USAID'S OFFICE OF FOOD FOR PEACE POLICY AND GUIDANCE FOR MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING FOR EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY ACTIVITIES

JULY 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADS   USAID's Automated Directives System
AOR   Agreement Officer's Representative
APS   Annual Program Statement
ARR   Annual Results Report
BL/FE   Baseline/final evaluation
CaLP   Cash Learning Partnership
DDL   USAID Development Data Library
DEC   USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
DQA   Data Quality Assessment
EFSP   Emergency Food Security Program
F   State Department Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources
FCS   Food Consumption Score
FEWS NET   Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FFP   USAID Office of Food for Peace
FY   fiscal year
GAM   Global Acute Malnutrition
HHS   Household Hunger Scale
IDP   Internally displaced person
IPC   Integrated phase classification
IQR   Implementation quality review
IYCF   Infant and young child feeding
LOA   Life of the award
LogFrame   Logical framework
LQAS   Lot quality assurance sampling
LRP   Local and regional procurement
M&E   Monitoring and evaluation
MT   Metric ton
NGO   Non-Government Organization
NPE   Non-permissive environment
OFDA   Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
PaBS   Participant-based surveys
PDM   Post-distribution monitoring
PIO   Public international organization
PVO   Private voluntary organization
PIRS   Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
R   Required indicator
rCSI   Reduced Coping Strategies Index
RiA   Required if applicable indicator
SMART   Standardized Monitoring and Assessment for Relief and Transitions
SPS   Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure
SOW   Statement of work
TPM   Third-party monitoring
UN   United Nations
USAID   U.S. Agency for International Development
USG   United States Government

CHAPTER 1: SUMMARY OF MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING PROCESSES

BACKGROUND

The mission of the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) Office of Food for Peace (FFP) is to partner with others to reduce hunger and malnutrition, and ensure that all individuals have adequate, safe, and nutritious food to support a healthy and productive life. Through its emergency awards, FFP provides food assistance to save lives, reduce suffering, and support the early recovery of populations affected by both acute and protracted emergencies. FFP 2016-2025 Food Assistance and Food Security Strategy presents the history and evolution of FFP's food assistance and food security programs as well as outlines FFP's strategy. FFP responds to emergency situations, or crises, where the food supply is severely disrupted and populations lack access to sufficient food through normally available means such as production, barter, or purchase in markets. Such situations may involve drought, floods, earthquakes, and/or civil conflict.

The primary purposes of monitoring, evaluation and reporting for FFP emergency food security activities are to:
* Fulfill FFP's obligation to ensure the effective and efficient use of resources
* Improve and refine activity design and implementation in order to achieve the best possible food security outcomes

This document describes key monitoring, evaluation, and reporting responsibilities of FFP international emergency food assistance awards using Title II or Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP) resources. The guidance applies to activities implemented by U.S. or non-U.S. non-governmental organizations, including private voluntary organizations (PVOs). Public international organizations (PIOs) are not required to follow this guidance. It is intended to provide supplementary technical guidance to what is communicated through the Annual Program Statement (APS) and award language.

1.1: PURPOSE OF MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING

USAID's Automated Directives System (ADS) 201, Program Cycle Operational Policy, describes monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as the following:

Monitoring is the ongoing and systematic tracking of data or information relevant to USAID strategies, projects, and activities. Relevant data and informational needs are identified during planning and design and may include output and outcome measures that are directly attributable to or affected by USAID interventions as well as measures of the operating context and programmatic assumptions. Monitoring informs strategy, project, and activity design and implementation. The analysis of monitoring data should inform progress towards anticipated results, efforts to manage adaptively, and promote accountability.

Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and higher level outcomes of strategies, projects, and activities conducted as a basis for judgments to improve

performance, effectiveness, and timed to inform decisions about current and future programming. Evaluation is distinct from assessment or an informal review of projects or activities. The purpose of evaluations is twofold: to ensure accountability to stakeholders and to improve design, implementation, and FFP policy and guidance.

For the purposes of this document, **reporting** refers to the quarterly, annual, and final reporting processes that provide updates on the programmatic progress and compliance of FFP emergency awards. Reporting requirements are stipulated in the terms of the award, which may reference other documents such as the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Annual Program Statement (APS) for the FFP Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP), and the Annual Results Report (ARR) guidance.

1.2: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The purpose of the M&E Plan is to serve as a framework for activities to demonstrate accountability and improve the quality of activity implementation and outcomes for participants. The M&E Plan should serve as a roadmap for activity staff, documenting M&E approaches and processes in sufficient detail. It should demonstrate that an awardee has a rigorous system for monitoring and evaluating activity performance in a way that produces accurate, reliable, and useful data in a timely manner for decision-making.

As described in Table 1, the M&E Plan is comprised of five components: (1) Logical Framework (LogFrame), (2) Monitoring Plan, (3) Evaluation Plan, (4) Indicator Table, and (5) Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS). The three components of the M&E Plan due at application should be submitted[1] as two attachments: An Excel document (LogFrame) and a Word document (Monitoring Plan and Evaluation Plan). The templates for the LogFrame and Indicator Table are included in the **FFP Emergency M&E Templates**. Applicants are encouraged to use these templates when developing their M&E Plans, but may use other formats as long as the required information is included.

The requirements in the *FFP Policy and Guidance for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting for Emergency Food Security Activities* are applicable to all FFP non-PIO emergency awards made after the issuance of the FY2019 APS (February 15, 2019). Table 1 summarizes the key components of the M&E Plan throughout the award cycle and the associated submission timing requirements.

---

[1] Application and submission information can be found on pages 14-16 of the FY19 APS.

Table 1: Requirements for Submission of the Components of the M&E Plan through the Award Cycle

Component	Application	Start-up	ARR	Closeout
LogFrame *Format: Excel*	Submit as an annex following the FFP template	Re-submit with updated targets within 90 days of the award approval		
Monitoring Plan *Format: Word*	The Monitoring Plan should include a description of the data collection methods, quality assurance and management practices as part of the M&E Plan narrative		Provide a description of applicable monitoring activities in the Results Report	
Evaluation Plan *Format: Word*	If applicable (see Table 2), submit evaluation plan with abbreviated baseline and final evaluation statement of work (SOW).	-Complete quantitative data collection **within 90 days** of award approval -Submit baseline study report to Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR) for review -Submit baseline study report to the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) **within 150 days** of the award approval	Upload the anonymized baseline data in CSV format to Development Data Library (DDL).	-Submit the final evaluation report to AOR - Upload the approved final evaluation report with ARR and to the DEC. (Forward the DEC URL to AOR)
Indicator Table		Submit an Indicator Table	Submit with baseline values,	Submit with all actual values with

		with baseline values, data sources, targets with required disaggregates within 90 days of the award approval	targets and actual values for the ARR	final report
Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) *Format: Word*		Submit for all indicators in conjunction with LogFrame and Indicator Table within 90 days of the award approval		

Note: Award approval refers to the date the award is signed.

In addition to the requirements outlined in Table 1 and the remainder of the *FFP Policy and Guidance for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting for Emergency Food Security Activities*, FFP emergency awards may include award-specific monitoring, evaluation, and reporting requirements. Awardees should thoroughly review their award documents and coordinate with the AOR to ensure that they fulfill all reporting requirements.

Table 2: Requirements for Baseline Study and Final Evaluation by Award Length

Awards of less than 12 months	Awards of 12 months or more
Optional Can be conducted by awardee or third party firm	**Required** Baseline study can be conducted by awardee or third party firm Baseline study must include quantitative data collection, but can be mixed-method Final evaluation must be mixed-method and conducted by an internal team led by an experienced external team leader or a third party firm
Note: All applicants planning to conduct a baseline study and final evaluation must submit an abbreviated SOW with the application regardless of award length	

Per the APS (pages 38-43), FFP requires the submission of the following components of the M&E Plan as part of every application:

- A LogFrame
- A Monitoring Plan
- An Evaluation Plan

The LogFrame should describe the activity logic (goals, purpose, outcomes, and outputs) in the Result Statement, the indicators for activity outcomes and outputs (including all applicable FFP indicators), data sources/methods, and assumptions (especially regarding the situational context and results from other stakeholders that the activity is reliant or impacted by). Targets must be provided for all indicators for the life of award (LOA). Awardees are required to include all required (R) and required-if-applicable (RiA) FFP emergency indicators, available in **Table 3**. Because the baseline values are not available at the application stage, the final targets may be expressed in relation to the baseline value (e.g., "baseline + 10 percentage points). (See Section 2.1 for additional guidance on the LogFrame.)

The Monitoring Plan includes a description of the type of monitoring, indicators, methods, and the data collection, quality, management and safeguarding procedures and resources that the awardee will use during the course of planning, implementation, and evaluation. (See Chapter 3 for further guidance.)

The Evaluation Plan must include a narrative that describes the baseline study and any planned assessments, as well as an abbreviated baseline and final evaluation SOW, if planned. The narrative must describe the purpose, timing, budget, planned data collection (including indicators) and methods for the baseline study, and any assessments. The final evaluation SOW must provide the purpose, timing, budget, evaluation questions, planned data collection (including indicators) and methods, and evaluator profile for the study. (See Chapter 4 for further guidance regarding the final evaluation structure, content and SOW.)

