FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS: FEED THE FUTURE MONITORING & EVALUATION APPROACH

FEBRUARY 2014

Feed the Future, the President's global hunger and food security initiative, has the overarching goal of sustainably reducing global poverty and hunger and seeks to have lasting development impacts over time. Measuring progress towards this goal is key. Therefore, we are committed to rigorous monitoring and evaluation of our Feed the Future investments to track progress and facilitate results-driven planning and performance-based management. We will regularly assess and learn from the answers to these questions: What are Feed the Future investments improving? Are Feed the Future activities, projects, and programs accomplishing what we intended? Are Feed the Future efforts impacting our overall goal to reduce poverty and hunger? Are barriers hindering the progress or performance of Feed the Future programs? What changes would support broader or deeper Feed the Future program impacts?

To this end, Feed the Future will employ the following monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tools[1]:

1. The Feed the Future Results Framework, which is the conceptual and analytic structure that establishes the goals and objectives of the Initiative;
2. A performance monitoring process and standard performance indicators to track progress toward desired results;
3. Local human and institutional capacity-building investments to improve the quality and frequency of data collection and use;
4. Impact evaluations to determine the measurable effects of Feed the Future investments; and
5. Knowledge-sharing activities to foster learning and use of M&E findings.

It is important to recognize that we embrace the current best practices promoted at USAID. For written guidance regarding a results framework, selection of indicators, and further guidance on monitoring and evaluation, go to feedthefuture.gov/progress.

Q: Have the Feed the Future indicators and definitions been changed/revised after public comment in February 2011?

A: Yes, we received really useful input from internal and external experts on the Feed the Future indicators and definitions. Changes have been made and have been incorporated into the Feed the Future Monitoring System as well as FACTS Info. A summary of the main revisions, the final Feed the Future indicator list and FTF Indicator Handbook of standard definitions are now posted on FeedtheFuture.gov. We highly recommend that you take the time to read through the standard definitions. Information on tracking indicators and methodologies used to gather data for each indicator, as well as on the disaggregation of data, is included.

Q: What are potential sources of M&E support for Feed the Future programs?

A: USAID/Bureau for Food Security (BFS) personnel are available to consult with individual Missions for TDY support, to finalize PMPs and M&E plans, to answer questions about specific indicators, and to work through details related to monitoring outcomes and measuring impacts.

[1] The associated reference documents for each of these five tools are located at FeedtheFuture.gov.

See points of contact below for each region:

M&E Points of Contact	
Asia	Farzana Ramzan (framzan@usaid.gov) Tajikistan: Tatiana Pulido (tpulido@usaid.gov)
Latin America & the Caribbean	Anne Swindale (aswindale@usaid.com)
East Africa	Tiffany Griffin (tigriffin@usaid.gov) Tanzania: Farzana Ramzan Uganda: Tatiana Pulido
Southern Africa	Anne Swindale
West Africa	Sophia van der Bijl (svanderbijl@usaid.gov) Nigeria: Jessica Cagley (jcagley@usaid.gov)
Regional Missions	Astrid Caldas (astridcaldas@yahoo.com)

In addition to BFS personnel, BFS has procured an M&E contractor under a mechanism called FEEDBACK. The FEEDBACK contractor has conducted data collection for several standard indicators for certain Feed the Future programs, is conducting impact evaluations in some Feed the Future countries, and provides support for knowledge management and M&E capacity-building. Many Missions have formed awards for their own M&E contractor, as well. The BFS/M&E team can assist in contacting the COTRs of service providers contracted by the PPL bureau.

Q: What M&E best practices will the Feed the Future Monitoring Approach employ?

A: Feed the Future places a high priority on best practices within monitoring and reporting, and Feed the Future programs are required to incorporate these into monitoring plans:

- The first priority is setting baselines and targets. Setting baselines and targets for every indicator at the varying levels of a results framework is a critical requirement for a robust monitoring and reporting system. All indicators used by Feed the Future Missions to monitor performance must develop evidenced-based targets and establish baselines as part of the monitoring system. Without targets and baselines, data collected for indicators become anecdotal statements.

