to the community people. Vaccinator ensure livestock & poultry vaccination, Seed Agent ensure supply quality seed and fish fry hawker ensure supply quality fingerling. They also provide technical knowledge on livestock rearing/agriculture/fisheries in line with their service provision. A Collector who collect produces from farm gate and sell to distant market and advice farmers regarding market demand.

Private Community Skilled Birth Attendance (PCSBA) and Blue Star Providers (BSP) are developed for ensuring health and nutrition services to the community people for those underserved areas. The focus of PCSBA is to ensure birth assistance, antenatal and postnatal care (ANC/PNC), essential new born care (ENC), primary health care (PHC), growth monitoring and promotion (GMP) and nutrition counseling. On the other hand, the focus of BSP is almost same, such as PHC, GMP, family planning (FP) injectable service.

People in the community are receiving services from the Sanchay Sathi. These services includes facilitation of community savings group and buying other goods and services from the Sanchay Sathi as well as sell their products to the Sanchay Sathi.

CALCULATION: If people received, at least one service (regardless of type of services) from any of the program promoted LSPs listed above; then these participants will be counted under this indicator.
Numerator: Total number of people received service from LSPs
Denominator: Total number of surveyed people. The indicator overall estimate will be sample weighted.

UNIT: Percentage	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** NA	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**Cumulative/Non-Cumulative:** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):** +

DATA COLLECTION METHOD:
Sampling Frame: Participants of VC, Agri-Others COG, IGA-Off Farm, Mother with children U5 & Non-PEP participant
Frequency of collection: Annually
Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PABS) (Additional sample from Non PEP (non participants) will be considered to collect data on this indictor)
Data collection instrument(s): Structure questionnaire
Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor

DATA QUALITY ISSUES:
- Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A

FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of LSP received service from private companies

DEFINITION:
This indicator counts the number of local service providers (LSPs), specifically Community-based vaccinators and Seed Agents, who have received services from private sectors in the past 12 months.

These services could include technical, logistic, on-the-job coaching, and referral support, among others.

In addition to ensuring sustained capacity, this program aims to build the capacity of local service providers (LSPs) and connect them with various private sector organizations so that they can communicate with them, and place their demand for getting technical assistance, logistical support, on job coaching, suggestion/guidance or referral support for improve service quality and meet demand of community.

Local Service Provider (LSP): In SHOUHARDO III Plus areas, the program facilitates Community-based vaccinators and Seed Agents as local service providers (LSPs) to provide accessible on-farm agriculture services to community members, including both PEP and Non-PEP individuals.

The Community-based vaccinators are responsible for ensuring livestock and poultry vaccination, while the Seed Agents ensure the supply of quality seeds. In addition to their service provision, both groups of LSPs provide technical knowledge on livestock rearing and agriculture practices to the community

Private Sector: The private sector is the part of the economy that is run by individuals and companies for profit and is not state controlled. Therefore, it encompasses all for-profit businesses that are not owned or operated by the government.

In order to strengthen local service provision, the program has established collaborations with private sector companies such as Lalteer Seeds, A R Malik Seed, Metal Agro Ltd., Square Agrovet Division, ACI Animal Health, Aftab Bohumukhi Farms Ltd., ACI Agribusiness, ASPIRE, Bengal Meat, Ayesha Abed Foundation, and Social Marketing Company.

CALCULATION:
Count number of LSPs that received any kind of assistance from relevant private sectors based on their needs.

UNIT: Number	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** LSP type.	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**Cumulative/Non-Cumulative:** Non-Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-): +**

DATA COLLECTION METHOD:
Sampling Frame: N/A
Frequency of collection: Quarterly
Method of collection: Routine Monitoring
Data collection instrument(s): RMTS
Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Implementing Partners

DATA QUALITY ISSUES:

- Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A

FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A

Sub-IR 1.4 Improved access to financial services.