1.2.2: START-UP

The initial three months of the award are a critical period for monitoring and evaluation. During this time, awardees should refine and finalize indicators and targets, conduct the baseline study (required for awards of 12 months or more), develop and refine their monitoring system and tools, and plan procurement for the final evaluation (required for awards of 12 months or more). Awardees must submit an updated LogFrame, Indicator Table, and PIRS to the AOR within 90 days of award approval.

LogFrame
The LogFrame should be updated to include revised targets when the baseline is complete. Please see Chapter 2 for further guidance.

Indicator Table

The Indicator Table provides additional information on the indicators including the disaggregations, baseline values, targets, actual values, and data collection sources and methods. Please see section 2.3 of Chapter 2 for further guidance.

PIRS

PIRS must be submitted for each indicator in the LogFrame including custom indicators. PIRS for FFP required and required-if-applicable indicators are attached to this guidance. FFP PIRS must also be contextualized to ensure understanding of how the awardee intends to collect indicator data within the activity context. Please see section 2.3 of Chapter 2 for further guidance.

Baseline Study

A baseline study is required for all non-PIO FFP emergency awards that are 12 months or longer in duration, unless FFP explicitly grants an exception during the application process. The purposes of the baseline study are to collect baseline values for specific outcome indicators that will be compared to values collected during the final evaluation and to provide information to the awardee about the activity's target population to strengthen the design and targeting of interventions.

The baseline study must:
- Include a probability sample at the participant or population level in the activity area, and be designed to produce values that will be compared to results from an endline survey so that change can be measured and tested for difference[2]
- Complete data collection within 90 days of the approval of the award

The baseline study may be conducted by the awardee directly if qualified staff are available or the awardee may contract and manage a qualified third-party firm to implement the study. FFP encourages awardees to consider using the participant registration process as a means of baseline data collection. If all required indicators can be collected from either all households or a representative subset of households during registration, it can save time and resources that would be devoted to a separate survey.

The final copy of the baseline study report must be submitted to the AOR for review and then uploaded on the DEC within 150 days of award approval. Awardees must submit the updated Indicator Table with the baseline values and final targets as part of the ARR at the end of the fiscal year in which the baseline survey was completed. Section 4.1 and Annex 1 provide detailed guidance about the baseline study.

1.2.3: ANNUAL RESULTS REPORT (ARR)

All awardees must submit an ARR for each fiscal year during which activities were implemented, unless the award was signed in the final quarter (July 1- September 30) of the reporting fiscal year. The ARR submission discusses and analyzes the activity's successes and challenges for the prior fiscal year, and is generally required around November of each calendar year. It is important to note that FFP sets the ARR due date to facilitate its congressional reporting requirements. FFP posts annual guidance on the

---

[2] A census of all participants collected at registration may also be used for the baseline.

content and submission schedule for ARRs under [Implementation and Reporting on FFP's website](#). Any changes to indicator targets during annual reporting require approval from the AOR. (See Chapter 5 for additional guidance on reporting.)

1.2.4: FINAL EVALUATION

Final evaluations are required for all emergency activities that are 12 months or longer in duration in order to assess performance against stated objectives and approved targets. The final evaluation must be a mixed-method performance evaluation led by an experienced external team leader or a third party firm. The team leader must be external to the organization. While not required by FFP, awards that are less than 12 months can plan for a final evaluation to capture best practices and lessons learned. **If an awardee plans for a final evaluation, an abbreviated SOW must be submitted with the application regardless of the duration of the activity**. The abbreviated SOW must include the following sections: *Evaluation Objectives*, *Illustrative Evaluation Questions/Topics*, and *Evaluation Methodology*. Additional guidance for the SOW can be found in [FFP Guidance for an Abbreviated Statement of Work (SOW) for a Baseline Study and Final Evaluation for Emergency Programs](#) In some instances, FFP may choose to contract and manage the final evaluation directly. In such an event, the AOR will notify the awardee at least six months prior to the end of the activity.

For awards that are at least 12 months in duration, the final evaluation must include a quantitative, participant or population-based household survey. Food security indicators are extremely sensitive to seasonality; therefore, to the extent possible, the endline survey data collection should match the season of the baseline survey, in order to enhance the comparability of the surveys.

Awardees must provide an updated Indicator Table with final indicator values as part of the ARR for the FY during which the endline survey data collection was completed. The awardee should include the final report in its ARR submission. In addition, for awardee-managed final evaluations, the awardee must submit the final report and related documents to the DEC and related data sets to the DDL before the closeout of the award. (See Section 3 of Chapter 4 for further guidance and information regarding final evaluations.)

CHAPTER 2. LOGFRAME & INDICATORS

2.1 ACTIVITY DESIGN AND THE LOGFRAME

A LogFrame is an important tool used in the design, monitoring, and evaluation of FFP activities. LogFrames are useful for both managers and M&E staff throughout the program cycle, including during design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. A LogFrame is a type of logic model presented in a table format that provides a simplified description of how an activity is to function in the form of a linear chain of cause and effect. When designing the LogFrame, it is important to consider the theory of change underlying the activity. This can significantly improve the logical coherence and the soundness of activity design, and help to identify the assumptions that are critical to the success of an activity.

Summary of LogFrame & Indicator Requirements

> ***When to submit a LogFrame***
> - Required for all awards with application regardless of duration
> - Re-submit a revised LogFrame within 90 days of award approval
>
> ***When to submit Indicator Table***
> - Submit within 90 days of award approval, including baseline/base values for all outcome/output indicators
>
> ***When to submit PIRS***
> - PIRS for all indicators in the LogFrame must be submitted within 90 days of award approval
>
> ***Required indicators***
> - Ensure that all required and required-if-applicable FFP indicators and relevant Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) indicators are included in LogFrame and Indicator Table (*see section 2.3.1*)

The first step to developing a LogFrame is to conduct a problem analysis. Applicants need to not only understand the immediate needs of the affected population, but also identify what the root causes of those issues are in order to design the most effective response. For example, the proper response to food insecurity driven by drought may be very different than to food insecurity driven by a conflict that disrupts markets. Applicants should use both primary information (i.e., needs assessments) and secondary information (Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), Food Security Cluster, etc.) to identify problems that lead to food and nutrition insecurity.

Once the applicant has a well-defined problem, they can begin developing the hypothesis to understand the set of interventions required to change the conditions, practices, or behaviors, and eventually address the main problem. The hypothesis must be developed using sound evidence. Should there be any gaps in evidence, the applicant should plan to use rapid data collection tools to fill the evidence gaps.

Finally, the assumptions underlying the theory of change should be identified and assessed to determine the feasibility of the selected approach. For example, if a critical assumption is unlikely to hold, then the approach should be reconsidered. These assumptions will be documented in the LogFrame, and should inform the activity's monitoring strategy. Assumptions internal to the activity (i.e. uptake of a promoted approach or behavior within the target population) should be monitored in the performance monitoring plan (*see chapter 3.1*), while external assumptions (i.e., the exchange rate remaining consistent) should be monitored in the context monitoring plan (*see chapter 3.2*).

2.2 LOGFRAME FORMAT

Every application must include a LogFrame. The LogFrame summarizes key elements of an activity under five columns: Result Statement, Indicators, Data Source/Methods, Targets, and Assumptions. Figure 1 shows the basic format of a LogFrame.

Figure 1: The structure of a LogFrame

Result Statement	Indicators	Data Source/ Methods	Target	Assumptions
Goal				
Purpose				
Sub-purpose*				
Intermediate Outcome*				
Output				

*Optional depending on complexity of design

Definitions of LogFrame Result Statement Terms

Goal: The highest-level outcome to which an activity can contribute. Typically, a Goal cannot be fully accomplished by the activity during the award period. Factors beyond the control of the activity must also be addressed before the goal can be fully accomplished.

Purpose: A key, high-level outcome that the activity expects to accomplish during the LOA. A Purpose describes a desired change in the condition or status of the population in the target area to which the outputs and outcomes of the activity's interventions should contribute significantly.

Sub-Purpose: An outcome necessary for a Purpose to be achieved. These often include behavioral and systemic changes, for example, adoption of promoted techniques or behaviors. Including Sub-Purposes is **optional**. Partners may choose to include Sub-Purposes depending on the complexity of their activity design.

Intermediate Outcome: An outcome that must occur before a Sub-Purpose or another Intermediate Outcome can be achieved, such as changes in knowledge or attitudes, mastery of skills, and adoption of new methods. There may be multiple levels of Intermediate Outcomes in sequence along a single pathway. Including Intermediate Outcomes is **optional**. Partners may choose to include Intermediate Outcomes depending on the complexity of their activity design.

Output: An output is a tangible, immediate product of an intervention under the activity's control or influence. Examples include "Food vouchers provided to target households," "infant and young child feeding (IYCF) training provided to mothers groups," or "ready-to-eat rations distributed to displaced households."