- Another priority is the monitoring of the context in which Feed the Future programs invest, by tracking a limited number of higher goal-level (or "impact level") indicators. We recognize this is new and a big undertaking. Following the Rome Principles, Feed the Future multi-year strategies are supporting components and the overall objective of host country Food Security Country Investment Plans. Their success is our success. To that end, it is important for us to track how the Country Investment Plan is performing against its goal and objectives, as well as against our multi-year strategies' specific goal and objectives.

Q: Can you tell me more about target setting?

A: BFS has developed tools to inform target setting on the high-level indicators (poverty, underweight and stunting).This tool involved using a series of national data to run scenarios to set FTF targets. The data include historical trends in poverty reduction, GDP growth and nutritional status (underweight and stunting), and data analysis was conducted with guidance from poverty expert, Don Sillers/EGAT and nutrition expert, Sally Abbott/BFS. Suggested target rates for high-level prevalence indicators of poverty, are presented in Volume 9 (Target Setting) of the FTF M&E Guidance (www.feedthefuture.gov/progress). BFS also held a webinar on poverty and nutrition target-setting, available on Agrilinks.

Q: I've heard that Feed the Future programs are required to use all the indicators in the Feed the Future Handbook, is this true?

A: No! There are only 8 required indicators and 21 additional indicators that are required-if-applicable.

Q: It is not clear what indicators are required for FTF reporting. Can you please clarify as this has significant implications on baseline data needs?

A: There are four categories of indicators in the Feed the Future Results Framework: (1) required; (2) required-if-applicable; (3) standard but not required; and (4) custom. Below are the definitions and list of indicators:

Required Indicators: These are high-level impact indicators at the goal and first-level objectives of the Results Framework. All Feed the Future focus country programs are required to incorporate into their monitoring plans the following 8 indicators:

Two indicators from the Feed the Future Results Framework goal of "sustainably reduce poverty and hunger":

- *Prevalence of poverty*
- *Prevalence of underweight children under 5 years of age*

Three indicators supporting the first-level objective of "Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth":

- *Percent change in agriculture sector GDP*
- *Per capita income (as proxied by expenditures or assets) of U.S. Government-assisted beneficiaries*
- *Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (see specific guidance)*

Three indicators supporting the first-level objective of "Improved Nutritional Status":

- *Prevalence of stunted children under 5 years of age*
- *Prevalence of wasted children under 5 years of age*
- *Prevalence of underweight women*

Each of these indicators has a detailed standard definition, which is available on FeedtheFuture.gov in the Handbook of Indicator Definitions.

To implement the important task of setting targets and baselines for these indicators in a timely manner, we ask that Missions be as proactive as possible in identifying potential primary and secondary data sources to support these indicators and have an assessment of data sources available on which the contract can build.

Required-If-Applicable: There are 13 outcome indicators at the second-level objective or intermediate-result level in the Feed the Future Results Framework, if applicable, and 8 project-level output and outcome whole-of-government indicators that all U.S. Government agencies with programs aligned with Feed the Future and the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program will report on. Depending on your multi-year strategy's mix of investments, we are asking Missions to review and incorporate, to the extent applicable, specific indicators associated with the Feed the Future Results Framework second-level or program objectives.

This standardized information will help us to "ladder up" the outcome progress for the 8 intermediate results across countries, regions and globally. If you are programming in areas that support these program objectives, we are asking you to incorporate the associated indicators as highlighted below:

One Improved Agricultural Productivity indicator:

- *Gross margins per hectare, animal, or cage of selected product*

Two Expanding Markets and Trade indicators:

- *Percent change of value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities*
- *Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level)*

Four Increased Investment in Agriculture and Nutrition-related Activities indicators:

- *Value of new private sector investment in agriculture sector or food chain leveraged*
- *Percentage of national budget invested in agriculture*
- *Percentage of national budget invested in nutrition*
- *Number of firms (excluding farms) or CSOs engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of U.S. Government assistance*

One Increased Employment Opportunities in Targeted Value Chains Indicator:

- *Number of jobs attributed to Feed the Future implementation*

One Increased Resilience among Vulnerable Communities and Households indicator:

- *Prevalence of households with moderate to severe hunger*

Two Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods indicators:

- *Women's dietary diversity*
- *Prevalence of children 6 to 23 months old that received a minimum acceptable diet*
- *One Improved Nutrition-related Behaviors indicator*
- *Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding under 6 months of age*
- *One Improved Use of Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition Services indicator*
- *Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age*

Standard definitions for each of the indicators listed above are available on FeedtheFuture.gov in the Handbook of Indicator Definitions.

