

GAFSP Revised M&E Plan 2022 (Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators)

Introduction:

This revised list of Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators was approved by GAFSP Steering Committee on April 26, 2022. This only reflects the Phase 1 revision. The rest of the revision, including Tier 1-impact indicators, is still ongoing and will be finalized by December 2022.

Scope of the modified Tier 2 indicators: This modified list of 15 Tier 2 indicators will be applicable to all GAFSP financed projects approved from December 2021 onwards. The four funding modalities are a) The country-led Grant-based Financing track (GBFT); b) the producer organization-led (PO) GBFT; c) the Business Investment Financing track (BIFT); and d) Private Sector Window. Therefore, this implies that they will apply to country-led and PO-led projects funded under the Sixth Call for Proposals. As in the previous revision, these modified Tier 2 indicators will **not** apply to previously approved GAFSP projects retroactively. Thus, projects funded prior to November 2021 will continue to report against the Tier 2 indicators as described in the 2017 M&E Plan¹.

Application of the Tier 2 indicators: Individual Supervising Entities (SEs) are not expected to have operations that fulfill all Tier 2 indicators, but they are expected to include all of those indicators that are applicable in any GAFSP-financed operation into their results framework and report to the GAFSP Coordination Unit on a six-monthly basis (for the Country-led and PO-led track projects). Individual SEs will continue to track additional indicators of relevance to their operations. For climate resilient indicators, the task team is required to include **at least** one of the three climate indicators in its results framework.

The following document includes:

- Table 1: Summary of Tier 2 indicators for all GAFSP projects (2022)
- Table 2: Tier 3 key performance/program management indicators (2022)
- Annex 1: Indicator Reference Sheet (Definition, Measurement Methodologies)

¹ <https://www.gafspfund.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/GAFSP%20Final%20Draft%202017%20M%26E%20Plan%20June%20upload.pdf>

Table 1. Summary of Tier 2 indicators for all GAFSP projects (2022)

#	Proposed Tier 2 Indicator, <i>Mandatory Breakdowns</i> [†] (unit) ▶ Indicator notes	Country-led track	PO-led track	Private Sector Window	BIFT	SDGs	Climate ++	Jobs	Gender	Nut.
1	Number of people receiving direct benefits (person) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females	•	•	•	•	1, 2, 5		•	•	•
2	Land area receiving improved production support (hectare) Disaggregation: Area provided with new/improved irrigation or drainage services (hectare)	•	•	•	•	2, 9, 15	•			
3	Number of smallholders producers/processors receiving productivity enhancement support (farmer) Disaggregation: Of which, female producers/processors	•	•	•	•	1, 2, 5			•	•
4	Number of producer-based organizations supported (organization)	•	•	•	•	2, 16		•		
5	Persons supported by project in rural areas accessing financial services (person) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females	•	•	•	•	1, 8		•	•	
6	Roads constructed or rehabilitated (km)	•				2, 9		•		
7	Number of processing, storage, and market facilities constructed and/or rehabilitated (facility)	•	•	•	•	2, 8, 12		•		•
8	Farmers that are supported in accessing improved marketing opportunities (farmer) +++ Disaggregation: Of which, female farmers	•	•		•	2, 5, 8, 12		•	•	•
9	<i>Direct employment provided (full-time equivalent)</i> Disaggregation: Of which, number of FTE jobs provided to female	•	•	•	•	1, 5, 8		•	•	•
10	<i>Persons receiving capacity development support (person)</i> Disaggregation: Of which, number of females	•		•	•	2, 4, 5		•	•	•
11	Number of policy products completed with project support related to agriculture, natural resource management, and food/nutrition security (knowledge product).	•				2, 5, 13, 15	•	•		•

#	Proposed Tier 2 Indicator, <i>Mandatory Breakdowns</i> [†] (unit) ▶ Indicator notes	Country-led track	PO-led track	Private Sector Window	BIFT	SDGs	Climate ^{††}	Jobs	Gender	Nut.
12	[Nutrition] People receiving improved nutrition services and products (person) Disaggregation: Of which, number of females	•	•	•	•	2, 3, 5			•	•
13	[Climate resilient indicator] Number of farmers receiving inputs or service on climate resilient or sustainable agriculture practices (farmer) ^{††} Disaggregation: Of which, female farmers Disaggregation: Of which, number of farmers adopting technologies or practices received	•	•	•	•	13	•		•	
14	[Climate resilient indicator] Agricultural/land area where climate resilient or sustainable agriculture practices are implemented (hectare) ^{††}	•	•	•	•	13	•			
15	[Climate resilient indicator] Agribusiness companies/enterprises/POs adopting climate resilient or sustainable agriculture interventions in their operations (organization) ^{††}	•	•	•	•	13	•			

Note: Climate – Climate resilient and sustainable Agriculture; Nut. – Nutrition.