*Note: FFP does not require **Inputs** in the LogFrame.*

The LogFrame should be designed to clearly and efficiently communicate the activity's theory of change. Because there is a wide range of complexity in the design of emergency food security activities, FFP allows some flexibility in the LogFrame design. The Goal, Purpose, and Output layers of the LogFrame are **required** for all FFP emergency applications. The Sub-purpose and Intermediate Outcome layers are **optional** depending on the complexity of the activity being proposed. Applicants should decide whether or not the additional layers of the LogFrame are necessary to effectively communicate the activity's design and monitor implementation.

A LogFrame template is included in the *FFP Emergency M&E Templates*. The template is meant to be a starting point for partners and should be adapted to match the activity's design. The LogFrame in Figure 2 below is included as an example. It describes a simple activity with two Purposes: 1) reducing the use of negative coping strategies, and 2) increasing adoption of IYCF best practices. It includes one Sub-Purpose and Output under each Purpose, but no Intermediate Outcomes.

Figure 2: LogFrame Example

No.	Indicator	Data Source/ Methods	Target	Assumptions
1/1/2019	FFP Partner	Country		Award No.
**LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (LogFrame)**				
Goal: Food security and nutrition of conflict affected households improved				
Purpose 1. Reduced use of negative coping strategies by conflict-affected households				
1	Reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)	BL/EL	Baseline -5	No additional large-scale displacement occurs
Sub Purpose 1.1: Target households access to minimum food basket increased				
2	Percentage of households with poor, borderline, and adequate food consumption score (FCS)	BL/EL, Monthly PDM	Poor (0%) Borderline (25%) Adequate (75%)	Food remains available in markets in all targeted areas
3	Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (HHS)	BL/EL, Monthly PDM	0%	Market prices remain relatively stable
Output 1.1.1 Cash transfers provided to targeted households monthly for 12 months				
4	Number of individuals participating in USG food security programs	Transfer logs from MIS	100,000	Security situation allows for timely distributions
5	Number of cash transfers distributed	Transfer logs from MIS	240,000	
Purpose 2. Use of IYCF best practices among targeted households increased				
6	Percentage of infants 0-6 months of age who are exclusively breastfed	BL/EL	Baseline +10	No large shocks affect targeted households
7	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet	BL/EL	Baseline +7	
Sub Purpose 2.1: Awareness of IYCF best practices among targeted households increased				
8	Percent of caregivers of children under 2 years who take part of support groups who are able to cite at least 3 IYCF best practices	BL/EL	85%	
Output 2.1.1 IYCF messaging provided to targeted households				
9	Number of people receiving behavior change interventions to improve infant and young child feeding practices	IYCF training attendance records	10,000	Conflict does not prevent participants from safely traveling to training locations

2.3 INDICATORS

There are two primary types of indicators: 1) performance indicators, and 2) context indicators. Performance indicators are used to measure whether or not the outputs and outcomes in the LogFrame are being achieved. Context indicators are used to measure external factors that are relevant to the success of the activity (i.e. the assumptions in the LogFrame). At least one performance indicator should be included for each output and outcome. Targets should be included for each performance indicator, indicating what will be achieved over the LOA.

The LogFrame should include the following indicators:
- All R and RiA FFP indicators
- Relevant OFDA indicators for activities proposing essential complementary activities
- Custom indicators selected by the applicant
- Context indicators may be optionally included in the LogFrame. If included, they should be placed in the *Assumptions* column.

FFP Indicators

Table 3 below describes all required (R) and required-if-applicable (RiA) FFP output and outcome indicators.

Table 3. FFP Emergency Food Security Indicators

FFP No.	INDICATOR	R / RiA	APPLICABILITY CRITERIA
EFSP 1	Number of individuals participating in USG food security programs	R	All activities.
EFSP 2	Percentage of households with poor, borderline, and acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS)	RiA	Activities 6 months or more in duration that provide in-kind, non-therapeutic food, cash or voucher transfers.
EFSP 3	Reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)	RiA	Activities 12 months or more in duration that provide in-kind, non-therapeutic food, cash or voucher transfers.
EFSP 4	Prevalence of households with moderate or severe Household Hunger Scale (HHS) score	RiA	
EFSP 5	Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs	RiA	Activities (of any duration) that target children under 5 with nutrition specific interventions, including social and behavior change communication that promote essential infant and young child feeding behaviors.
EFSP 6	Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs	RiA	Activities (of any duration) that target pregnant women with nutrition-specific interventions including counseling on maternal and/or child nutrition, multiple micronutrient supplementation, and direct food assistance of fortified/specialized food products.

EFSP 7	Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USG-supported programs	RiA	Activities (of any duration) that target children under two with nutrition interventions at the community level.
EFSP 8	Number of individuals receiving nutrition-related professional training through USG-supported programs	RiA	Activities (of any duration) that provide training on basic and applied nutrition-specific or nutrition-sensitive topics to health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, policy-makers, researchers, students, and non-health personnel.
EFSP 9	Prevalence of global acute malnutrition (GAM)	RiA	Activities 12 months or more in duration with nutrition-specific interventions, nutrition objectives, and dedicated budget to improving nutrition outcomes.

The FFP Indicators for Emergency Program Performance Indicator Reference Sheets includes the PIRS for all of the R and RiA indicators, with details on the indicator definition, data collection, and indicator calculation.

Note that Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a required outcome indicator for activities six months or longer in duration, but a baseline study is not required for activities shorter than 12 months. For activities between 6-12 months that do not conduct a baseline study, FCS must be measured at least once during the activity, but preferably at a more regular frequency (e.g. through monthly post-distribution monitoring (PDM)) in order to track the food security status of participants over time.

The following applicable output indicators required for annual reporting should also be included in the LogFrame (see page 39 of the FY 2019 APS for more information):

Local and Regional Procurement (LRP Commodity):
- Actual quantity delivered (MT)
- Quantity distributed (MT)
- Planned and actual participants disaggregated by sex

Cash Transfers and Food Vouchers:
- Planned and actual number of food vouchers distributed
- Number of food vouchers redeemed
- Planned and actual number of cash transfers distributed
- Total number of participants receiving transfers
- Quantity distributed (MT)

Relevant OFDA Indicators

Applications proposing essential complementary activities should choose relevant OFDA indicators. Essential complementary activities are defined on pages 7-9 of FFP's FY 2019 APS as "discrete activities that enhance the overall effectiveness and impact of the food assistance transfer modalities described above, and contribute to the stabilization of household/community availability of, access to, and utilization of nutritious foods." Essential complementary activities include nutrition[3], agriculture and food security, livelihoods, WASH, coordination and capacity building support, efforts to strengthen gender equity, empower youth, or improve cohesion, and multipurpose cash assistance.

Custom Indicators

Applicants are encouraged to create custom indicators to measure specific activity outputs, outcomes, and context for which there are no corresponding FFP or OFDA indicators. Custom indicators may be adopted from the Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources (F) Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators, from external groups (e.g., United Nations (UN) Specialized Agencies, other donors, or the Sphere Handbook), or they may be created by the activity's M&E personnel. The PIRS must be submitted for all custom indicators.

Context Indicators

There are factors outside of the control of every activity that can affect whether or not the outcomes are achieved. These context indicators can be included with the assumptions in the LogFrame, and should be tracked in the Indicator Table. For example, an activity that provides cash to enable target households or individuals to buy food and other necessities may require price stability and product availability in local markets in order to achieve food security outcomes. FFP recommends that applicants define custom contextual indicators that are important to monitor the activity and understand the intervention's results. Actual values for context indicators must be reported in the Indicator Table, but no targets are required.

2.3.2 INDICATOR TARGETS

A target is a measurable value that represents a specific, planned level of achievement to be accomplished (output) or a change that should occur (outcome) within a specific timeframe. Typically, indicators for emergency activities will be for the life of award. Targets should be included for both output and outcome indicators. No targets are required for context indicators, but it can be useful to set thresholds upon which an action will take place (i.e., re-evaluate voucher value once inflation reaches a certain level; triggering changes in security protocols if conflict increases).

---

[3] Note that FFP's RiA nutrition indicators must be used where applicable. If OFDA is funding the nutrition component of the activity, the OFDA indicators must also be used.

Targets serve multiple purposes:

1. **Establish shared goals**
   - Gives stakeholders a common understanding of what to expect from the activity
   - Provides justification for the investment
   - Helps to measure effectiveness of the proposed interventions
2. **Monitor progress**
   - Provides benchmarks for accountability
   - Provides evidence that the theory of change is working
   - Promotes transparency
3. **Learning**
   - Gives insights into what should be adjusted in future activities

Targets should be **ambitious** yet **achievable**. They should motivate partners to "reach" while also being realistic. The basis of the targets should be rational. Targets must be consistent with the underlying logic model of the activity design, and with time and budget constraints.

Population vs. Participant Targets

When setting targets, it is important to determine whether the measurement will take place at the population/community level, or the participant level. Most FFP emergency food security activities will measure indicators at the participant level, either through a participant-based survey or collection from all participants (e.g., census). Participant-based measurement of indicators makes target-setting simpler.

