

The M&E Toolkit for GAFSP Public Sector Window Projects

This M&E toolkit describes key features of the updated GAFSP M&E Plan, including applicable tools, revised indicators and reporting requirements, and how each is applied at different stages of the project cycle: preparation, implementation, and completion. It applies to all GAFSP funded Public Sector Windows projects — Investment Projects, Technical Assistance, Missing Middle Initiative — unless specified.

M&E Guidelines during Project Preparation

Project teams and their client counterparts should:

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

[Investment Projects only]

Carry out ex-ante economic analysis following Supervising Entity (SE) protocols, to address project sustainability in financial and fiscal dimensions and questions of market failure and spillovers, through quantitative information. The analysis will either be: (1) cost-benefit analysis, or (2) cost-effectiveness analysis. The key summary statistic of reference is the economic rate of return (ERR).

BASLINE

Collect baseline data no later than the end of the first year of project implementation and include data for all indicators included in the project's results framework. For investment projects, the survey instrument should include the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES). **See Box 1.** All GAFSP projects will undergo some form (rigorous or rapid) of impact evaluation or assessment upon completion of the project with the baseline as the first stage of the survey round. Typically, the evaluation will follow a regular cycle of baseline, mid-line, and end-line survey.

RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Prepare a comprehensive results framework for the project, explaining the logic of how the development objective of the project will be achieved. The results framework includes a set of indicators to measure outcomes that are linked to the development objective/goal of the project and a set of intermediate results to track progress toward achieving the outcomes. Ensure that all relevant GAFSP core indicators are included. **See Box 2.**

TARGETS

Determine the estimates of targets for each indicator on the basis of technical expertise, past trends, and keep assessment of what is likely to be achieved over the course of the project cycle. It is strongly preferred that **annual** targets for each indicator are provided in the project logframe or results framework.

1. FOOD INSECURITY EXPERIENCE SCALE (FIES)

GAFSP adopted the FIES as a preferred project level indicator to monitor food security (access to food) at individual or household level. All Public Sector Window investment projects are required to incorporate the FIES survey module (8 questions) in their baseline evaluations and any follow-up impact evaluation. *While investment projects must gather data for FIES, it is up to the task team if they wish to add FIES to the project results framework.*

The FIES will be used as a common metric for measuring food insecurity at several levels of severity, across different geographic areas and cultures. The household surveys will report and inform the analysis of GAFSP's mandatory impact indicator FIES at the project level. GAFSP CU, in partnership with FAO's Voices of the Hungry, will provide technical assistance to support the roll-out of FIES.

For technical assistance or questions, contact the GAFSP Coordination Unit (CU). **See Box 6.**

2. INDICATOR SELECTION

The M&E Framework for GAFSP is organized into three tiers corresponding to program or impact goals, "core" project results indicators, and portfolio performance indicators. Project teams must ensure reflection of **key GAFSP indicators** in their results frameworks, as follows:

Tier 1: GAFSP Goals & Targets

Choose from two key impact-level indicators: income and productivity. Note FIES as the mandatory indicator at the impact level, for which data must be collected for all investment projects. **See Box 1.**

Tier 2: Project-level "core" indicators

Projects must refer to the list of current GAFSP core indicators at Tier 2 and select from this menu ALL relevant indicators that are applicable to the project. These indicators should be included in the project's results framework, and progress against the targets reported to the GAFSP CU on a six-monthly basis. **Refer to the appending table.**

Tier 3: Portfolio Performance Indicators

GAFSP projects will be asked to report on specific Tier 3 indicators such as (i) Disbursement (ii) Cross-Cutting Themes (Gender, Nutrition, Jobs, Climate Change) (iii) Stakeholder Engagement (e.g. CSOs) as part of the Six Monthly Data Monitoring exercise through GAFSP Portal. **Refer to M&E Plan, pg. 16.**

M&E Guidelines during Project Implementation

Project teams and their client counterparts should:

PROGRESS REPORTING

Submit a completed progress report template on a **six-monthly basis**, for aggregation and onward submission to the Steering Committee, through the GAFSP Portal. **See Box 3.** You will be informed by the CU when data entry is due (as of end June or end December).