† Reporting on the indicator requires reporting all mandatory breakdowns for the indicator.

†† Climate resilient or sustainable agriculture are practices and interventions defined as consistent with each Supervising Entity’s climate definitions, including climate smart agriculture (as per the FAO definition) and agroecology (as per FAO’s 10 elements)

††† IFC will continue to report on the prior indicator “Volume of agricultural production processed by post-harvest facilities established with GAFSP support, by food group (tons)”

Table 2: Tier 3 key performance/program management indicators (2022)

#	Tier 3 indicator	Country-led & PO-led	PrSW & BIFT
1.	Utilization		
	1.1 # and \$ of projects approved	•	•
	1.2 # and \$ of projects committed (Private Sector Window and BIFT only)		•
	1.3 # and \$ of projects disbursed (by SE)	•	•
	1.4 # of months between approval by the Steering Committee and disbursement by a supervising entity (Country-led and PO-led only)	•	
2.	Financial sustainability and leverage		
	2.1 Leverage ratio, also disaggregated into different funding sources from IFIs, government, private sector, etc. ²	•	•
3.	Diversification		
	3.1 Regional distribution of projects	•	•
	3.2 Country distribution of projects: % of projects in Fragile and Conflict-affected States	•	•
	3.3 Product distribution of projects: debt, equity, guarantees, advisory services (Private Sector Window and BIFT only)		•
4.	Inclusiveness: \$ volume of financing that goes to projects that are:		
	4.1 Climate resilient and sustainable agriculture	•	•
	4.2 Gender sensitive	•	•
	4.3 Nutrition related	•	•
5.	Development performance		
	5.1 % of projects rated successful on development outcome [†]	•	•
6.	Collaboration between Country-led, PO-led projects, BIFT, and Private Sector Window entities		
	6.1. # of joint events	•	•
	6.2 # of projects across Country-led, PO-led, BIFT and Private Sector Window partnerships, also as % of total projects across all tracks/windows, respectively	•	•
7.	Stakeholder engagement³		

² The prior 2.1 indicator on financial return to the fund (Private Sector Window only) was deleted since IFC does not calculate this indicator anymore.

³ The prior indicator 7.3 # of meetings held with stakeholders (including SC and Donor Committee meetings) was deleted as it doesn't measure stakeholder engagement in a meaningful manner.

#	Tier 3 indicator	Country-led & PO-led	PrSW & BIFT
	7.1 # of routine and ad hoc reports submitted by CU to individual donors in a timely manner	•	•
	7.2 # of civil society organization representatives participating in key GAFSP activities, e.g., proposal development at country level, Steering Committee meetings, M&E/DIME and fundraising events both headquarters and national levels, project implementation	•	•
8.	Communications		
	8.1 # of projects with complete and timely updates in the GAFSP Portal	•	•
	8.2 # of unique visitors and return visitors to GAFSP website	•	•
	8.3 # of engagements GAFSP campaigns make on social media	•	•
	8.4 # of external events where GAFSP is represented	•	•
	8.5 # of external events that GAFSP organizes and hosts	•	•
	8.6 # of comms products published that are externally facing, inc. blogs/stories/videos/etc.	•	•
9.	Knowledge sharing and capacity building		
	9.1 # of knowledge events sponsored	•	•
	9.2 # of knowledge products published (e.g., GHG report, AR, PR, thematic portfolio assessment, Knowledge Forum and MMI workshop reports) ⁴	•	•
10.	Resource management		
	10.1 % of administrative costs relative to portfolio; difference between planned/actual (Country-led and PO-led track projects only)	•	

† Development outcome ratings for the Country-led and PO-led track projects are based on a CU-led periodic portfolio review. IFC carries out periodic portfolio assessments for the Private Sector Window.

⁴ The prior 9.2 indicator “# of knowledge/learning pieces published within each implementing entity and externally” is deleted as there is no mean for the CU to collect this data.

ANNEX 1: Indicator Reference Sheet (Definition, Measurement Methodologies)

Introduction: This reference sheet consists of guidance including definitions, measurement units, required disaggregation for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicators included in the Revised GAFSP M&E Plan (2022).

Frequency of reporting: On a six-monthly basis, SEs will submit to the Coordination Unit (CU) (for aggregation and onward submission to the SC) a completed progress report template, which will include the updated status of the GAFSP Tier 2 indicators. CU will also collect Tier 3 indicators on a six-monthly basis.