When indicators are measured at the population level it means that households who may not have received assistance, either because they were ineligible or because the entire eligible population could not be reached, will be included in the sample. When setting population targets, it is important to consider the baseline value, the coverage of the intervention, the timing and duration of the activity, and the effectiveness of the intervention.

For example, when setting a population-level target for the indicator "Percentage of households with poor, borderline, and acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS)" consider:
- Baseline value: what percent of households currently fall into each category in the target areas?
- Saturation: what percent of households in the target areas will be reached by the intervention?
- Effectiveness: what percent of households reached are expected to be in the 'acceptable' food consumption category after the intervention?

2.3.3 INDICATOR TABLE

The Indicator Table supplements the information included in the LogFrame by documenting the disaggregates, indicator type, desired direction of change, targets, actual values, data source/methods, data collection frequency, and position responsible for each indicator. The Indicator Table is organized by performance indicators and context indicators. Each aspect of the Indicator Table is described below Figure 3.

Figure 3: Indicator Table Template

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	Version	Awardee		Country		Award					
2							**Actual Values**				
3	Indicator No.	Indicator	Disaggregates	Indicator Type	Desired direction of change (+/-)	Target	Baseline Value	Endline Value	Data Source/ Methods	Data Collection Frequency	Position Responsible for Collection
4	Performance Indicators										
5	Outcome Indicators										
6											
7											
8											
9	Output Indicators										
10											
11											
12											
13											
14											
15	Context Indicators										
16				Context	NA						
17				Context	NA						
18				Context	NA						
19				Context	NA						

Definitions of Indicator Table Terms

Activity information (row 1)
The top row of the table should be updated with the Indicator Table version number, the name of the applicant/awardee, country, and award number.

Indicator Number (column A): All indicators should be numbered to correspond with the order they are listed in the LogFrame. If an indicator is deleted after the first submission, its number may not be reused, and the numbers for the indicators that followed it in the Indicator Table should not change.

Indicator (column B): Enter the indicator title, which should match the LogFrame. Note that indicators from FFP must match the indicator list in the FFP Indicators for Emergency Program Performance Indicator Reference Sheets, and indicators from OFDA must match the indicator list provided in the OFDA Proposal Guidelines.

Disaggregates (column C): Add rows for each of the disaggregates for the indicator. For example, EFSP 1 (number of individuals participating in USG food security programs) should be disaggregated by sex. For all output indicators, include a line for "total" after the disaggregates (e.g., for EFSP 1, the disaggregates should be *Female, Male, 0-14, 15-29, 30+, Total*). Include total for all output indicators.

Indicator Type (column D): Specify whether the indicator is a FFP, OFDA, custom, or context indicator.

Desired Direction of Change (+/-) (column E): For all indicators other than context indicators, enter "+" or "-" to indicate whether the desired direction of change for the value is positive or negative. For example, the desired direction of change for "percentage of households with acceptable Food Consumption Score" is positive, but the desired direction of change for "percentage of households with poor food consumption score" is negative.

Target (column F): The specific, planned values of the performance indicator to be achieved within an explicit timeframe with a given level of resources. The Indicator Table submission (due within 90 days of award approval) should include targets for the life of award for every output and outcome indicator.

Actual Values (columns G-H):
These columns should be used to record actual values of the indicator. The **Baseline Value** column should list the value of an indicator prior to activity implementation. The Indicator Table submission (due within 90 days of award approval) should include baseline values for every outcome indicator and any required disaggregates. Base values should be included for all Output indicators in this column, and will typically be zero.

Multiple columns of actual values may be added depending on data collection sources and frequency, and should be clearly named. For example, if three rounds of PDM are planned, then additional columns should be added titled *PDM 1, PDM 2,* and *PDM 3* to record those values (see Figure 4 below) . Columns that are not relevant can be grayed-out for certain indicators (e.g. PDM columns can be grayed out for indicators measured only at baseline and endline).

Figure 4: Example of Actual Value Section of Indicator Table

Target	Actual Values				
	Baseline Value	PDM 1	PDM 2	PDM 3	Endline Value

Data Source/Methods (column I): This column should provide a short summary of the data source and methods that will be used to measure the indicator. For example, FCS may be measured by a participant-based baseline survey at baseline and endline, and through PDM. Be as specific as possible, and avoid generic terms like "project records." This description should provide enough information so that a reviewer would know where to look in the M&E Plan for a more detailed description of the methods that will be used.

Data Collection Frequency (column J): In this column, state how frequently the indicator will be measured. For some indicators, this may be twice (baseline and endline), monthly (such as with indicators measured during PDM), or more frequently (such as with some output indicators).

Position Responsible for Collection (column K): This column should name the position with responsibility to collect data for each indicator. While the M&E Manager may be responsible for compiling all indicators, it is likely that other staff are involved in the collection. For example, a Distribution Manager may be responsible for collecting data for the indicator "number of individuals participating in USG food security programs."

2.3.4 PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)

A PIRS is a tool used by FFP to define performance indicators. PIRS are important for ensuring indicator data quality and consistent approaches to data collection. A well-designed PIRS should be clear enough that if the M&E Manager is to abruptly leave, the successor could continue measuring and reporting the activity's indicators in a consistent manner without ambiguity. Since both FFP and the applicant's headquarters aggregate data collected by different activities in different countries for reporting and analyses, PIRSs help to ensure the consistency of data for a specific indicator. Variation in indicator definition, disaggregation, or computation will limit the ability to aggregate the data.

The objective of a PIRS is to describe the indicator in detail, which should include:
- What raw data are needed
- What survey questions to ask, or observation processes to follow to get accurate raw data
- Who is responsible for collecting the data
- Which tools will be used for data collection
- From whom will data be gathered, or what will be observed
- Precisely when data will be collected
- How the collected data will be used to calculate the indicator value
- In what unit the indicator will be presented in
- What disaggregations will be reported
- Definition of all terms in the indicator

PIRS for all FFP emergency outcome indicators are included in the FFP Indicators for Emergency Program Performance Indicator Reference Sheets document. These PIRS should be used to ensure that the indicators are measured consistently across partners. If necessary, the FFP emergency PIRS can be contextualized to meet the specific needs of the partner and the context in which they are operating. These changes should not alter the underlying definition or calculation of the indicator, and all changes should be clearly documented.

PIRSs for all indicators in the activity's LogFrame (both FFP and custom) are due within 90 days of award approval. For FFP indicators, the partners can submit the FFP PIRSs, with contextualization as needed. For custom outcome indicators, partners are required to develop their own PIRS following the FFP

template so that FFP can understand what the indicator is measuring and how it will be calculated. Note that PIRS are only required for custom outcome indicators, but producing PIRS for other levels of custom indicators is recommended.

Table 4: Emergency Indicator PIRS Template

INDICATOR: [enter indicator number and title)	
APPLICABILITY:	
INDICATOR REFERENCE NUMBERS:	
DEFINITION:	
UNIT:	
CALCULATIONS:	
REQUIRED DISAGGREGATION:	
LEVEL:	DIRECTION OF CHANGE (+/-):
MEASUREMENT NOTES	
LEVEL OF COLLECTION:	
WHO COLLECTS DATA:	
DATA SOURCE:	
FREQUENCY OF DATA COLLECTION:	
DATA COLLECTION METHODS:	
FURTHER GUIDANCE:	

Descriptions of PIRS Sections

Indicator: Include the indicator title and FFP indicator number (if applicable).

Applicability: This section describes when the indicator is required. For custom PIRS, enter "N/A".

Indicator Reference Numbers: List the reference numbers for the indicator, including FFP EFSP indicator numbers, Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure (SPS), etc.

Definition: A precise description of what the indicator is and how it is derived. This section should unambiguously define key words, terms, and phrases. For data collected using questionnaires, the indicator definition should include the specific question(s) that enumerators will use to gather the raw data needed to calculate the indicator. Note that the definition for custom output indicators should **not** explain why the indicator was included. The justification for using the indicator should be clear in the LogFrame.

Unit: The unit of measure in which the indicator will be presented (e.g., number, percent, kilograms, score, etc.). As applicable, include the range of minimum and/or maximum indicator values or a list of the possible encoded values with their meanings.

Calculations: How the raw data will be processed to derive the indicator values. Include the formula for calculation and fully define each factor in the formula.

Required Disaggregation: A list of all the different ways the indicator values will be disaggregated (male/female, urban/rural, region, household composition, IDP/non-IDP, etc.)

Level: Identify the indicator as an outcome, output, or context indicator. The level must correspond to the related level in the LogFrame. Note that PIRS are only required for custom outcome indicators, but producing PIRS for other levels of custom indicators is recommended.

Direction of Change: For all indicators other than Context, include the desired direction of change (either "+" or "-").

Data Source: The data source for each indicator should be listed in this section. Who/what will provide the specific data for the indicator. Be as specific as possible, and avoid generic terms like "project records."

Data Collection Method: This section should describe what methods will be used to collect data for the indicator. What tools or approaches are used to collect data. For example, a participant-based survey would be conducted for the baseline and endline surveys, or a representative sample of voucher recipients sampled monthly for PDM.