Indicator Title: EG.4.2-7 Number of individuals participating in USG-assisted group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs [IM-level]	
DEFINITION: This indicator tracks individual participation in group-based savings, microfinance, or lending programs. This performance indicator, along with the similar ZOI indicator, tracks financial inclusion. Group-based savings programs are formal or informal community programs that serve as a mechanism for people in poor communities with otherwise limited access to financial services to pool their savings. The specific composition and function of the savings groups group vary and can include rotating loan disbursement. The definition is inclusive of all of the different types of group-based savings programs. According to the World Bank, microfinance can be defined as approaches to provide financial services to households and micro-enterprises that are excluded from traditional commercial banking services. Typically, these are low-income, self-employed or informally employed individuals, with no formalized ownership titles on their assets and with limited formal identification papers [1] [2]. This indicator captures the uptake of financial services by the participants of USG-funded activities. It should be noted that the indicator captures the numbers who are participating but does not say anything about the intensity of participation. Furthermore, while summing the number of individuals participating in savings and credit programs is acceptable as a measure of financial inclusion, saving and credit are functionally different and the numbers participating in each type of program should not be compared against each other. Savings groups have added benefits, like fostering social capital, that also contribute to resilience and a household's ability to manage risk and protect their well-being. [1] For more on microfinance please refer to the World Bank working paper on microfinance. [2] World Bank FINDEX http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/globalfindex	
RATIONALE: Access to group-based savings, microfinance, or lending programs is one pathway to a household's financial inclusion. Access to financial services is important for households to diversify their livelihood strategies, protect well-being outcomes and manage risks. This indicator links to IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses in the GFSS Results Framework.	
UNIT: *Number*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sex: Female, Male Age: 15-29, 30+ Product Type: Savings, Credit Duration: **New** *(participated in a savings, micro-finance or lending program for the first time in the reporting year);* **Continuing** *(participated in a savings, micro-finance or lending program in a previous reporting year and continues to participate in a savings, micro-finance or lending program in the current reporting year)*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity level, Activity participants
WHO COLLECTS DATAFOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	Participant-based survey, activity records
FREQUENCY OFCOLLECTION:	Annually
BASELINE INFO:	Baseline is zero
REPORTING NOTES	
FTFMS Data Entry Notes: If someone participates in both savings and credit programs they should be counted for both of the product type disaggregates, but only once for the age and sex disaggregates.	
CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES: The program will facilitate Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) in SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity community (Adult Male, Adult Female, Adolescent Boy and Adolescent Girl). Member of the VSLA will count under this indicator. While reporting Age disaggregated participant number, adolescent girls and adolescent boys (Age 13-17 defined by program) will fall under unique individuals 15-29 years age bar. As the program is intended to leverage other formal channel of financial services to avail by the program participants, thus, significant number of participants may save and lend through formal financial services. However, these will not capture in the reports to keep the report simple. **MEASUREMENT NOTES:** • **WHO COLLECTS**: Implementing partners • **FROM WHOM**: VSLA participants • **METHOD**: Routine monitoring • **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION** and **REPORTING** : Quarterly	

Sub-IR 1.5 Access to information technologies for producers and vulnerable groups enhanced

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of farmers who report access to market information in last 12 months
DEFINITION: The program developed local agricultural input providers (micro seed retailers/dealers for seed, fish fry hawker for fingerling, vaccinator for animal vaccine) and formed village entrepreneur forum with village level input/service providers related to agricultural production for quality services. Farmers will get quality input with technical information along with input and output market from those providers. For this indicator, program will consider farmers who get input and output market information for their production business in last 12 months from the LSPs.
CALCULATION: Numerator: Number of farmers who get input and output market information from LSP in past 12 months.