Selection and use of core indicators: In finalizing the results framework, each team must refer to the list of current GAFSP core indicators (Tiers 1 and 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 (for the Country-led and PO-led track projects). Projects will continue to **maintain additional customized indicators** as dictated by their specific project and institutional requirements. Where applicable, and in addition to end-of-project targets, it is *strongly preferred* that **annual** targets (cumulative) for each indicator be provided in the project results framework, to allow both project teams and the CU to assess progress. For **climate resilient indicators**, the task team is required to include **at least one of the three** climate indicators in its results framework. Similar as above, if considered to be not applicable, task team needs to send written justification to the CU.

Indicator	Definition and Measurement						
Tier 1							
Prevalence of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)	<p>Definition: The indicator measures the percentage of households that experienced food insecurity at moderate and severe levels during the 12 months prior to data collection. The questions refer to the experiences of the individual respondent or of the respondent’s household as a whole. The severity of the experience of food insecurity is defined as a measurable latent trait (a characteristic that is not directly observable, but can be measured indirectly, for example by taking into account behavioral and psychological experiences, in this case around food insecurity). This is one of the indicators to track progress on SDG2. The indicator is based on an estimation of the probability that each household belongs to a specific category of food insecurity severity (moderate and severe), as determined by the household’s position on the scale.</p> <p>The inability to access food results in a series of experiences and conditions that are common across cultures and socio-economic contexts. The FIES global indicator for measuring food insecurity (access) is calculated from answers to a set of eight questions that covers a range of severity of food insecurity. The questions are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Standard label</th> <th>Questions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>WORRIED</td> <td>During the last 12 months, was there a time when you were worried you would not have enough food to eat because of a lack of money or other resources?</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Standard label	Questions	1	WORRIED	During the last 12 months, was there a time when you were worried you would not have enough food to eat because of a lack of money or other resources?
	Standard label	Questions					
1	WORRIED	During the last 12 months, was there a time when you were worried you would not have enough food to eat because of a lack of money or other resources?					

	2	HEALTHY	Still thinking about the last 12 months, was there a time when you were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food because of a lack of money or other resources?
	3	FEWFOODS	During the past 12 months, was there a time when you or others in your household ate only a few kinds of foods because of a lack of money or other resources?
	4	SKIPPED	During the past 12 months, was there a time when you or others in your household had to skip a meal because there was not enough money or other resources to get food?
	5	ATELESS	Still thinking about the last 12 months, was there a time when you ate less than you thought you should because of a lack of money or other resources?
	6	RANOUT	During the past 12 months, was there a time when your household did not have food because of a lack of money or other resources?
	7	HUNGRY	During the past 12 months, was there a time when you or others in your household were hungry but did not eat because there was not enough money or other resources for food?
	8	WHOLEDAY	During the past 12 months, was there a time when you or others in your household went without eating for a whole day because of a lack of money or other resources?
<p>Measurement and data collection of FIES</p>	<p>The response categories for each of the questions include 'Yes (1),' 'No (0),' and 'Refused.' Cases with 'Refused' are excluded from the analysis.</p> <p>Data collection method: Data for this indicator need to be collected from a representative sample of project households (i.e., the targeted population where the GAFSP-financed project intends to achieve household- and person level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition). To ensure the change can be attributed to the project alone, the assessment requires data collection from a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual group to control for factors other than the project alone that might account for the observed change. FIES data collection can be part of other project data collection efforts or a stand-alone effort.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Percent</p> <p>Disaggregation: This indicator can be disaggregated by gendered household type: Male headed household and female headed household</p> <p>Data Collection Responsibility: An independent M&E contractor procured by the project (e.g., survey firm, M&E consulting firm, research organizations). The questions are asked typically in face-to-face interviews, although they may be conducted by telephone as well.</p> <p>Sources of data: Household Survey</p> <p>Frequency of Collection: At a minimum, data should be collected at baseline and project completion time.</p>		