Further Guidance: References, handbooks or other guidance with additional details on the measurement of the indicator.

CHAPTER 3. MONITORING

Monitoring plays an important role in ensuring that emergency food security activities are efficient, effective, and on track to meet their objectives. Monitoring has two main purposes: tracking progress and accountability. The Monitoring Plan should be based on the activity's LogFrame and designed to facilitate management decisions. A well-designed monitoring system can provide credible and actionable data enabling both the awardee and FFP to gain important insight into how to manage and improve the effectiveness of activities.

Examples of the role that monitoring plays for accountability and performance include:
- Demonstrating results to stakeholders
- Accountability to the affected population
- Keeping to the activity plan during implementation
- Improving the relevance and appropriateness of the activity
- Identifying implementation issues and improving the quality of implementation
- Organizational learning to inform future activities

This chapter provides FFP's policy and guidance for both performance monitoring and context monitoring in emergency activities. **Performance monitoring** includes monitoring the quantity, quality, and timeliness of activity outputs within the control of FFP awardees, as well as monitoring activity strategic outcomes that are expected to result from the combination of these outputs and other factors. **Context monitoring** includes monitoring local conditions or external factors that our outside of the manageable interests of the awardee but may directly affect implementation and performance.

3.1 Performance Monitoring
Performance monitoring is defined as the ongoing and systematic collection of performance indicator data and other quantitative or qualitative information to reveal whether implementation is on track, the quality of implementation is high, and whether expected results are being achieved. This includes monitoring the quantity, quality, and timeliness of activity outputs within the control of FFP or its awardees, as well as the monitoring of activity and strategic outcomes that are expected to result from the combination of these outputs and other factors.[4] In the context of FFP emergency awards, performance monitoring falls into three distinct groups: outcome monitoring, output monitoring, and process monitoring.

3.1.1 OUTCOME MONITORING

Outcomes are the conditions of people, systems, or institutions that indicate progress or lack of progress toward achievement of activity goals. Outcomes are any result higher
than an output to which a given output contributes but for which it is not solely responsible. Outcomes may be intermediate or end outcomes, short-term or long-term, intended or unintended, positive or negative, direct or indirect.[5] These might include changes in households' food security or nutrition

---

[4] Adapted from USAID ADS 201.3.5.5A
[5] Adapted from USAID ADS 201.6 Definitions

status, or changes in people's knowledge, attitudes, or practices. Lower-level outcomes in an activity's LogFrame are preconditions for higher-level outcomes.

Monitoring outcomes is important to understand if an activity is achieving or on-track to achieve the stated objectives. Awardees should document their outcome monitoring strategy in their Monitoring Plan, including what methods and practices will be used to monitor outcomes and the frequency of data collection. FFP requires monitoring food security outcomes for all activities of six months or more in duration. FFP has three core outcome indicators:

- **EFSP 2: Percentage of households with poor, borderline, and acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS)**
  - *Required for all activities 6 months or more in duration that provide in-kind, non-therapeutic food, cash or voucher transfers.*
- **EFSP 3: Reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)**
  - *Required for activities 12 months or more in duration that provide in-kind, non-therapeutic food, cash or voucher transfers.*
- **EFSP 4: Prevalence of households with moderate or severe Household Hunger Scale (HHS) score.**
  - *Required for activities 12 months or more in duration that provide in-kind, non-therapeutic food, cash or voucher transfers.*

Outcome monitoring can be particularly challenging in the context of rapid onset emergencies. Emergency activities are typically implemented over a short period of time (12 months or fewer) limiting the ability to measure changes in some indicators. The affected populations may be mobile (refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs)), which can make it difficult to re-sample the same population. Finally, security issues can limit access to the affected population. This chapter describes some methods and practices that can be used for outcome monitoring in these environments.

3.1.2 OUTPUT MONITORING

Outputs are the immediate products of interventions implemented by an activity, including goods and/or services provided (i.e., food or cash distributed), trainings completed, and behavior change communication events held. Outputs are what are produced as a direct result of inputs. They are the tangible, immediate, and intended products or consequences of an activity within FFP/awardees' control or influence. Outputs must be completed in order for an activity to achieve its outcomes. FFP's primary required output indicator is[6]:

- **EFSP 1: Number of individuals participating in USG food security programs**
  - *Required for all activities.*

Monitoring outputs is a critical tool for both project management and accountability. It allows the stakeholders to understand whether the implementation is on track as planned, and whether it corresponds to the resources spent.

---

[6] Indicators EFSP 5-8 are required-if-applicable for activities that include certain nutrition interventions.

3.1.3 PROCESS MONITORING

Process monitoring allows activity managers to assess implementation quality, adherence to minimum standards, and identify ways in which implementation can be improved. Process monitoring is a critical tool for managers as it allows for early detection of issues. Identifying and addressing implementation issues early is important so that outputs are of high quality and activity objectives are likely to be achieved.

With resource transfer activities (regardless of modality), the aim of process monitoring is to ensure accountability across the supply chain and ensure that the participant experience throughout the program cycle meets or exceeds humanitarian standards. Process monitoring may be used to identify protection issues including accommodation for vulnerable groups, sexual exploitation and abuse, and transaction costs incurred, or issues of fraud, waste, or abuse.

Process monitoring for supply chains should ensure that tracking systems and standard operating procedures are able to effectively follow resource transfers to the end recipient. This includes methods for monitoring and minimizing losses (including adequate storage, transportation, and handling), ensuring commodity quality, and adherence to checks and balances which specifically assign responsibility.

The objective of process monitoring is to ensure that activities and resources are delivered in such a way that it meets or exceeds humanitarian standards. More specifically, this includes timely delivery of appropriate assistance while doing no harm in the process and minimizing exposure to risks (with specific consideration to protection and gender).

One example of process monitoring is food basket monitoring. The purpose of food basket monitoring is to ensure consistency in the size of the ration participants are receiving. For example, a sample of participants leaving the distribution site might have their ration weighed to ensure that it is within the margin of error of the planned ration size.

Other examples of process monitoring include:
- Whether the resource transfer was received by the right person, safely, on time, and in the correct amount
- Travel and wait times to receive the transfer
- Transaction costs incurred in receiving the transfer
- Targeting-related inclusion and exclusion errors

For additional guidance on process monitoring, see the following resource:
- [Monitoring Guidance for CTP in Emergencies](#), CaLP

3.2 CONTEXT MONITORING

In addition to monitoring the performance of the activity, awardees should also monitor the surrounding context. Context monitoring is defined as the systematic collection of information about conditions and external factors relevant to the implementation and performance of the activity. This includes

information about local conditions that may directly affect implementation and performance (such as other projects operating in the same sector or geographic area), markets, or external factors that may indirectly affect implementation and performance (such as macroeconomic, social, security or political conditions). Context monitoring should be used to monitor assumptions and risks identified in an activity's LogFrame.[7]

Applicants must include an operational context monitoring plan as a section of their Monitoring Plan that describes the operational context issues that may impact the activity and how these issues will be monitored. The context monitoring plan must identify the indicators and data collection methods that will be used.

At a minimum, the operational context monitoring plan must monitor the price and availability of staple food commodities in the primary market areas where operations are occurring. Applicants must identify the commodities that will be tracked, the locations, and the frequency of market monitoring. To mitigate duplicative monitoring, partners may use reliable secondary data from other actors (UN, FEWS NET, NGOs, and/or National Ministries) in shared markets. If specific thresholds are to be established to signal the possibility of a distortion, describe the process that will be used to identify those thresholds. FFP encourages partners to work with FEWS NET, WFP, Food Security Clusters and Cash Working Groups to ensure harmonized technical standards around market monitoring including units of measurement (both in terms of weight and commodity specifications), frequency of collection, methodology and locations. FFP expects all partners to routinely provide FEWS NET and coordination mechanisms with market monitoring data.

For more technical guidance on market monitoring and analysis see the following resources:
- MARKit: Price Monitoring, Analysis and Response Kit
- ICRC Market Analysis Guidance: Chapter 3
- WFP Price Monitoring

3.3 DATA COLLECTION

The following sections provide guidance on data collection methods, standards, and practices to be used in the monitoring of emergency activities.

3.3.1 METHODS

Participant-based surveys (PaBS)

PaBSs are conducted among a sample of the target population that participates in an activity's interventions. In the context of emergency activities, PaBS is commonly used to collect baseline data, post-distribution monitoring, and endline data. Chapter 4 provides more information on PaBS design.