The 8 whole-of-government (WOG) indicators that are also required, if applicable, are highlighted below:

Five Improved Agricultural Productivity indicators:

- *Number of individuals who have received U.S. Government-supported short-term agriculture sector productivity or food security training*
- *Number of farmers and others who have adopted new technologies or management practices as a result of U.S. Government assistance*
- *Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of U.S. Government assistance*
- *Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving U.S. Government assistance*
- *Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of U.S. Government assistance*

Three Expanding Markets and Trade indicators:

- *Kilometers of roads improved or constructed*
- *Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans*
- *Number of households with formalized land*

Please note: At this time, we are not including common (WOG) indicators for resilience and nutrition, as USAID is the only agency investing in these areas. For purposes of global reporting comprehensively across all second-level objectives, we will directly lift from the Feed the Future monitoring system project-level indicators for resilience and nutrition that best describe progress in these program areas.

Standard Indicators: The remaining 25 indicators in the Feed the Future Handbook are categorized as "standard" and have gone through extensive consultation both internally and externally. They represent "best practices" in tracking project-level progress in the areas of key interest to the Feed the Future strategy. Feed the Future programs should use these indicators to the extent applicable to develop a robust monitoring plan around their set of investments. We have diligently worked to keep these indicators comprehensive and to a minimum. Still, we always welcome your input on how we can improve the definitions. We also will be reviewing use of these indicators on a regular basis and making adjustments within the Feed the Future Handbook, as appropriate.

Custom Indicators: The Feed the Future Indicator Handbook was not developed as an exhaustive, limiting list of indicators to monitor Feed the Future investments. Feed the Future programs should create custom indicators tailored to measure specific projects when no standard indicator is available. We will review the custom indicators proposed on a regular basis. Where there is common use across Feed the Future programs of a custom indicator, there may then be cause to incorporate and categorize it appropriately into the Feed the Future set of standard indicators.

Q: How do I set multi-year strategy- and project-level targets and/or determine the cost of those targets?

A: BFS continues to promote the use of cost-benefit analysis tools to assist Feed the Future programs in making strategic decisions on the mix of investments to pursue and to help set evidence-based, project-by-project targets. Those targets can be incorporated into performance deliverables of contracts and agreements to guide implementation. We understand that most Feed the Future programs do not have staff with skills to carry out cost-benefit analysis, and we offer the following services and opportunities:

- The USAID E3 (EGAT) Office of Economic Policy will be offering training opportunities in cost-benefit analysis. If you are interested in these trainings, please contact Jerrod Mason (jemason@usaid.gov) and Juan Belt (jbelt@usaid.gov) for more information.

- We are working closely with E3 to spread the use of ex-ante cost-benefit tools. E3 has identified in-house experts and staff who have skills and experience in conducting cost-benefit analyses. If you have an immediate need, we may be able to make these experts available to you to assist with strategic planning. Please contact Kristen Schubert in E3 if you are interested and/or have questions (krschubert@usaid.gov).

Q: Determining population-based indicator values requires planning and can be costly. What are possible sources of support for population-based data collection?

A: Missions have a few options for population-based survey support. There are several centrally-managed Evaluation Services mechanisms with contractors who could provide data collection services. Contact Lacy Kilraine from PPL (Lkilraine@usaid.gov) for details. Please also refer to the Feed the Future documents on Feed the Future Baseline Guidance and Feed the Future Sampling Guidance located on FeedtheFuture.gov/progress.

Q: Will the reporting requirements in the Initiative create a parallel process to existing requirements (i.e. CAS, OP, Annual Plans, etc.)?

A: BFS is making every effort to harmonize Feed the Future reporting requirements with other standard reporting requirements to reduce the burden on Missions. BFS is currently working with F to develop a Feed the Future system interface for FACTSInfo that will funnel all reported data into required reports. The proposed interface will manage data at the implementing mechanism level, be web-based, and allow for direct data entry by non-U.S. Government partners. Every effort will be made to reduce the workload for Missions.