Denominator: Total number of farmers interviewed.		
UNIT: Percentage	**DISAGGREGATE BY: Male and Female**	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**Cumulative/Non** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):** (+)
DATA COLLECTION METHOD: Sampling Frame: On farm participants Frequency of collection: Annual Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS) Data collection instrument(s): Structured questionnaires Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor		
DATA QUALITY ISSUES: Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):		
MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES:		
FURTHER GUIDANCE:		

Intermediate Result 2: Improved and sustained nutritional status of children under five years of age, pregnant, and lactating women and adolescent girls

Indicator Title: HL.9-1 Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]

DEFINITION:

Children under 5: Children under 5 years are those zero to 59 months of age. They are often targeted by United States Government (USG)-supported activities with nutrition objectives.

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

1. Social and behavior change communication (SBC) interventions that promote essential infant and young child feeding (IYCF) behaviors including, but not limited to, the following:
    - Exclusive breastfeeding for six months after birth
    - Continued breastfeeding until at least age two
    - Age-appropriate complementary feeding of children 6 to 23 months of age (including meeting minimum dietary diversity and appropriate frequency, amount, and consistency)
    - Hygienic preparation and feeding of food to a young child
    - Appropriate responsive feeding of young children
2. Vitamin A supplementation in the past 6 months
3. Zinc supplementation during episodes of diarrhea

4. Multiple Micronutrient Powder (MNP) supplementation
5. Admitted for treatment of severe acute malnutrition
6. Admitted for treatment of moderate acute malnutrition
7. Direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products (i.e. CSB+, Supercereal Plus, etc.)

Children reached: Children are often reached through interventions that target adults such as mothers and caretakers. If, after birth, the child benefits from the intervention, then the child should be counted, regardless of the primary recipient of the information, counseling, or intervention. For example, if a project provides counseling on complementary feeding to a mother, then the child should be counted as reached. Implementers should not count a child as reached during pregnancy. There is a separate standard indicator that enumerates the number of pregnant women reached (HL 9.3).

A child reached directly or via a caretaker should be counted if s/he receives a product, participates in an intervention, or accesses services from a USG-supported activity during the reporting year.

A child should not be counted as reached if the mother or caretaker was solely exposed to a mass media or social media behavior change campaign such as radio, video, or television messages. However, projects should still use mass communication interventions to reinforce SBC messages. Children reached through community drama or community video should only be counted if their caregivers participated in a small group discussion or other interactive activity along with it.

If the USG is supporting a nutrition activity that is purchasing nutrition commodities (e.g. vitamin A, zinc, MNPs) or providing "significant" support for the delivery of the supplement, then the child should be counted as reached. Significant is defined as: a reasonable expectation that the intervention would not have occurred in the absence of USG funding.

Projects that support growth monitoring and promotion (GMP) interventions should report children reached under the SBC disaggregate (#1).

Double counting across disaggregates: A child can be counted under more than one intervention disaggregate if s/he receives more than one intervention, but double counting should be eliminated when calculating the total number of children reached. In order to avoid double counting , the implementing partner (IP) should follow a two-step process:

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

USAID only: To avoid double counting across all USG funded activities, the Mission should estimate the overlap between the different activities before reporting the aggregate number in the PPR.

The sex disaggregates must sum to the total number of children reached.

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

There are three nutrition PPR indicators (HL 9.1, HL 9.2, HL 9.3) that seek to measure children and pregnant women reached. These indicators measure various age groups and interventions in the critical 1,000 day period of life from pregnancy to age two, as well as key interventions reaching children under five years of age. There is some degree of overlap in individuals reached across these indicators. IPs are allowed to double count children and mothers/caretakers reached across these PPR indicators since they seek to measure different underlying constructs.

USAID Reporting Notes: Missions and IPs that have a strong justification may opt out of the requirement to disaggregate this indicator into the seven interventions. For example, Operating Units may opt out if IPs rely on the government health system to collect this data and these disaggregates are not included in that system. The reason should be noted in the online PPR reporting database (via the indicator narrative). In this case, Missions may report the total number of children under five reached. If only some disaggregates are available, then Missions should report both the total number and the number for each available disaggregate. Sex disaggregates are required and should be calculated using available program or government health information system data on actual services provided. If data on sex disaggregates are not available (e.g. not collected by the government system), this should be noted in the indicator narrative and population estimates can be used (only when program or government system data are not available).