---

[7] Context monitoring definition adapted from ADS 201.3.5.5b

FFP discourages the use of Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) for collecting data for EFSP indicators. However, it can be used for processes monitoring, and to measure coverage of services.[8]

Routine monitoring

Routine monitoring refers to data that is collected on an ongoing basis by activity staff throughout implementation. Routine monitoring data is typically collected from all direct participants, and measures indicators at the output and outcome levels. Routine monitoring requires staff to allocate time so that they can collect data from participants, and for M&E staff and supervisors to regularly review and spot-check that data to identify issues. This system of checks instills confidence in the integrity of the data, thereby allowing the activity to use the data in near real time to review progress and identify challenges. Examples of routine data collection include:

- Activity staff collecting information on participants who attend trainings, receive transfers (food/cash/voucher), or receive behavior change communication, including attendance, demographic data, and achievement (i.e., results of pre and post-tests)
- Monitoring transaction records of a transfer program using ATM cards or mobile-money transfers
- Activity staff records from a food or voucher distribution verifying the participant ID and ration received
- Collecting food security outcome data such as food consumption score using the prescribed tool from the participants

For more technical guidance on participant-based surveys see the following resources:

- Participant-Based Survey Sampling Guide for Feed the Future Annual Monitoring Indicators

3.3.2 STANDARDS

Actionable

All data collected under the monitoring system should be actionable. Given the short life of most emergency activities, and complex operating environments, it is critical that activities only collect data that will be useful. The Monitoring Plan should not only document how data will be collected, but also specify how it will be used. There are two components to creating actionable data. First, the organizational use of each piece of data should be articulated, including reporting, learning, and management decision making. Second, monitoring systems should be designed to ensure that information gets to those who need it when they need it.[9]

---

[8] For additional information, please refer to section 9.1.5 ("*A Cautionary Note on the Use of Lot Quality Assurance Sampling*") on page 35 of the Participant-Based Survey Sampling Guide for Feed the Future Annual Monitoring Indicators.

[9] Adapted from "Monitoring for Learning and Accountability", Goldilocks Toolkit, Innovations for Poverty Action, 2016.

Primary and Secondary Data

Emergency activity awardees may use both primary or secondary data in their monitoring. Primary data refers to data that is collected directly by the awardee. While collecting primary data requires more time and resources, awardees have significantly more control over the quality of primary data. Secondary data are data collected by someone else for a different purpose. The data could have been collected from other sources, such as host country governments, the cluster system, or other implementing partners. While primary data is preferred, the use of secondary data should be explored, especially for context monitoring including market monitoring.

Do No Harm

Awardees must consider the principle of "do no harm" when designing monitoring strategies, paying attention to who is collecting data, from whom, where, when, and how. This is particularly important for sensitive information, and in conflict-affected areas, where awardees must balance the tradeoffs between collecting enough data to verify their activities with the security risks facing their staff and participants.

3.3.3 APPROACHES

Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM)

PDM is a performance monitoring tool primarily used to monitor the use of transfers (in-kind, cash, and voucher). However, awardees often add other process indicators such as the effectiveness of the complaints and feedback mechanism, wait time, taste of food, and adequacy. PDM provides managers with information which they can use to assess the appropriateness of the modality, the efficiency of implementation, and the effectiveness of the approach to achieve stated outcomes.

PDM should be implemented after each distribution, and should track utilization of household food assistance, household food consumption, participants' food preferences, timeliness of the assistance, participants' perception about gender and protection considerations, safety and security, access to and effectiveness of participant feedback loops and other factors associated with the transfer of the entitlement.

The PDM approaches proposed for the activity must be documented in the PDM plan. The PDM plan must include the following components: indicators collected, survey design, sampling frame, sample size calculation, sample selection, and analysis including sample weight application.

PDM data can be collected through routine monitoring or through surveys. If it is collected through a survey, the design should use a probabilistic sampling method. However, considering the frequency of PDM and the purpose, a lower level of precision could be acceptable (e.g., using a 90 percent confidence interval) to keep the sample size at a reasonable size.

Participant Complaint and Feedback Monitoring

Participant complaint and feedback monitoring is both an important performance monitoring tool and necessary for achieving accountability to affected populations (AAP). In line with the fifth Core

Humanitarian Standard, communities and people affected by crisis should have access to safe and responsive mechanisms to handle feedback and complaints. The Monitoring Plan must describe the participant complaint and feedback monitoring system, including:

- How the affected population was involved in the program design
- What mechanisms will be put in place to receive complaints and feedback from participants (e.g., hotline, suggestion box, focus group discussions, etc.)
- How the affected population will be made aware of the complaint and feedback mechanism(s)
- Indicators and targets that will be used to track the timely resolution of complaints received
- How complaints will be managed in a timely, fair, and appropriate manner
- How you will ensure that the mechanism is safe, secure, and accessible

FFP expects that the complaint and feedback mechanism(s) will be easily accessible to participants, and that the existence of the mechanism will be will known among the participant population. Note that participant complaint and feedback mechanisms are not necessarily standalone, and may use other parts of the monitoring system, such as PDM, to receive information.

Third-party Monitoring (TPM)

FFP and our partners work in many complex non-permissive environments (NPEs) where security concerns prevent FFP and expatriate partner staff from conducting regular site visits to monitor and verify the implementation of activities. USAID defines a NPE as having significant barriers to operating effectively and safely due to one or more of the following factors:

- Armed conflict to which the U.S. is a party or not a party;
- Limited physical access due to distance, infrastructure, disaster, geography, or non-presence;
- Restricted political space due to repression of political activity and expression; or
- Uncontrolled criminality including corruption.[10]

TPM is one remote management tool that FFP and partners can use to monitor activities in NPEs. While the primary objective of TPM is to verify outputs, it can also be used to capture implementation challenges, successes, and community perception of the interventions implemented by the activity. TPM involves contracting a third party organization to conduct both quantitative and qualitative data collection, primarily through periodic site visits.

Awardees operating in countries where FFP utilizes a third-party mechanism will be expected to closely coordinate with the TPM contractor, and facilitate any requested site visits. Site visits typically involve the TPM contractor interviewing activity staff, key informants (community or camp leaders, etc.), and conducting focus group discussions with participants. Depending on the activity being monitored, TPM site visits will also include visual observations, such as adherence to warehousing standard operating procedures or observing the distribution process, or review of documents. Site visits are typically categorized using a rating system that indicates areas of concern, positive findings, or the need for

---

[10] United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2017, January 23). ADS Chapter 201 Program Cycle Operational Policy.

immediate action.[11] In addition to verifying outputs, TPM mechanisms may also monitor outcome indicators, such as FCS and coping strategies.

While the primary objective of TPM is verification, it can also serve an important role as a complement to a partner's internal performance monitoring system. The results of each site visit are shared with awardees for their awareness, and to respond to any issues that were flagged. This provides a useful flow of information about implementation that can help inform partner management decision-making.

In some high-risk contexts, partners may be asked to have their own TPM. This will be communicated to applications during the application phase.

3.4 DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE

Given the difficult contexts and time-sensitive nature of emergency activities, awardees must carefully design systems to ensure that data collected are of sufficiently high quality to meet management needs. The Monitoring Plan must describe how an awardee will ensure that data collected and generated in their M&E systems meet the five key data quality attributes: **validity**, **reliability**, **timeliness**, **precision**, and **integrity**.

The Data Quality Assurance section of the M&E Plan should describe:
- Strategies used to reduce bias and errors in measurement, transcription, and processing of data.
- Documentation of methods and protocols for data collection, data entry and cleaning, coding, aggregation, and analysis.
- Procedures for verifying and validating the data collected by the M&E system. These procedures may include:
    - o Site visits by project staff to participants who were respondents to surveys or another means of data collection in order to verify responses
    - o Inclusion of photographs, video or audio recordings, or other evidence to allow others to verify observations, transcriptions, and interpretations by the collector
    - o Systematic review of collected data to compare values collected across time and location to flag outliers or reversals of trends that should be investigated
    - o Incorporation of reasonability checks and comparisons into data collection, entry, and processing software; double keying of data in entry procedures; use of dropdowns and conditional entry fields; and developing filters, macros, and scripts to identify data outside reasonable parameters or data that contradict each other

Data Quality Assessments (DQAs) are periodic reviews to assess how effective the data quality assurance processes described in the monitoring plan have been at meeting the five key data quality attributes: validity, reliability, timeliness, precision, and integrity. The purpose of a DQA is to ensure that

---

[11] Note that the rating system will vary between TPM contracts, but should be well defined and communicated with all stakeholders.

awardees and FFP staff are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of indicator data, and the extent to which data integrity can be trusted to influence management decisions. A DQA is designed to:

- Verify the <u>quality</u> of the data
- Assess the <u>system</u> that produces the data
- Develop action plans to address identified issues and improve quality

DQAs can be particularly important for partners operating in non-permissive environments and implementing through remote management. The DQA can help the partners to identify threats to their data quality. FFP encourages all awardees to complete one DQA during the course of the activity. For each DQA, FFP recommends that an awardee focus on 2-3 indicators. The selection of the indicators should be strategic, and may take into consideration:

- Indicators that are complicated to measure
- Indicators of suspect data quality
- Indicators of high importance to decision making
- Indicators that demonstrate an intervention's progress
- Indicators that represent different data flow processes

In the DQA, reviewers will review the flow of data for each of the selected indicators to verify their quality and potential sources of error at each stage, beginning from the initial point of collection and continuing through reporting and use. The DQA process may examine:

- M&E staffing, functions, and capabilities
- Indicator definitions and reporting guidelines
- Data collection tools and reporting forms
- Processes of data verification, aggregation, processing, management, storage, and safeguarding
- Data use and dissemination practices

For awardees planning to conduct a DQA, the Monitoring Plan should describe the timing and processes, including:

- A list of indicators to be reviewed and a justification for the selection
- Timing and duration of the planned DQA
- Specific focus of the review (e.g. identify a particular step in the data collection process that has been identified as a risk to data quality)
- Roles and responsibilities for conducting the DQA

A DQA will typically be implemented by activity M&E staff (internal DQA). DQAs can also be externally conducted for increased independence. The findings from any DQA should be shared with the activity's management, and should be used to improve the data collection processes and systems for the selected indicators. FFP strongly encourages awardees to also share DQA findings with FFP. USAID may choose to conduct its own DQA, which may be conducted by FFP M&E staff or by a contractor.