Revisions to the Results Framework and Feed the Future Handbook of Indicator Definitions have been finalized and are now posted on FeedtheFuture.gov. These changes have been incorporated into the Feed the Future data management system (FTFMS). BFS has scheduled webinars for FTF Missions and their implementing entities to participate in and receive training on data entry, validation, data assembly, data analysis and reporting. As needed, BFS will respond to mission requests for TDY's to provide follow-on direct assistance to set up and manage data in this Feed the Future system. Please contact John Spears (jspears@usaid.gov) or Tatiana Pulido (tpulido@usaid.gov) if you have any questions about FTFMS.

Q: How does the Feed the Future Evaluation Approach fit with USAID's new Evaluation Policy?

A: USAID's Evaluation Policy states that "Evaluation provides the information and analysis that prevents mistakes from being repeated and that increases the chance that future investments will yield even more benefits than past investments. While it must be embedded within a context that permits evidence-based decision making, and rewards learning and candor more than superficial success stories, the practice of evaluation is fundamental to the Agency's future strength." The policy has divided evaluation practice in USAID into two categories: (1) impact evaluation[2] and (2) performance evaluation[3]. According to the Evaluation Policy, any activity within a project involving untested hypotheses or demonstrating new approaches that are anticipated to be expanded in scale or scope through U.S. Government foreign assistance or other funding sources, will, if feasible, undergo an impact evaluation. USAID plans to devote approximately 3 percent of total program dollars, on average, to external performance and impact evaluation. Please refer to the USAID Evaluation Policy.

The primary objective of the Feed the Future impact evaluation approach is to provide the best available empirical evidence to inform policy and investment decisions under the Feed the Future initiative to support innovative and sustainable development practices, while providing accountability to stakeholders. USAID/BFS has developed a Learning Agenda to examine key evaluation questions related to the Feed the Future Results Framework that will be answered through rigorous impact evaluations.

Learning Agenda questions are based on the Feed the Future Results Framework. They are segmented into six categories:

1. Improved Agricultural Productivity
2. Improved R&D, Agricultural Extension, Technology Adoption and Diffusion
3. Expanded Markets, Value Chains and Increased Investment
4. Improved Nutrition and Dietary Quality
5. Improved Gender Integration and Women's Empowerment
6. Improved Resilience of Vulnerable Populations

Please contact Emily Hogue (ehogue@usaid.gov) for more information on the Feed the Future Learning Agenda.

Q: What should impact evaluations look like under Feed the Future?

A: USAID/BFS will support rigorous impact evaluations of Feed the Future investments as a key component of the Feed the Future program. Using the most rigorous evaluation methods possible, recognized experts in agricultural development and nutrition will independently and scientifically evaluate the impact of Feed the Future. Impact evaluations will be grouped into two categories. The first category of evaluations will be of those that are designed as Randomized Control Trials (RCTs). This category of evaluations will use an experimental design by constructing credible counterfactual scenarios, with the most credible being the random selection of treatment and control groups.

When randomization is not possible, a quasi-experimental design may be used. A quasi-experimental design is like an experimental design but lacks the key ingredient -- random assignment. Instead of random pre-selection processes, a comparison group that resembles the treatment group, at least in observed characteristics through econometric methodologies, will be

[2] Impact evaluations measure the change in a development outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention; impact evaluations are based on models of cause and effect and require a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change.

[3] Performance evaluations focus on descriptive and normative questions: what a particular project or program has achieved; how it is being implemented; how it is perceived and valued; whether expected results are occurring; and other questions that are pertinent to program design, management and operational decision making.

selected through a matching method, difference in differences method, instrumental variable method, or reflexive comparison. These evaluations will typically commence at the beginning of a project's implementation, to give evaluators the opportunity to work closely with program implementation staff to design the evaluation and obtain data throughout the life of the project.

The second category of impact evaluations are conducted in situations in which a credible counterfactual cannot be established. Depending on the context in which the project is being implemented, these evaluations should commence near the beginning of a project's implementation—although if that is not possible, they can commence during implementation or after a project is completed. When it is not possible to establish a counterfactual evaluation using control or comparison groups, these evaluations must still use the most rigorous methodology possible to assess whether anticipated results were achieved. Methodologies to be applied in this category will include qualitative methods that assess economic and nutritional conditions of the population, before, during and after project implementation. USAID/BFS will work with identified experts in impact evaluation to determine which country investments and evaluation questions will be subjected to category 1 or category 2 impact evaluations. Please refer to the guidance document called Feed the Future Impact Evaluation Guidance posted on FeedtheFuture.gov/progress.