Note for Feed the Future target countries: Values reported should reflect countrywide results in Feed the Future target countries; results should not be restricted to only those achieved in the Feed the Future Zone of Influence.

Note: The previous version of this indicator (indicator number *3.1.9-15*) allowed projects to count the number of "contacts" rather than the number of individual children reached. The indicator now requires that numbers of unique children are reported, and not number of contacts. Moreover, the previous version of this indicator did not require disaggregation by type of intervention. All OUs for which it is applicable should report against this indicator.

RATIONALE:

Good coverage of evidence-based nutrition-specific interventions among children under five years of age is essential to prevent and treat malnutrition and to improve child survival. Undernutrition is an underlying cause of 45 percent of childhood deaths. This indicator measures the progress of USAID's Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy (2014-2025) and is linked to Intermediate Result (IR) 8 (Increased use of nutrition specific services) of the Global Food Security Strategy results framework. It also supports reporting and measurement of achievements for the following: Acting on the Call Annual Reports; Feed the Future Progress Reports; International Food Assistance Report; and Feed the Future and Global Health annual Portfolio Reviews.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Sex: Male, Female Intervention: ● Number of children under 5 whose parents/caretakers received social and behavior change communication interventions that promote essential infant and young child feeding behaviors ● Number of children 6-59 months who received vitamin A supplementation in the past 6 months ● Number of children under 5 who received zinc supplementation during episodes of diarrhea ● Number of children under 5 who received Multiple Micronutrient Powder (MNP) supplementation ● Number of children under 5 who were admitted for treatment of severe acute malnutrition

	● Number of children under 5 who were admitted for treatment of moderate acute malnutrition ● Number of children under 5 who received direct food assistance FTFMS will produce aggregated totals for the Indicator and for each Disaggregate for entry in FACTSInfo.
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity-level, activity participants, only those children reached by USG intervention
WHO COLLECTS DATAFOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	Activity records/program data, regular monitoring systems such as registration/attendance lists during activities or unique identifier cards, government health information systems, or participant surveys. In cases where multiple IPs are operating in the same area and participants are counted as reached through different monitoring systems, we encourage the use of coordinated annual surveys between the IPs with shared costs to increase the ability of the Mission to adjust for double counting. If the IP has a list of participants, data may be collected through a participant-based survey and indicator values computed as sample-weighted totals.
FREQUENCY OFCOLLECTION:	Annually
BASELINE INFO:	Baseline is zero
REPORTING NOTES	

FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

- Enter the unique number of children reached during the reporting year by sex, and FTFMS will produce aggregated totals for the indicator and for each disaggregate for entry in FACTSInfo.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

To avoid double counting across all USAID-funded activities, Missions should estimate the overlap between the different activities before reporting the aggregate number in the PPR.

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

For this indicator program will consider two data point i.e. IYCF Counselling and vitamin A supplementation

IYCF Counselling:

The program will consider the number of children under the age of two (U2) whose mothers received Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) Counselling from Private Community Skilled Birth Attendants (PCSBAs) or Blue Star Providers within the SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity area. Data will be gathered quarterly from the registers maintained by PCSBAs and Blue Star Providers

Vitamin A:

SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity will assist the front-line staff of the Ministry of Health and Family Planning Welfare (MoH&FW) department, as well as Local Service Providers (PCSBA, BSP), in providing support on

vitamin A supplementation to children aged 6-59 months. Following the completion of each round of vitamin A supplementation, field staff will collect data with the assistance of the LSPs.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION?** Mothers of U2 child received counselling and U5 children received vitamin A.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? I**mplementing partners.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Routine monitoring
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION and REPORTING :** Quarterly

Indicator Title: HL.9-3 Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]

DEFINITION:

Pregnant women: This indicator captures the reach of interventions that are targeted toward women during pregnancy, intended to contribute to the health of both the mother and the child, and to positive birth outcomes. A separate standard indicator will count the number of children under two reached by United States Government (USG)-supported programs (*HL.9-2 Number of children under two (0- 23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]*).