	<p>Note: Technical assistance in reporting on the FIES is available from the FAO's Voices of the Hungry team through the CU. Please contact the CU to discuss prior to baseline collection and end of project survey data collection. For further knowledge about FIES, FAO also provides an e-learning course on the collection and analysis of data, and on how the information provided by the FIES can be used to inform decisions of policy making, which is available at: https://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/using-fies/en/</p>
Income	<p>Methodology: Income is measured through a production-based approach (revenues minus costs), and home-produced food that is not sold but is consumed by the household is valued as income. The Private Sector Window is also piloting the use of the SWIFT tool, developed by the World Bank, to estimate income. These approaches are preferred over the use of consumption-expenditure surveys, which are more time consuming, more costly, and less practical for the purposes of a mandatory indicator (especially for the 70 percent of projects that are expected to undertake a “rapid” assessment as per the GAFSP SC decision). The income⁵ is estimated equivalent to farmers’ gross margin [gross margin= gross income – input costs].</p> <p>For the projects using experimental and quasi-experimental impact evaluation designs, the baseline and follow-up surveys include revenue data generating from both agriculture (crops, poultry, and livestock, fishing and fish-raising, forestry and agroforestry, agricultural labor, and so on) and non-agricultural sources (services, business revenue, pension, scholarships, bank interest, loan interest, remittances, unskilled wage labor/casual labor, self-employment, sale of asset, rentals, cash/gift contributions from relatives, cash support from NGO, and so on). The definition/coverage of non-farm income may differ across projects based on the activities of the targeted households. While measuring the income gain, in the calculation we discount for income derived from household assets and nonfarm activities (etc.) that are outside the scope of the project.</p>
Measurement and data collection of Income	<p>Data collection method: Data for this indicator need to be collected from a representative sample of project households (i.e., the targeted population where the GAFSP-financed project intends to achieve household- and person level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition). To ensure the change can be attributed to the project alone, the assessment requires data collection from a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual group to control for factors other than the project alone that might account for the observed change. Household income data collection can be part of other project data collection efforts or a stand-alone effort.</p> <p>Disaggregation: This indicator can be disaggregated by male-headed households and female-headed households</p> <p>Sources of data: Household Survey</p> <p>Frequency of Collection: At a minimum, data should be collected at baseline and project completion time.</p>
Agricultural Productivity	<p>Definition: Crop yield is a commonly used indicator of land productivity. Crop yield for any particular crop can be calculated as a measure of crop production weight (in kg) per area of land under cultivation (in hectares)”. Area under cultivation is defined as “the area that corresponds to the total sown area,</p>

⁵ Income is measured through sales, including imputed in-kind consumption and does not include imputed returns for asset.

	<p>including the ruined areas (e.g., due to natural disasters)". It is area under planted, not area under harvest. This definition is adopted since pre-harvest losses can be mitigated by farmer management practices such as climate smart agriculture and sustainable land management practice, which can be within GAFSP's sphere of influence.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Kg/hectares, ton/hectares. Kg/head.</p> <p>Project can also opt to measure value weighted across crops at the farm level. This unified way of measurement address issues of aggregation of agricultural products across different commodities, fisheries, or livestock, among others.</p> <p>Sources of data: Household Survey</p> <p>Frequency of Collection: At a minimum, data should be collected at baseline and project completion time.</p> <p><i>Notes: This indicator will apply only to those projects with explicit productivity gain goals.</i></p>
<p>Food Consumption Score (FCS)</p>	<p>Definition. Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a score calculated using the frequency of consumption of different food groups consumed by a household during the 7 days before the survey, which is then weighted according to the relative nutritional value of the consumed food groups. The FCS is also able to capture both Dietary Diversity and Food Frequency.</p> <p>Methodology: The food consumption groups include: starches, pulses, vegetables, fruit, meat, dairy, fats, sugar. If these groups are surveyed in a disaggregated fashion, the consumption frequencies of the different foods in the groups are summed, with the maximum value for the groups capped at 7.</p> <p>The formula, based on these groups, with the standard weights, is: $FCS = (starches*2) + (pulses*3) + vegetables + fruit + (meat*4) + (dairy*4) + (fats*.5) + (sugar*.5)$.</p> <p>WFP advises a recall of 7 days to ensure both good time coverage and "reliability" of respondent's memory</p> <p>Measurement unit: Weighted sum of frequency of household consumption, a continuous variable with a possible range of 0 to 112</p> <p>Sources of data: Household Survey</p> <p>Frequency of Collection: At a minimum, data should be collected at baseline and project completion time.</p> <p>Data collection method: Data for this indicator need to be collected from a representative sample of project households (i.e., the targeted population where the GAFSP-financed project intends to achieve household- and person level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition). To ensure the change can be attributed to the project alone, the assessment requires data collection from a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual group to control for factors other than the project alone that might account for the observed change. Household income data collection can be part of other project data collection efforts or a stand-alone effort.</p> <p><i>Notes: This indicator was developed by WFP. More detailed methodology can be accessed from its website:</i></p>

Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women (MDD-W)

Definition. MDD-W is a population-level indicator of diet diversity validated for women aged 15-49 years old. The MDD-W is a dichotomous indicator based on 10 food groups and is considered the standard for measuring population-level dietary diversity in women of reproductive age.

The MDD-W was preceded by the Women’s Dietary Diversity Score (WDDS), which was a validated continuous indicator based on reported intake of 9 food groups. The MDD-W was developed after additional validation using new data sets was carried out and with the objective of creating a dichotomous (easier to interpret) indicator rather than a continuous one ([FAO & FHI, 2016](#)).