Q: How can our Mission design an impact evaluation if we don't know what our five-year budget will be?

A: We are doing our best to provide Missions with planning guidance on budget allocations for this fiscal year and expectations for out-year budget allocations, to the fullest extent possible. In the meantime, you should think through and prioritize key questions about your Feed the Future investments that you want to answer through a rigorous impact evaluation.

As mentioned above, impact evaluations for Feed the Future have a two-fold purpose: (1) to strengthen Feed the Future's accountability to stakeholders, and (2) to foster learning that will improve the effectiveness of Feed the Future programs. Through impact evaluations, we can learn which results can be attributed to Feed the Future interventions and use this knowledge to inform future program design and development, enabling a feedback loop that is a critical piece of the Feed the Future strategy. Impact evaluations can examine whether Feed the Future programs are fulfilling their specific objectives and provide the best available empirical evidence to inform policy and investment decisions that support effective, innovative and sustainable development practices.

Consider stepping back from your multi-year strategy to review and assess how confident you are in the level of evidence supporting your portfolio projections. Are there any weak causal linkages proposed in your multi-year strategy or specific investments that you want to test? Are you proposing a new approach or innovation that you may want to validate through a piloting phase for scale-up potential based on the outcome of an impact evaluation? Develop a short list of key questions you'd like to answer with a rigorous impact evaluation approach. Engage your implementing entities as well regarding key questions to be answered.

In addition, it is important that your implementing entities understand that they will not be responsible for carrying out any impact evaluation, however, their cooperative participation in design (e.g. sample sizes) and implementation (e.g. control groups) will be critical to successful impact evaluation outcomes.
Having this short-list of questions will put you in an excellent position to make final decisions with impact evaluation experts, provided by BFS through central funding or mission funding, to

design and implement at least one rigorous impact evaluation integrated into your selected Feed the Future investment(s). To immediately help you think through options and help prioritize key questions that you want to answer, there are several in-house experts who can help. Emily Hogue (ehogue@usaid.gov) is the monitoring and evaluation lead for BFS and you can also contact Winston Allen in PPL/LER (wallen@usaid.gov) for guidance.

Q: How will Feed the Future's impact on gender be measured? It appears that "gender" will be tracked as part of the first-level objective of inclusive agriculture sector growth, but no specific indicators are described.

A: The Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation Approach will measure the impact on gender in several ways. First, 33 of the Feed the Future indicators are either disaggregated by sex or specific to women. Second, some centrally funded impact evaluations will examine critical questions related to gender equality, gender integration, and women's empowerment. Feed the Future programs are also strongly encouraged to set impact evaluation agendas that include questions on gender impacts. Third, BFS has developed an index to measure change in women's empowerment in countries' agriculture sector.

The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index measures changes in women's inclusion in the agriculture sector, a Feed the Future first-level objective. The concept of women's empowerment or inclusion in agriculture is broad and multi-dimensional. To simplify its measurement, the Feed the Future initiative further defines the concept and women's relationship to it as "the improvement of women's roles and engagement throughout the various areas of the agriculture sector, as it grows, in both quantity and quality" and operationalizes that improvement by measuring change in the following domains:

1. Women's role in household decision-making around agricultural production
2. Women's access to productive resources, such as loans or land (outside household)
3. The adequacy of women's incomes to feed their families
4. Women's access to leadership roles within the community
5. Women's labor time allocations

Data for the Index will be collected through the Population-Based Surveys throughout the life of the Initiative. If you have questions regarding the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index, please contact Emily Hogue in BFS (ehogue@usaid.gov).

Q: How is Feed the Future proposing to measure local capacity building (USAID FORWARD)?

A: Local capacity development is a crosscutting issue: It should be a part of all of USAID's efforts, not just in certain sectors or in a handful of projects. Feed the Future is addressing USAID FORWARD's goals of developing local capacity by working directly with host government ministries and institutions, private firms, and civil society organizations (CSOs) engaged in agriculture and food security-related manufacturing and services to improve their viability and to ensure there are sustainable, local entities "left behind" to continue delivering critical services to the agriculture, nutrition/health and rural sectors. Local capacity building has two main purposes:

1. To build local ministries and public institutions to effectively serve the needs within the agriculture and nutrition sectors, including implementing USAID projects.