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

1. Iron and folic acid (IFA) supplementation
2. Individual or small group counseling on maternal and/or child nutrition
3. Calcium supplementation
4. Multiple micronutrient supplementation
5. Direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products (e.g. CSB+, Supercereal Plus)

Women reached: Nutrition interventions for women are often delivered at the facility level, included in the package of antenatal care (ANC), but they may also be delivered through community-level platforms, such as care groups or community health extension activities. IFA supplementation is a commonly implemented intervention for pregnant women, often with broad coverage. Ideally, however, pregnant women should receive nutrition interventions beyond IFA, within a comprehensive ANC program informed by the local epidemiology of nutrient deficiencies. A woman is reached with IFA if she receives the IFA according to national guidelines regardless of the number of days she adheres. If a woman only receives iron or only folic acid, she would not be counted as reached.

If the IP contributes to "supply" side activities (e.g. procuring the commodity), then the women reached through these interventions can be counted as reached. If the activities, however, only contribute to "demand" creation (e.g. social and behavior change (SBC) messaging), then they should not be counted under this indicator.

The nutrition interventions during pregnancy listed above affect neonatal health outcomes such as low birth weight, small for gestational age, preterm birth, and other negative birth outcomes. Nevertheless, pregnant women reached by these interventions should be counted under this indicator, and not counted as a "child reached" under the two other nutrition PPR indicators: (1) *HL.9-1: Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs*; (2) *HL.9-2: Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USG-supported programs*.

Double counting across disaggregates: Women can be double-counted across the intervention disaggregates if they receive more than one intervention, but a unique number of women reached must be entered into the age disaggregates. The age disaggregates must sum to the total number of pregnant women reached. In order to avoid double counting across interventions, the implementing partner (IP) should follow a two-step process:

1. First, count each pregnant woman by the type of intervention. For example a woman who receives IFA and who also receives nutrition counseling should be counted twice, once under each intervention;
2. Second, eliminate double counting when estimating the total number of pregnant women reached and when disaggregating by age group. The IP should estimate the overlap between the different types of interventions. For example, if 100 women receive comprehensive facility-based ANC and 20 of those women are also participants in a community-based nutrition SBC program, the total number of pregnant women reported in aggregate is only 100, not 120.

USAID only: To avoid double counting across all USAID funded activities, the Mission should estimate the overlap between the different activities before reporting the aggregate number in the PPR.

There are three nutrition standard indicators (HL 9.1, HL 9.2, HL 9.3) that seek to measure children, pregnant women, and/or caretakers reached, as well as the types of interventions received. These indicators measure various age groups and interventions in the critical 1,000 day period of life from pregnancy to age two, as well as key interventions reaching children under five years of age. There is some degree of overlap in individuals reached across these indicators. IPs are allowed to double count children and mothers/caretakers reached across these PPR indicators since they seek to measure different underlying constructs.

USAID Reporting notes: Missions and IPs who have a strong justification may opt out of the requirement to disaggregate this indicator into the five interventions. For example, Operating Units (OUs) may opt out if IPs rely on the government health system to collect this data and these disaggregates are not included in that system. The reason should be noted in the online PPR reporting database (via the indicator narrative). In this case, Missions may report the total number of pregnant women reached. If only some disaggregates are available then Missions should report both the total number and the number for each available disaggregate. The Mission and IPs should disaggregate this indicator by intervention in addition to age (number of women < 19, number of women >+ 19) to determine the extent to which projects are reaching this vulnerable adolescent population. Age disaggregates are required and should be calculated using available program or government health information system data.

Note for Feed the Future target countries: Values reported should reflect countrywide results in Feed the Future target countries; results should not be restricted to only those achieved in the Feed the Future Zone of Influence.