Methodology: Data are gathered from a questionnaire administered to a female respondent 15-49 years of age. Respondents are asked to recall the food groups that they consumed over the previous 24 hours using either a list-based method (which asks about consumption of each of the 10 food groups in order), or an open recall (where respondents recall all foods they ate during the previous day and the enumerator determines to which food groups these foods belong). Although the MDD-W guidelines present both recall methods, they recommend the use of the open-recall method ([FAO & FHI, 2016](#)). The 10 food groups required for the MDD-W are:

MDD-W Food Groups	
1.	Grains, roots, and tubers
2.	Pulses
3.	Nuts and seeds
4.	Dairy
5.	Meat, poultry, and fish
6.	Eggs
7.	Dark leafy greens and vegetables
8.	Other Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables
9.	Other vegetables
10.	Other fruits

The enumerators should record whether the respondent did, or did not, consume foods within each food group. The total number of food groups consumed is summed and all foods are equally weighted. The population-level indicator is calculated based on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Women 15-49 years of age who consumed foods from 5 food groups during the previous day}}{\text{Total number of women 15-49 years of age surveyed}}$$

Sources of data: Household Survey

Frequency of Collection: At a minimum, data should be collected at baseline and project completion time.

Data collection method: Data for this indicator need to be collected from a **representative sample** of project households (i.e., the targeted population where the GAFSP-financed project intends to achieve household- and person level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition). To ensure the change can be attributed to the project alone, the assessment requires data collection from a credible and rigorously defined **counterfactual group** to control for factors other than the project alone that might account for the observed change. Household

income data collection can be part of other project data collection efforts or a stand-alone effort.

Notes: The tool must be adapted to include culturally relevant examples of foods for each of the 10 food groups. Enumerators must be properly trained to correctly categorize meals containing a mix of different food groups, and to record only food groups where more than 15 grams of a food in that group was consumed, in order to exclude nutritionally less relevant foods used as condiments or seasonings from the total score. More details to be found on ([FAO & FHI, 2016](#)).

Minimum Dietary Diversity for Children (MDD-C)

Definition. The minimum dietary diversity (MDD) score for children 6-23 months old is a population-level indicator designed by the World Health Organization (WHO) to assess diet diversity as part of infant and young child feeding practices among children 6-23 months old.

Methodology: Data are gathered from a questionnaire administered to the child’s caregiver. Respondents are asked to indicate whether or not their child consumed any food over the previous 24 hours from each of eight food groups. The eight food groups included in the questionnaire are:

MDD Food Groups	
1.	Breast milk
2.	Grains, roots, and tubers
3.	Legumes and nuts
4.	Dairy products
5.	Flesh foods
6.	Eggs
7.	Vitamin A rich fruits and vegetables
8.	Other fruits and vegetables

The total number of food groups consumed is summed. The population-level indicator is calculated based on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Number of children 6 – 23 months of age who received foods from 5 or more food groups yesterday during the day or night}}{\text{Children 6 – 23 months of age for whom data on breastfeeding and diet were collected}}$$

Sources of data: Household Survey

Frequency of Collection: At a minimum, data should be collected at baseline and project completion time.

Data collection method: Data for this indicator need to be collected from a **representative sample** of project households (i.e., the targeted population where the GAFSP-financed project intends to achieve household- and person level impacts on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition). To ensure the change can be attributed to the project alone, the assessment requires data collection from a credible and rigorously defined **counterfactual group** to control for factors other than the project alone that might account for the observed change. Household income data collection can be part of other project data collection efforts or a stand-alone effort.

Notes: For more information on calculating this indicator, refer to the WHO measurement guidelines ([WHO, 2010](#))

Tier 2
(GAFSP will require an update on progress against Tier 2 indicators every six-months: June and December)