For more information on DQAs, see the following resources:

- [USAID ADS 201.3.5.8](#)
- [FFP DQA Webinar handout](#)

- [MEASURE Evaluation Data Quality Assessment Methodology and Tools](#)

3.5 DATA MANAGEMENT AND SAFEGUARDING

The Monitoring Plan must describe an awardee's plan for protecting data from unintended change, misuse, loss, or destruction as it is collected and as it flows between and through the various sites of processing to its final storage location. This relates to data on paper, on other media, and in digital format. Any breach of privacy or inappropriate use of data can potentially result in negative unintended consequences, especially in contexts with conflict or internal divisions and tensions. Therefore, access to data for viewing, use, and modification must be restricted. The plan should also describe how and for how long the data will be preserved for future use. For consortium or partnership activities, the Monitoring Plan must describe how data management will be coordinated across partners.

Examples of data management and safeguards include:
- Measures that will be taken to ensure and safeguard participant confidentiality and protect personal identity information, including on both hard copy and digital files
- Systems to store/maintain original data files/activity records: Where original data will be stored, how they will be protected, who can access them, how long the awardee will retain them, and procedures and timeline for their destruction
- Methods, frequency, and locations of file and database backups and who is responsible for making backups; measures to prevent and detect unauthorized data access for data entry, editing, processing, or retrieval; virus protection of digital data; and security measures to protect the physical location of hard copies, databases, and data backups

CHAPTER 4. EVALUATION

Evaluation plays an important role in fulfilling FFP's obligation to ensure the effective and efficient use of resources as a tool for both accountability and learning. This chapter describes FFP's requirements for baseline studies, implementation quality reviews (IQRs), and final evaluations for emergency activities. Evaluations funded by FFP should be widely shared with partners including FEWS NET, clusters and working groups, and posted to the DEC.

4.1 BASELINE STUDIES

A baseline study is required for all awards that are 12 months or longer in duration. FFP recommends that a baseline study is conducted for shorter awards, but does not require it. The purpose of the baseline study is to collect data for outcome indicators before implementation begins. These baseline values serve as a point of comparison with endline values during the final evaluation. They also provide the implementing partner with important information about their affected population that can be used to improve targeting and activity design before implementation begins. In many cases, the baseline study will represent the most thorough recent study of the target population and can provide valuable insights to activity staff.

Summary of Baseline Study Requirements

> *When a Baseline Study is Required*
> - Required for awards 12 months or longer
> - Optional for awards shorter than 12 months
>
> *Who Conducts Baseline*
> - Implementing partner or external firm
>
> *Requirements for Awardees Conducting a Baseline*
> - Submit abbreviated statement of work (SOW) with the application
> - Complete quantitative data collection **within 90 days** of award approval
> - Submit final Baseline Study report to AOR and DEC **within 150 days** of award approval
> - Submit all datasets to the DDL in accordance with ADS 579

4.1.1 BASELINE STUDY METHODS

The baseline study must include a quantitative participant-based or population-based survey depending on the objective of the activity or interventions proposed. A population-based and participant-based surveys must be based on a probability sample. Each option is discussed briefly below. In rare cases, a participant census may be used.

Participant-based Survey

Most baseline studies for FFP-funded emergency activities should use participant-based surveys (PaBSs). PaBSs are conducted among the target population that participates in an activity's interventions. The PaBS must use a probability sample. The awardee may conduct a probability-based sample of activity participants either during registration or at a later time. The sampling strategy should match the activity's design. If the activity will use rolling participant registration or cohorts, baseline data collection should be collected on a rolling basis or for each cohort.

Population-based Survey

In cases where an awardee is implementing community-level interventions or is required to report on GAM, a population-based survey (PBS) may be conducted. A PBS is a probability survey that is designed to be representative of all households in the area of implementation. Population-based surveys are more complex and time consuming to implement than participant-based surveys, but they allow for inferences to be made about the entire population rather than just direct participants.

Participant Census

A census includes *all* participants whereas a probability sample survey includes only a *selection* of participants. A census may be appropriate if the awardee collects baseline data (i.e., outcome indicator data) during the participant registration process and opts to collect data from all participants.

Awardees with nutrition components who are reporting GAM may use one of the probability-based sampling methodologies described in the [SMART methodology](#).

4.1.2 BASELINE STUDY CONTENT

The baseline study should be designed to measure all outcome indicators in the awardee's LogFrame. The baseline study must collect data on:

- All required (R) and required if applicable (RiA) FFP emergency indicators. They must be collected and calculated exactly as described in the [FFP Indicators for Emergency Program Performance Indicator Reference Sheets](#). An indicator handbook is forthcoming. These indicators should not be modified or substituted without approval from FFP (AOR and M&E Advisor). However, PIRS should be contextualized as appropriate without changing the indicator definition.
- Any custom outcome indicators included in the applicant's LogFrame.

FFP does not require a qualitative component of the baseline study. However, an awardee may conduct qualitative data collection to complement or help interpret the quantitative data, learn about the context, or to help answer any other questions they identify to improve implementation.

4.1.3 BASELINE STUDY TIMING

Quantitative data collection for the baseline study must be completed within 90 days of the approval of the award. Data collection should take place before implementation has begun in order to get an accurate measure of participants' baseline status. It is important to ensure that data is collected quickly as to not delay implementation. However, implementation should not wait if the awardee cannot conduct the baseline right away. If implementation begins before the baseline data is collected, this should be discussed in the "limitations" section of the baseline study report. The final baseline study report must be submitted to the AOR and Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) within 150 days of award approval.

4.1.4 USE OF BASELINE STUDY RESULTS TO REFINE ACTIVITY STRATEGIES

Baseline studies often represent the most in-depth and recent study of the target population. FFP expects that awardees will use the baseline study results to review their activity design and refine implementation as necessary. For example, an activity with an IYCF component may find that the prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet was much lower than anticipated, and decide to re-allocate more resources to their activities working to improve this. Awardees can consider holding a workshop to present their baseline findings to staff, discuss assumptions that may have been challenged, and identify how implementation should be adjusted.

Baseline study resources:

- [FFP Guidance for an Abbreviated Statement of Work (SOW) for a Baseline Study and Final Evaluation for Emergency Programs](#)
- [Measuring Mortality, Nutritional Status, and Food Security in Crisis Situations: SMART Methodology](#)

4.2 IMPLEMENTATION QUALITY REVIEWS

Implementation quality reviews (IQRs) are optional and serve as a complement to the awardee's performance monitoring. IQRs may be proposed by the partner or requested by FFP. FFP may request an IQR for longer-term activities (over 12 months), or for activities that are being considered for a cost-extension.

The objective of an IQR is to objectively review the progress of implementation, assess implementation quality, identify challenges faced, and provide recommendations for course correction. IQRs will primarily use qualitative approaches.

An IQR will typically be conducted as a joint monitoring trip comprising technical specialists from FFP, the USAID/Mission and awardees based on a jointly drafted SOW. In other instances, the awardee may propose to conduct their own IQR internally or with a third-party consultant.

4.2.1 IMPLEMENTATION QUALITY REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

If a partner plans to conduct an IQR, it should be detailed in their Evaluation Plan when it is submitted with the proposal. The plan should detail who will participate in the IQR (implementing partner staff, USAID staff, etc.), what questions it will attempt to answer, what methods will be used, and when it will take place. A SOW should be developed for all IQRs before they take place. IQRs should be conducted by staff not directly working on the activity where possible.

Note: further guidance on IQRs for FFP emergency food security activities is forthcoming.

4.3 FINAL EVALUATIONS

A mixed-method final performance evaluation is required for all awards that are 12 months or longer in duration.[12] Final evaluations are recommended but not required for awards shorter than 12 months. Exceptions to the evaluation requirement can be requested for responses immediately following a sudden-onset disaster (e.g. hurricane, earthquake, tsunami, flood, cyclone, etc.). Possible evaluation objectives include:

- Evaluate the achievements of the activity in relation to the goal, objectives, results, and targets.
- Evaluate the activity's effects on local markets, and how it affected certain groups of interest (women and men; youth; refugees/IDPs/host communities, etc).
- Evaluate the effectiveness and relevance of the modality, transfers, and complementary interventions to achieve activity outcomes.
- Identify best practices, lessons learned, strengths, and challenges in the activity design, including the LogFrame, and implementation for achieving activity achievements.