RATIONALE:

The 1,000 days between pregnancy and a child's second birthday are the most critical period to ensure optimum physical and cognitive development. Good coverage of nutrition-specific interventions among pregnant women is essential to prevent both child and maternal undernutrition and to improve survival. Undernutrition is an underlying cause in 45 percent of childhood deaths. Part of this burden can be alleviated through maternal nutrition interventions. Moreover, maternal anemia is estimated to contribute to 20 percent of maternal deaths. This indicator measures the progress of USAID's Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy (2014-2025) and is linked to Intermediate Result (IR) 8 (Increased use of nutrition specific services) under the Global Food Security Strategy results framework. It also supports reporting and measurement of achievements for the followings: Acting on the Call Annual Reports; Feed the Future Progress Reports; International Food Assistance Report; and Feed the Future and Global Health annual Portfolio Reviews.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Intervention: ● Number of women receiving iron and folic acid supplementation ● Number of women receiving individual or small group counseling on maternal and/or child nutrition ● Number of women receiving calcium supplementation ● Number of women receiving multiple micronutrient supplementation ● Number of women receiving direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products Age: Number of women < 19 years of age; Number of women > or = 19 years of age. FTFMS will produce aggregated totals for the Indicator and for each Disaggregate for entry in FACTSInfo.

TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Activity-level, activity participants, 37Tonly those women reached by USG intervention
WHO COLLECTS DATAFOR THIS INDICATOR:	Implementing partners
DATA SOURCE:	3Activity records/program data, 37Thealth facility records37, regular monitoring systems, government health information systems, or participant surveys. In cases where multiple IPs are operating in the same area and participants are counted as reached through different monitoring systems, we encourage the use of coordinated annual surveys between the IPs with shared costs to increase the ability of the Mission to adjust for double counting. If the IP has a list of participants, data may be collected through a participant-based survey and indicator values computed as sample-weighted totals. The data disaggregation by type of intervention can also be collected using surveys if the IP has a reasonably good estimate of the total number of pregnant women reached, but not a list of specific participants.
FREQUENCY OFCOLLECTION:	Annually
BASELINE INFO:	Baseline is zero
REPORTING NOTES	
3*DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):* To avoid double counting across all USAID-funded activities, Missions should estimate the overlap between the different activities before reporting the aggregate number in the PPR.	

CONTEXTUAL SPECIFIES:

The program will consider the number of pregnant women who received maternal nutrition Counselling from Private Community Skilled Birth Attendants (PCSBAs) or Blue Star Providers within the SHOUHARDO III Plus Activity area. Data will be gathered quarterly from the registers maintained by PCSBAs and Blue Star Providers

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL OF COLLECTION:** Pregnant women received counselling.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR? I**mplementing partners.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED?** Routine monitoring
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION and REPORTING :** Quarterly

Sub- IR 2.1 Increased consumption of nutritious foods among children, adolescent girls and women of reproductive age

Indicator Title: HL.9.1-d Percentage of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity [ZOI-level]

DEFINITION:

This indicator captures the percent of women of reproductive age in the population who are consuming a diet of minimum diversity (MDDW). A woman of reproductive age is considered to consume a diet of minimum diversity if she consumed at least five of 10 specific food groups during the previous day and night. The 10 food groups included in the MDD-W indicator are:

1. Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains
2. Pulses (beans, peas and lentils)
3. Nuts and seeds1 (including groundnut)
4. Dairy
5. Meat, poultry and fish
6. Eggs
7. Dark green leafy vegetables
8. Other vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables
9. Other vegetables
10. Other fruits

The numerator for this indicator is the sample-weighted number of women 15-49 years in the sample who consumed at least five out of 10 food groups throughout the previous day and night. The denominator is the sample-weighted number of women 15-49 years of age in the sample with food group data. Note that while Feed the Future usually considers groundnut as part of a legume value chain, for MDD-W purposes it is classified in the Nuts and seeds group.