<p>#1 Number of people receiving direct benefits, gender disaggregated</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of people who directly receive benefits from the activities supported by the project through various asset and service provisions or technical assistance. If data are collected at the household level, the data can be either converted to people by using the locally appropriate household size or reported along with appropriate household size. Do not double count people who have been provided with more than one type of benefit under the project.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Persons (If data is collected by households, please estimate the number of persons using the average household size and convert)</p> <p>Disaggregation: Gender</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E</p>
<p>#2 Land area receiving improved production support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area provided with new/improved irrigation or drainage services 	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the total land area, measured in hectares, that has benefited from the project’s activities, investments, and/or technical assistance. Such activities may include, but are not limited to, areas that have adopted new technologies and sustainable land management practices promoted by the project. Technologies and sustainable land management practices include crop genetics, cultural practices, pest management, disease management, seeds, new practices, mechanizations tools, soil-related fertility and conservation, construction or rehabilitation of irrigation and drainage infrastructure, using climate adaptation and mitigation methods, and use of mechanization in land preparation. Do not double count land area provided with multiple services.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Hectare</p> <p>Disaggregation: Area provided with new/improved irrigation or drainage services (ha):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">This disaggregated indicator measures the total land area that has benefited from the project’s investments in new or improved irrigation or drainage services. Such activities may include: (i) area provided with new irrigation or drainage services (ha); and (ii) area provided with improved irrigation or drainage services (ha). Irrigation or drainage services refers to the better delivery of water to, and drainage of water from, arable land, including better timing, quantity, quality, and cost-effectiveness for the water users. New irrigation or drainage services refers to the provision of irrigation and drainage services in an area that has not had these services before. Improved irrigation or drainage services refers to the upgrading, rehabilitation, and/or modernization of irrigation or drainage services in an area with existing irrigation and drainage services.</p> <p>Data Collection: Project is recommended to collect geo-referencing data for the areas that are provided with improved irrigation services and other land management infrastructure.</p> <p>Geo referencing how to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Method: UTM geo-coordinates of the four corners of the field. Shape files of the canal network. ▪ Devices: recorded by GPS
<p>#3. Farmers receiving productivity enhancement</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of people who have directly participated in the project’s activities and is expected to be a subset of people receiving direct benefits. Includes technology/technique adoptees, water users</p>

<p>support, gender disaggregated</p>	<p>with improved services, those who had land rights clarified, people offered new financing/risk management services. Examples include farmers who have adopted improved food production technologies and sustainable management practices being promoted by the project; farmers with access to new or upgraded water infrastructure through the project. This indicator tracks “receipt” of support, not “adoption” of technologies or practice.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Farmers/producers</p> <p>Disaggregation: gender of the farmers/producers.</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report</p>
<p>#4 Producer-based organizations supported (Number)</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of relevant associations, whether or not formally registered, that are either established through or strengthened by the project to achieve or enhance the project development outcomes since project start-up (cumulative reporting). These producer organizations are established or strengthened to enhance agricultural, livestock or fishery production, processing or marketing, and provide services to their members. Such associations include but are not limited to water user associations, producer organizations, farmer cooperatives, trade and business associations, community-based organizations, and financial cooperatives.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Number of organizations</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report.</p>
<p>#5. Persons supported by project in rural areas accessing financial services, gender disaggregated</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of persons supported with financial services, which include credit, deposit/saving accounts, mobile money accounts, weather-based crop insurance, agri-insurance, warehouse receipts etc. It does not include support that only contribute to people’ access to finance (e.g., financial literacy trainings, organizational support/formalization for group lending, land titling)</p> <p>Financial services vary widely, and project teams usually use the exact wording for the type of services offered by their projects. Thus, teams should report to GAFSP the progress on these project customized indicators in their respective results frameworks if not exact wording is used.</p> <p>Measurement unit: persons</p> <p>Disaggregation: gender</p> <p>Notes: PrSW will continue to use loans indicators, and estimate number of persons</p>
<p>#6. Roads constructed or rehabilitated, including feeder roads and access roads</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the kilometers of all-weather or seasonal roads that enables transportation in rural spaces where rural-based production activities are taking place. The road construction or rehabilitation can directly or indirectly connect farmers with areas where market centers are located. The construction or rehabilitation is expected to ease commercial transportation along the road to provide beneficiaries (farmers, fisheries, communities, and others) with better market access, helping on-farm as well as non-farm activities.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Kilometer</p> <p>Data Collection: Project is encouraged to collect geo-referencing data <i>of the road constructed/rehabilitated.</i></p>