---

[12] If a base award is fewer than 12 months and is then extended to a total length of over 12 months, please consult with FFP (AOR and M&E Advisor) regarding final evaluation requirements.

Summary of Final Evaluation Requirements

When a Final Evaluation is Required
- Required for awards 12 months or longer
- Optional for awards shorter than 12 months

Who Conducts Final Evaluation
- Either a third-party firm, or an internal team led by an experienced external team leader

Requirements for Awardees Conducting a Final Evaluation
- Submit abbreviated statement of work (SoW) with the application
- Submit final evaluation report to AOR and DEC
- Submit all datasets to the DDL in accordance with ADS 579

4.3.1 FINAL EVALUATION METHODS & CONTENT

The final evaluation must be a mixed-methods performance evaluation. The performance evaluations should integrate a comparison of baseline and endline quantitative data, as well as a qualitative study. The performance evaluation may also include a review of performance monitoring data. A draft evaluation SOW must be included with the application, which should describe the evaluation questions and methods that will be used to answer those questions.

Evaluation Questions

When drafting the evaluation SOW, it is important to ensure that evaluation questions are consistent with the evaluation objectives, and that the evaluation methods are appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. It is also important to structure the evaluation to the context of the activity. For example, an evaluation of a response to a sudden-onset emergency (e.g. earthquake or flood) should look different to a response to a protracted crisis (e.g. protracted refugee crisis).

FFP typically recommends that between one and five evaluation questions are selected, and that each evaluation question is concise with well-defined terms. Avoid long lists of poorly-defined or difficult-to-answer questions. Keep in mind that the evaluation questions should focus on what is most important - not every aspect of an activity needs to be evaluated. Vague terms like "relevance" and "effectiveness" can be interpreted in many ways, so clear definitions should be provided. Evaluation questions should be listed by order of importance, with question number one being the most important.

Examples of evaluation topics and questions that can be used to inform the development of evaluation questions include:
a) **Achievements**: To what extent have the activity's interventions adhered to planned implementation - schedules, participant targeting, resource transfer composition and quantities, inputs and service delivery, and outputs - and achieved intended goals, purposes and outcomes? Did interventions reach the appropriate target groups and individuals within the target areas? Are interventions appropriate and effective for the target group based on the nature of their vulnerabilities? How effective was the targeting approach in achieving the activity goal? What

factors promoted or inhibited adherence to plans and targets? How were problems and challenges managed? What lessons were learned?

b) **Effectiveness and Efficiency of Interventions and Intervention Implementation**: To what extent did the activity consider gender equity, protection, age, physical and emotional challenges of the participants, and risks to participation in various interventions in activity design and implementation? How has management adapted the activity design or implementation based on monitoring information and feedback from the target population? What lessons were learned regarding activity design and implementation? What was the level of efficiency timely delivery of the goods or services, and adjusting the transfer amount based on price and need changes?

c) **Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned:** What changes—expected and unexpected, positive and negative—did targeted participants, community members and other stakeholders associated with the activity's interventions? What factors appear to facilitate or inhibit these changes? Which interventions appear to be more or less influential to activity outcomes? How do these changes correspond to those hypothesized by the activity's LogFrame?

d) **Linkages, Layering, and Exit Strategies**: To what extent did the activity take advantage of other USG and non-USG investments in the same space to facilitate linkages with complementary services, layering with earlier investments, and implementing an exit strategy/ies to minimize the dependency on external support? To what extent did the activity align and integrate with host government social protection strategy/policy/service delivery?

Quantitative Baseline and Endline Surveys

FFP requires the collection and analysis of quantitative survey data at baseline and as part of the final evaluation. Quantitative baseline/endline surveys must utilize the same data collection instruments, level of statistical precision, and statistical power. The evaluation should be designed to detect statistically significant changes in estimates from baseline to endline for key indicators.

Ideally, a quantitative baseline/endline survey should collect data at the same season to ensure comparability of data. The required indicators that should be included in the baseline and endline surveys are described in section 2.3.1 of this document.

Where possible, baseline and endline surveys should follow the same methodology to simplify analysis. For example, a rolling baseline (e.g., a baseline conducted with different groups of participants as they are enrolled in the activity over time) should not be compared with an endline survey that is taken with a sample of all participants at the end of the activity. Because participants were enrolled at different times, they will have received different amounts of assistance. Also, some participants may still be receiving assistance at the time of the endline, while others may have gone months without receiving assistance. In this case, one option the awardee may propose would be to use a final PDM (conducted at a standardized interval after the final distribution - e.g., one month) to ensure that the data is comparable across participants. Awardees should consult with the FFP M&E Advisor backstopping their country to discuss their plan.

For guidance on sample sizes and sampling strategies for the baseline and endline surveys, see [FFP Guidance for an Abbreviated Statement of Work (SOW) for a Baseline Study and Final Evaluation for Emergency Programs](#).

Qualitative Study

FFP requires that a qualitative study be conducted as part of the final evaluation. The qualitative methods used should be selected in order to accurately answer the evaluation questions. The qualitative data collection should assess the effectiveness of:

- project management, systems, and processes established by the activity, including strategies to improve gender equity both at the participant and project management level
- protection issues
- exit strategy and its implementation,
- performance monitoring, and
- conflict sensitivity.

The qualitative evaluation must also capture lessons learned and best practices. The evaluation team can use a variety of qualitative methods for collecting information. These methods and protocols should be designed to ensure that if a different, well-qualified evaluator were to undertake the same evaluation, he or she would arrive at the same or similar conclusions.

The evaluation team will design the overall qualitative study approach and should consider a variety of primary data collection methods, including: semi-structured in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and observations. The evaluation team leader and members will be responsible for collecting and analyzing the qualitative data.

Where possible, the qualitative study should follow the quantitative data collection. This will allow evaluators to use the qualitative data collection to further study topics and trends that emerged from the quantitative data collection.

Additional information on methodology and an illustrative list of evaluation questions can be found in the [FFP Guidance for an Abbreviated Statement of Work (SOW) for a Baseline Study and Final Evaluation for Emergency Programs](#).

4.3.1 FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation team leader is responsible for drafting the final evaluation report. It is important to ensure that both the quantitative and qualitative components are well-integrated and are used to support cohesive findings. FFP expects that evaluation reports will be well-written, insightful, and concise. Once the report is finalized, it should be uploaded to the DEC.

All evaluation reports should be formatted consistently with USAID's [evaluation report template](#).

CHAPTER 5. REPORTING & CLOSEOUT

This chapter provides a summary of reporting and closeout requirements for FFP emergency awards. This should serve a supplementary resource. Awardees should reference the language included in their award document as their primary source of information.

5.1 REPORTING

5.1.1. QUARTERLY REPORTING

All emergency activities must submit quarterly reports within 30 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, except for the last quarter of the year when the ARR would replace the quarterly report and include any information that would otherwise be due in that fiscal quarter. The purpose of quarterly performance reports (QRs) is to share progress against indicators identified in the M&E Plan, tell the story behind the indicators, and share any planned changes in programmatic approaches. In addition, FFP requires post distribution monitoring (PDM) reporting related to household food security and the role of food assistance in achieving household food security. The PDM reporting should describe how beneficiaries use food assistance transfers, whether that usage is consistent with the project design, and other sources of household food. The detailed requirements for QRs are listed on pages 55-58 of the APS. Other specific requirements based on the modality may be included in the award documentation.

5.1.2 ANNUAL REPORTING

The Annual Results Report (ARR) is an annual reporting requirement for all current and recently closed FFP awards implemented by U.S. or non-U.S. non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including private voluntary organizations (PVOs). ARRs are required for both emergency and non-emergency awards.

For more information on the Annual Results Report:
- Annual Results Report Guidance for Emergency and IFRP Awards

5.1.3 FINAL PROGRAMMATIC REPORTING

Final programmatic reporting requirements are described in the award language and on pages 58-60 of the APS. Information should be reported at the end of the activity life for the entire life of the activity.

5.2 CLOSEOUT

5.2.1. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS TO THE DEC

The Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) is the largest online resource for USAID-funded technical and activity materials. PVO awardees are required to submit documentation created during the course of their award to the DEC, such as assessments, analyses, studies, articles, baselines studies, midterm and final evaluations, and appropriate components of the Annual Results Report. Awardees should review their award language and consult with their AOR if there are questions about what must be submitted to the DEC.

Resources:

- USAID's [ADS 540: USAID Development Experience](#) provides policy directives, required procedures, and roles and responsibilities governing the submission of materials to the DEC.

5.2.2. SUBMISSION OF DATA TO THE DDL

The [Development Data Library (DDL)](#) is the Agency's repository of USAID-funded, machine readable data created or collected by the Agency and its implementing partners. According to [ADS 579](#), any dataset created or collected with USAID funding must be submitted to the DDL. For FFP emergency awards, this would include baseline and endline survey datasets. Awardees should refer to their award documentation for any exemptions, and to the [DDL website](#) or [ADS 579](#) for submission requirements.

Resources:

- USAID's [ADS 579: USAID Development Data](#) provides policy directives, required procedures, and roles and responsibilities governing the submission of materials to the DDL.