- *This fulfills USAID FORWARD Implementation & Procurement's Objective No. 1 of increasing use of reliable partner country systems and institutions to provide support to partner countries.*

2. To leave behind viable local private firms and CSOs to continue servicing the needs within the country's agriculture and nutrition sectors, including implementing USAID projects.

    - *This fulfills USAID FORWARD Implementation & Procurement's Objective No. 2 of capacity building and local grant and contract allocations.*

Because of the crosscutting nature of capacity building, Feed the Future has created indicators to measure the performance of our capacity development efforts all throughout our Results Framework, instead of making it a separate goal or objective. Specifically, we will measure performance of our Feed the Future capacity development efforts using indicators that reflect the sustainability of both public and private sector investments and institutions. Please refer to the document called Feed the Future Local Capacity Development Guidance located on FeedtheFuture.gov/progress.

If you have questions regarding the proposed indicators and BFS' overall effort to support USAID Forward, please contact Emily Hogue (ehogue@usaid.gov).

Q: How do we define our geographic focus areas for the purposes of measuring FTF high-level impact indicators?

A: The cable guidance sent to Feed the Future Missions on October 13, 2010, titled "USG Multi-year Feed the Future Strategy Guidance" included a section on making focused choices about where we believe we can have the highest impact. It emphasized the importance of setting evidence-based priorities and focusing U.S. Government resources in a limited set of major interventions in defined geographic areas. These choices of interventions and geographic location align with the focus country's national food security investment plan.

As evidenced in the multi-year strategies submitted for review and approval, Missions have made difficult choices in focusing Feed the Future investments. The geographic focus areas in Feed the Future need to be defined in clear and exact terms that delineate the geographic boundaries of the area. Your Feed the Future zone of influence should be defined at the smallest geopolitical unit (district, municipality, etc.), with corresponding population, to provide the needed information for a sampling frame. For our mapping unit, designation by district is preferable. However if you do not have this level of detail, please provide pdf's of maps showing the zones so that we may be able to work from them to identify coverage.

As an example, if the country of Macondo[4] has geo-political units called departments, provinces, districts, and communities (from largest to smallest) and USAID/Macondo plans to program in areas that comprise nearly all of four provinces, the Mission should define their zone of influence as those four provinces. If USAID/Macondo plans to program in 37 adjacent districts that compose portions of four provinces, its zone of influence would be those 37 districts.

[4] Fictional country in Gabriel Garcia-Marquez's "A Hundred Years of Solitude"

Missions need to define their zones of influence along those geo-political lines for several reasons:

- It provides a commonly understood "unit" in describing where Feed the Future funds will be administered.
- It can be clearly articulated to the host country, other U.S. Government agencies, other donors, and development stakeholders where the Feed the Future investment will be concentrated. The area can be clearly presented to this same audience for purposes of attracting their investment as well.
- It clearly defines a population of potential Feed the Future beneficiaries.
- Local government authorities collect and disaggregate useful household data at these varying official, geographic sub-regional levels.
- For purposes of collecting data for monitoring impact-level indicators that sample households in the targeted Feed the Future zone, it represents a concise way to define your target population.
- For purposes of designing and implementing impact evaluations, it will allow the Feed the Future programs to establish a valid control group among comparable geo-political units.

We recognize that for many Missions, if not all, using official sub-divisions creates boundaries around a population that will not all be reached with Feed the Future multi-year resources. The intention is to use these boundaries to define an area not <u>only</u> inclusive of our direct beneficiaries but to apply and test the Feed the Future approach: that if we concentrate our resources, and attract those of the host government, other U.S. Government agencies, other donors, and civil society, we will have greater, deeper and more sustainable poverty and nutritional impact than if we spread our resources more broadly across a country and its population.

We also recognize that for purposes of monitoring the impact of Feed the Future investments, sampling among a larger population beyond direct beneficiaries may dilute the findings. Missions can reduce the problem of diluted findings by choosing the smallest geo-political unit that practically delineates the zone of influence.

QUESTIONS ABOUT FEED THE FUTURE MONITORING SYSTEM

Q: Why are you using Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS), not FACTS Info?