MDD-W is a new version of the Women's Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS) indicator (number HL.9.1-c). There are two main differences between the MDD-W and the WDDS. First, the MDD-W is a prevalence indicator, whereas the WDDS is a quasi-continuous score. Prevalence indicators, which reflect the percent of a population of interest that is above or below a defined threshold (in this case, women who are consuming a diet of minimum diversity), are more intuitive and understandable to a broad audience of stakeholders. MDD-W will be more useful for reporting and describing progress toward improved nutrition for women than the WDDS, which reports the mean number of food groups consumed by women. Second, the food groups used to calculate MDD-W are slightly different from those used to calculate WDDS. MDD-W uses 10 food groups, while WDDS uses nine. Since Feed the Future used WDDS to establish baselines and set targets through 2017, the initiative will continue to track WDDS through the second interim survey in 2017, after which it will be dropped. Feed the Future started collecting data on MDD-W in the first interim survey in 2015 and will continue to monitor only MDD-W.

[1] "Seeds" in the botanical sense includes a very broad range of items, including grains and pulses. However, seeds are used here in a culinary sense to refer to a limited number of seeds, excluding grains or pulses, which are typically high in fat content and are consumed as a substantial ingredient in local dishes or eaten as a substantial snack or side dish. Examples include squash/melon/gourd seeds used as a main ingredient in West African stews and sesame seed paste (tahini) in some dishes in Middle Eastern cuisines.

RATIONALE: Dietary diversity is a key characteristic of a high quality diet with adequate micronutrient content and is thus important to ensuring the health and nutrition of both women and their children. Research has validated that women of reproductive age consuming foods from five or more of the 10 food groups in the MDD-W indicator are more likely to consume a diet higher in micronutrient adequacy than women consuming foods from fewer than five of these food groups. This indicator is linked to IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets under the Global Food Security Strategy results framework.	
UNIT: Percent	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** Age Category: < 19, 19+ years
LEVEL (OUTPUT/ OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Participant Based Survey	
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	Data for this indicator are collected from a random sample of households (children under five years of age) in the ZOI (i.e. the targeted sub-national regions/districts where the USG intends to achieve the greatest household- and individual-level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition.)
WHO COLLECTS:	Primary data: The national statistics office under the LSMS-ISA+ national data systems strengthening activity or an M&E contractor. Secondary data: M&E contractor or Country Post staff
FROM WHOM:	Primary or secondary data from a population-based representative sample survey. Primary data: Primary data are collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI using the Feed the Future Survey Methods Toolkit (https://agrilinks.org/post/feed-future-zoi-surveymethods). Secondary data: National poverty survey (MEASURE DHS or UNICEF MICS), if the data were collected within the previous two years. Location variables are used to identify records corresponding to the ZOI in the secondary data set, and the secondary data analysis is then conducted using those records. Note, if the secondary data are not from DHS, national level figures may not be comparable with ZOI figures, which are collected using DHS methods.
FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:	Data should be collected at baseline, and during each subsequent ZOI-level population based survey thereafter. ZOI refers to three types of ZOIs:

	1. the target or aligned country ZOI (i.e. the targeted sub-national regions/districts where the USG intends to achieve the greatest household- and individual-level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition), 2. Office of Food for Peace development program areas, and 3. Resilience to recurrent crisis areas
BASELINE INFO:	A baseline is required, and the value is from the FTF phase two baseline ZOI survey.

REPORTING NOTES

FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:

- USAID Missions or the M&E contractor should enter ZOI-level values under the "High Level Indicators – [COUNTRY NAME]" mechanism in the FTFMS.
- Enter the year that data were collected in the field under the Indicator Comment. If field data collection spanned two years, enter the year field data collection began.
- Enter the value for the overall indicator and for each age disaggregate category under the appropriate ZOI/area category (Target or Aligned Country ZOI, FFP development program area, or Resilience to recurrent crisis area).
- Enter the total number of women of reproductive age in the ZOI/area and for each age disaggregate category in the appropriate ZOI/area category (Target or Aligned Country ZOI, FFP development program area, or Resilience to recurrent crisis area).