	<p>Geo referencing how to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collector: road construction company gives data to PMU ▪ Method: UTM geo-coordinates of the road to be collected every 300 meters along the trajectory of the road. Driving in the middle of the road with a GPS device from the beginning to the end of constructed area. ▪ Devices: recorded by GPS ▪ Level of accuracy: medium ▪ Frequency: once
<p>#7. Processing, storage and market facilities constructed and/or rehabilitated</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of facilities constructed or rehabilitated by the project, including post-harvest handling centers, collection centers, markets, agro-processing, storage, quality control and other marketing related facilities.</p> <p>Market facilities are the structures used to sell produce, such as marketplaces and shading structures. Processing facilities include equipment and machinery that are used for the transformation of agricultural produce (such as mills, hullers, shellers, extractors, and slaughter house for livestock) where value is added. Storage facilities include structures used for mid- to long-term storage or preservation of produce. The facilities may be on-farm storage structures such as containers and small silos, or village/community facilities such as warehouses, granaries, and large silos.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Number of facilities</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting should only concern the infrastructure for which physical works were fully completed by the time of the reporting. Infrastructure for which physical works have started during the past six months, but are not yet complete, will be reported in the next reporting period (or upon completion).</i></p> <p>Data Collection: Project is recommended to collect geo-referencing data of the physical infrastructures of market facilities.</p> <p>Geo referencing how to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collector: PMU ▪ Method: Geolocation at entrance of building recorded ▪ Devices: recorded by GPS, smartphones or tablets ▪ Level of accuracy: low ▪ Frequency: once
<p>#8. Farmers that are supported in accessing improved marketing opportunities</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the total number of farmers that have improved access to market due to project support. This includes an array of services and training provided on marketing, business management, post-harvest handling, value-addition and processing, and facilitation of linkages with off-takers/buyers.</p> <p>Some illustrative (not exhaustive) examples on trainings on technology and practice include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marketing and distribution: e.g., contract farming technologies and practices; productive alliance/partnership; improved commodity sale technologies and practices; improved market information system and practices.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Post-harvest handling and storage: e.g., decay and insect control; temperature and humidity control; improved quality control technologies and practices; sorting and grading, sanitary handling practices. - Value-added processing: e.g., improved packaging practices and materials; food and chemical safety technologies and practices; improved preservation technologies and practices <p>This indicator is related to indicator #7. This indicator (#8) counts farmers who are supported with non-physical/training support while #7 measures the number of physical installations supported by the project.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Farmers/producers</p> <p>Disaggregation: gender.</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report.</p> <p><i>Note: If the same farmer has been supported by the project on market opportunities for more than one type of service, he/she should be counted only once to avoid double-counting of beneficiaries.</i></p>
<p>[Cross-cutting theme: Jobs]</p> <p>#9. Direct employment provided as part of an explicit project objective, female employment and youth employment disaggregated (full-time equivalent)</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the additional employments gains (for example, jobs provided) owing to implementation of the GAFSP-supported project. Direct employment provided considers the provision of contractual, part-time and seasonal jobs as well. Direct employment could therefore be estimated through <i>net-full time equivalent (FTE) jobs</i>⁶ (for example, the number of FTE jobs generated by the project, both on-farm as well as off-farm through forward and backward linkage employment effects such as those arising from processing, marketing, farm input provision, and related services) or short-term employment supported by the activities of the project. To the degree possible, the CU encourages SEs to follow the principles of Decent Rural Employment and encourages related monitoring⁷. The decision on whether certain jobs be included should be based on whether generating employment is part of the project theory of change/results chain. Other types of created jobs such as construction workers to build project-financed infrastructure or technical service providers hired to deliver project activities should not be included unless generating temporary employment is part of project objectives (e.g., cash for work as social protection program). PrSW will follow IFC's definition on this</p> <p>Measurement unit: Full time equivalent jobs</p> <p>Disaggregation: by gender, By youth</p>

⁶ The total number of FTE jobs created by a program can be measured by dividing the net additional days of work due to a program intervention by 240. For Private Sector Window projects, it can be measured as the number of FTE employees as per local definition working for the client company or project at the end of the reporting period. This number includes individuals hired directly and individuals hired through third-party agencies, as long as those individuals provide on-site services related to the operations of the client company. Also, this number includes the FTE worked by seasonal, contractual, and part-time employees. Part-time jobs are converted to FTE jobs on a pro rata basis, based on the local definition (for instance, if the working week equals 40 hours, a 24 hr/week job would be equal to a 0.6 FTE job). Seasonal or short-term jobs are prorated on the basis of the portion of the reporting period that was worked (for example, a full-time position for three months would be equal to a 0.25 FTE job if the reporting period is one year). If the information is not available, the rule-of-thumb is that two part-time jobs equal a full-time job. *Note: employment for the purpose of the construction of the client company's hard assets is not to be included in this indicator..*