A: FTF is an interagency initiative and only USAID and State use FACTSInfo. We also need to collect information at the mechanism level to provide meaningful feedback and to more accurately gauge the results from different types of interventions. FTFMS also allows implementing partners to enter data directly. We are working with PPL and CIO to integrate FTFMS capabilities into ongoing efforts to develop a central reporting system for USAID and will phase-out FTFMS when possible.

Q: Why do you want implementing partners to have access to FTFMS?

A: FTFMS access for implementing partners (IPs) has benefitted Missions that did not have an established process for collecting data from their implementing partners. IP access also reduces the data entry burden on Mission staff and involves IPs in the FTF M&E discussions between Washington and the field.

Q: What types of reports will this generate? Who will manage the user lists?

A: The FTFMS database can produce reports showing all data entered as well as deviation narratives and indicator comments. Most users can find all of the reports they need on the "Generate Data Entry Status Report" screen in FTFMS. Missions can create a report of all Implementing Mechanisms (IMs) in their portfolio and a "PPR Report." The PPR Report aggregates all data from the IM level to the Mission level and can be used to quickly transfer data from FTFMS to the Performance Plan and Report (PPR) in FACTSInfo. Please contact your FTF M&E POC if you need to create a custom report.

Each Mission is responsible for ensuring all Mission staff and implementing partners have access to FTFMS. Please send requests for new accounts to Support@ftfms.net.

Q: Why do we need FTFMS?

A: FTFMS not only tracks yearly performance but also allows for inclusion of baselines and indicator data from other agencies (the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps). We are able to see the whole Feed the Future universe, have information at the implementation level, and aggregate the information gathered up to OU, Agency, and initiative levels.

Q: Will BFS provide additional training on FTFMS?

A: Yes. We have prepared guidance for the FY2013 reporting cycle and a webinar. The webinar took place in October and is online. Please see the FTFMS page on Agrilinks to view the guidance document, presentations, FAQs and other relevant information. Please contact John Spears (jspears@usaid.gov) for system questions, Tatiana Pulido (tpulido@usaid.gov) for budget/attribution, and your M&E POC for more information.

Q: Does the FTFMS include programs that count towards Feed the Future that are not funded with Feed the Feed the Future money?

A: FTFMS ties budget obligations with project performance to the extent possible. Missions/Operating Units must report results for all activities funded through Feed the Future allocations, including buy-ins to Washington-managed mechanisms and activities that pool donor funding. FTFMS uses the budget allocation transferred from FACTSInfo to determine the amount of FTF funding for each mechanism. As needed, FTFMS can produce reports that determine the results attributable to FTF (*4.5 Agriculture, 3.1.9 Nutrition*).

For example, a project is 70 percent FTF funded and 30 percent funded through Global Climate Change Initiative funds and supported 100 individuals in long-term training. The implementing partner will enter 100 as the result under # of individuals with long-term training indicator. FTFMS would attribute 70 percent of results (i.e. 70 individuals trained) to FTF funding. However, since information on the allocation of funding under pooled donor activities is not available in FACTSInfo, only the proportion of results attributable to USAID funding for multi-donor activities should be entered into FTFMS. We attribute the full results from the Zone of Influence population-level indicators to FTF because of our essential contribution to host country, whole-of-government, and multi-donor coordinated efforts.

Food for Peace, USDA 632b Agreements, and Peace Corps:
Food for Peace development food aid programs are considered part of FTF and are included in FTFMS. Reporting for all FFP mechanisms will be entered by DCHA/FFP. As usual, USDA sends data for 632b agreements to the USAID Agreement Manager. The Agreement Manager is responsible for entering project data into the FTFMS. Please coordinate with Peace Corps to ensure PAPAs and other USAID-funded mechanisms implemented by Peace Corps are reported to Mission staff and entered into FTFMS.

Nutrition: Results will be different in the FTFMS and PPR.
FTFMS: For FTF Focus countries: only enter nutrition results that occurred within FTF Zone of Influence. For all other FTF countries: do not report 3.1.9 nutrition results in FTFMS.

PPR: Enter all 3.1.9 funded nutrition results for all countries and all nutrition funding. Please reference the GH PPR Annex for further information.

Buy-ins to central/BFS-managed mechanisms: Missions should coordinate with BFS to report buy-ins to Washington managed mechanisms. We can create an entry for the buy-in in FTFMS and, in most cases, the data will be entered by the IP in the buy-in entry at the same time data are entered for the centrally-managed mechanism.