GEO-REFERENCING

By the end of the first year of implementation, task teams should plan to support geo-coding of project activities onto a map overlaid with key development indicators. Technical assistance on this geo-referencing exercise is provided through the CU and is financed through additional GAFSP budget.

3. GAFSP PORTAL

The GAFSP Portal is an online collaboration space. Through the Portal, project team leaders will (a) have access to up to date project level data, information, and analytics on GAFSP-funded projects; (b) be able to input relevant project data including key milestones, disbursements, and results; and (c) be able share information in real time.

> <https://clientconnectionfifs.worldbank.org/GAFSP>
Please note that Internet Explorer supports the GAFSP Portal best

M&E Guidelines during Project Completion

Project teams and their client counterparts should:

COMPLETION REPORTS

Submit the institution's disclosable project completion reports within six months of grant closing, through the GAFSP Portal. In instances when an institution's reports cannot be disclosed to the public, or for technical assistance projects, complete and submit a completion report, following a CU-provided template. See **GAFSP M&E Plan, Annex 6**.

END-LINE EVALUATION

Conduct the end-line evaluation survey upon completion of the project, and submit the complete impact evaluation/evaluation package (**See Box 4**) (including baseline, mid-line, end-line) through the GAFSP Portal. See **M&E Plan, Annex 1**.

4. IMPACT EVALUATION (IE)

All GAFSP projects will undergo some form (rigorous or rapid) of IE or assessment upon completion of the project. For a select group of projects (approximately 10–30% of all GAFSP Public Sector Window projects), an IE will be conducted using in-depth, experimental, quasiexperimental, or statistically sophisticated non-experimental methods. For the remainder of GAFSP projects, alternate or “rapid” methods will be considered sufficient.

For those projects interested in applying for additional GAFSP resources to support an in-depth IE, please see **M&E Plan, pg. 39** for related information and steps required.

5. REFERENCES

- > GAFSP Monitoring & Evaluation Plan
<http://bit.ly/2yt6JHR>
- > Guidance on Processing Of GAFSP-Funded Projects by Selected Supervising Entities
<http://bit.ly/2AYLOzk>
- > GAFSP Portal Instructions
<http://bit.ly/2ry5ucs>
- > The Food Insecurity Experience Scale Survey Module (FIESSM)
<http://www.fao.org/3/a-bl404e.pdf>
- > Food Insecurity Inexperience Scale Exploration Paper: GAFSP Operationalization and Target Setting
<http://bit.ly/2j1Zt0t>
- > R Manual for the implementation of the FAO Voices of the Hungry methods to estimate food insecurity
http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/ess/voh/R_Manual_complete_final.pdf

6. CONTACTS

➤ Portfolio Management

Natasha Hayward <nhayward@worldbank.org>
Indira Janaki Ekanayake <iekanayake@worldbank.org>
Dipti Thapa <dthapa@worldbank.org>

➤ GAFSP Portal

Indira Janaki Ekanayake <iekanayake@worldbank.org>
Thokozeni Chawani <tchawani@worldbank.org>