For example, a GFSS Target Country entering data from the Feed the Future ZOI baseline survey would enter:

1. Year of field data collection in the Target Country ZOI [in the Indicator Comment]
2. Sample-weighted percent of women 15-49 years of age who consumed a diet of minimum diversity (at least five of 10 specific food groups) in the previous 24 hours in the Target Country ZOI
3. Total number of women 15-49 years of age in the Target Country ZOI
4. Sample-weighted percent of women 15-18 years of age who consumed a diet of minimum diversity in the Target Country ZOI 5. Total number of women 15-18 years of age in the Target Country ZOI
6. Sample-weighted percent of non-pregnant women 19-49 years of age who consumed a diet of minimum diversity in the Target Country ZOI
7. Total number of women of 19-49 years in the Target Country ZOI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

▪ ZOI-level indicators are not included in the PPR master indicator list. Missions may include them in PPR reporting as custom indicators.

-

Sub- IR 2.2 Improved access to nutrition services (including services provided by private sector and development partners)

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of pregnant women who receive pregnancy care support (day-time rest, extra food) during pregnancy period.		
DEFINITION: Proportion of pregnant women who are provided additional food and day-time rest during throughout their pregnancy period. These extra food and day-time rest is ensured through themselves or other members of the households. If pregnant women take more food or more day time rest during pregnancy as usual they do, they will be considered as receiving pregnancy care support.		
CALCULATION: ***Numerator:*** Number of pregnant women who receive pregnancy care support. ***Denominator:*** A total number of pregnant women interviewed. The overall estimate of indicator will be sample weighted. Enumerator/data collector should ask pregnant women 'Regarding amount of food you ate during your pregnancy, do/did you take the same amount of food as usual, more food than usual or less food than usual? And Regarding taking day-time rest during your pregnancy, do/did you take the same amount of day-time rest as you usually do, more day-time rest than usual or less day-time rest than usual ?'		
UNIT: Percentage	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** None	
TYPE (OUTPUT/OUTCOME/ IMPACT): Outcome	**Cumulative/Non-Cumulative: Non-**Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):** +
DATA COLLECTION METHOD: Sampling Frame: Pregnant Women Frequency of collection: Annual Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS) Data collection instrument(s): Structured questionnaires Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor		
DATA QUALITY ISSUES: Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A		
MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A		
FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A		

Indicator Title: Custom- Percentage of participants who reported increased access to targeted public services

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures progress in participants' access to targeted public services under agriculture and nutrition mainly. The activities with social accountability interventions typically work with both service providers and activity participants.

This indicator does not track the usage of services because use depends on the need for the services which may vary year to year. Instead, the indicator tracks *perceived* access and availability: Whether a participant thinks that s/he has access to the services when s/he needs it. The activity must target a service, or set of services (e.g., DAE, DLS, DoF, MoH&FW, or any other targeted service), for the reporting year. Services targeted will depend on the activity's interventions.

This indicator is labeled as cumulative because a participant need to be interviewed annually even if she or he reported increased access in the previous years. Having access in one year does not mean the participant will have continued access to services.

UNIT: Percentage	**DISAGGREGATE BY:** **First level -** Service Type: Agriculture, Fisheries, Veterinary health, Nutrition) **Second level -** Sex: Male, Female	
LEVEL (OUTPUT/ OUTCOME/IMPACT): Outcome	**CUMULATIVE/ NON CUMULATIVE:** Cumulative	**DIRECTION OF CHANGE:** (+)

DATA COLLECTION METHOD:

Sampling Frame: Project participants under FC, IGA on-farm and CHD and Mothers with children U5 age
Frequency of collection: Annual
Method of collection: Participant Based Survey (PaBS)
Data collection instrument(s): Structured questionnaires
Data collector(s)/recorder(s): Third party survey contractor

DATA QUALITY ISSUES: Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

MEASUREMENT/OTHER NOTES: N/A

FURTHER GUIDANCE: N/A