➤ M&E Indicators, FIES, and Impact Evaluation

Natasha Hayward <nhayward@worldbank.org>
Shijie Yang <syang1@worldbank.org>

➤ Communications

Kimberly Parent <kparent@worldbankgroup.org>
Tammy Mehdi <tmehdi@worldbank.org>

TIER 2 INDICATORS FOR ALL GAFSP PROJECTS

#	Proposed Tier 2 Indicator, Mandatory Breakdowns ¹ (unit) ▶ Indicator Notes	PuSW	PrSW	GAFSP Pillar ²					SDGs	CSA	Jobs	Gender	Land	Nut.
				1	2	3	4	5						
1	Number of beneficiaries reached, <i>gender disaggregated, percentage who have been helped to cope with impact of climate change</i> ³ (number of people) ▶ People receiving benefits from the project. ▶ Disaggregation for gender and those receiving CSA-specific support.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1, 2, 13	•	•	•	•	•
2	Land area receiving improved production support, <i>percentage of these that are climate smart</i> (ha) ▶ Area that adopted new inputs/practices, new/rehab irrigation services, land registration, etc. ▶ Disaggregation for climate smart interventions.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2, 13, 15	•	•	•	•	•
3	Number of smallholders receiving improved productivity enhancement support, <i>gender disaggregated, climate smart agriculture support</i> (number of people) ▶ Number of end-users who directly participated in project activities ▶ Includes technology/technique adoptees, water users with improved services, those who had land rights clarified, people offered new financing/risk mgmt. services ▶ Using CSA approaches	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1, 2, 5, 13	•	•	•	•	•
4	Number of producer-based organizations supported (number) ▶ Relevant associations established or strengthened by project	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2, 16	•	•	•	•	•

#	Proposed Tier 2 Indicator, Mandatory Breakdowns ¹ (unit) ▶ Indicator Notes	PuSW	PrSW	GAFSP Pillar ²					SDGs	CSA	Jobs	Gender	Land	Nut.
				1	2	3	4	5						
5	Volume of agriculture loans that are outstanding (number of loans) ▶ Number of outstanding loans for agriculture and agribusiness in a financial intermediary company	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1, 8	•	•	•	•	•
6	Percentage of beneficiaries with secure rights to land, property and natural resources (percent of total beneficiaries) ⁴ ▶ Measured as those with legal documentation or recognized evidence of tenure and those who perceive their rights are recognized and protected	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	16	•	•	•	•	•
7	Roads constructed or rehabilitated, <i>percentage resilient to climate risks</i> (km) ▶ All-weather roads built, reopened, rehabilitated or upgraded by project ▶ Percentage that are designed to withstand changes in climate.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2, 9	•	•	•	•	•
8	Number of post-harvest facilities constructed and/or rehabilitated (number) ▶ Includes markets, <u>agro</u> -processing/storage/quality control facilities	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2, 8, 12	•	•	•	•	•
9	Volume of agricultural production processed by post-harvest facilities established with GAFSP support, <i>by food group</i> (tons) ▶ Tons of total produce processed sorted by ten major FAO food groups	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2, 8, 12	•	•	•	•	•
10	People benefiting from cash or food-based transfers, <i>gender disaggregated</i> (number of people) ▶ Number of people who benefited from cash or food transfer interventions	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1, 2	•	•	•	•	•

#	Proposed Tier 2 Indicator, <i>Mandatory Breakdowns</i> ¹ (unit) ► Indicator Notes	PuSW	PrSW	GAFSP Pillar ²					SDGs	CSA	Jobs	Gender	Land	Nut.
				1	2	3	4	5						
11	People receiving improved nutrition services and products, <i>gender disaggregated, age disaggregated</i> (number of people) ► Number of people who received nutrition counseling/education, recipients of Ready-to-use-Therapeutic Foods, bio-fortified foods, Vitamin A and micronutrient supplements. ► Number of people receiving extension support for nutrition-relevant techniques (e.g. homestead gardens, Farmer Field School support, etc.)	•	•			•			2, 3, 5			•		•
12	<i>Direct employment supported, gender disaggregated (full-time equivalent)</i> ► Number of direct employees in a client company ► Part time jobs aggregated to full-time equivalent	•	•			•	•		1, 5, 8		•	•		•
13	Persons receiving capacity development, <i>gender disaggregated, organization type</i> (number of people) ► Agricultural and non-agricultural rural training and capacity building support provided ► Distinguishes between individual producers, CSO staff, govt. officials	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2, 4, 5	•	•	•	•	•
14	Number of substantive deliverables on food security processes completed (number) ► Measures “soft support” for institutional development provided through discrete deliverables ► Deliverables include policy studies, strategies and plans, best practices, lessons learned, others	•	•					•	2, 5, 13	•	•	•	•	•