⁷ <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bc270e.pdf>

	Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report.
#10. Persons receiving capacity development support, gender disaggregated	<p>Definition: This indicator counts number of persons who received project technical assistance and capacity development activities. This counts both the capacity development activities to technical staff for project delivery (e.g., training of trainers) and activities to enhance institutional capacities of project-related institutions. The capacity development activities will include not only formal training but all other types of tools such as on the job training, coaching, mentoring, exposure visit, exchange of good practice, peer to peer learning, etc.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Persons</p> <p>Disaggregation: by gender</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report.</p> <p><i>Note: To avoid double counting, this indicator should not include trainings provided to people receiving direct benefits. Trainings on agricultural productivity or nutrition related training, which should be counted under indicators #3 and #11.</i></p>
#11. Policy products completed with project support related to agriculture, natural resource management, and food/nutrition security.	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of completed policies, strategies, laws, regulations, and sector plans, and other analytical work that serve to meet or enhance the project’s development outcomes to support agriculture, natural resource management, and food/nutrition security.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Number of pieces of analytical work</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report.</p>
<p>[Cross-cutting theme: Nutrition]</p> <p>#12. Persons who have received improved nutrition services and products, gender disaggregated</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the increase in the number of people with access to a basic package of nutrition services through a GAFSP-financed project (e.g., provision of Ready to Use Therapeutic Foods (RUTFs), micronutrient supplements, biofortified plant materials, community nutrition education programs). The contents of the basic package are defined by the project and are therefore not identical.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Guidance on “Ready to Use Therapeutic Food” (RUTF): This energy-dense, mineral/vitamin-enriched food is designed specifically to treat severe acute malnutrition. It is equivalent in formulation to Formula 100 (F100), which is recommended by the World Health Organization to treat malnutrition.⁸ RUTF is usually oil-based and contains little available water, which means that it is microbiologically safe, will keep for several months in simple packaging, and can be made easily using low-tech production methods. As it is eaten uncooked, it is ideal for delivering many micronutrients that might otherwise be broken down by heat. RUTFs permit community-based therapeutic care (CTC)—treatment at home and in the community—rather than costly and more problematic clinical care. An example of RUTFs is Plumpy’Nut. ii. Guidance on “Biofortification”: Biofortification improves the micronutrient density of staple food crops. This process helps to reduce the high prevalence of specific nutritional deficiencies, especially of iron, zinc, and vitamin A, which commonly occur in low-income populations. Biofortification differs from ordinary fortification because it focuses on

⁸ WHO (1999a).

	<p>making plant foods more nutritious as the plants are growing, rather than on adding nutrients to foods when they are processed, including fortification. Examples of some foods that have been biofortified are orange flesh sweet potatoes and enriched maize.</p> <p>iii. Guidance on “Micronutrients”: These essential nutrients are needed by the human body in small quantities for it to function normally. Categories of essential nutrients include vitamins, dietary minerals, essential fatty acids, phytochemicals, and essential amino acids.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Persons</p> <p>Disaggregation: by gender.</p> <p>Data Collection: Project M&E through regular progress report.</p> <p><i>Notes: Do not double count people who have been provided with more than one type of services and products under the project.</i></p>
--	---

CROSS-CUTTING THEME: CLIMATE INDICATOR

<p>#13. Farmers receiving inputs or service on climate resilient or sustainable agriculture practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of which, female farmers - Of which, number of farmers adopting technologies or practices received 	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of farmers who have received inputs or service on resilient or sustainable agriculture practices. Climate resilient or sustainable agriculture are practices and interventions defined as consistent with each Supervising Entity’s climate definitions, including climate smart agriculture (as per the FAO definition⁹) and climate resilience related elements in agroecology (as per FAO’s 10 elements¹⁰)</p> <p>This includes a broad range of climate resilient/climate risk management technologies and practice that are promoted with the explicit objective of reducing risk and minimizing the severity of climate change. Examples include interventions related to: i) develop and introduce management practices or techniques more resilient to climate change in farming system, plant breeding, and livestock breeding; ii) raise awareness of risks on climate change or/and benefits of adaptation, iii) recover degraded areas for crop production through innovative management practices and soil management practices that control soil erosion; iv) introduce crops or crop mix more suited to climate change, including drought and flood resistant varieties, short-duration varieties, adjustment of sowing time; diversification, use of perennial varieties, agroforestry; v) change watershed, wetland and irrigation management systems and practices to reduce vulnerability; vi) incorporate risks in irrigation/water management planning to reduce climate risks; vii) change management practices or techniques to reduce vulnerability to climate change in animal health service, pasture management, fodder production and storage practices, viii) restore or maintain environmental services, and ix) increase farmers’ access to climate services (including weather and climate advisory service, early warning systems) and benefitting from weather-based crop insurance or index-based insurance, and so on.</p> <p>This also includes a broad range of climate mitigation technologies that minimize emission intensities relative to other alternatives (while preventing leakage of emissions elsewhere). Examples include low- or no-till practices; restoration of organic soils and degraded lands; efficient nitrogen fertilizer use; practices that</p>
---	--

⁹ <https://www.fao.org/climate-smart-agriculture-sourcebook/en>

¹⁰ <https://www.fao.org/agroecology/home/en/>

	<p>promote methane reduction; agroforestry; introduction/expansion of perennials; practices that promote greater resource use efficiency (e.g., drip irrigation).</p> <p>This also includes a list of CSA practice and technologies that work on both climate adaptation and mitigation.</p> <p>Measurement unit: Farmers</p> <p>Disaggregation: 1) by gender. 2) Of which, number of farmers adopting technologies or practices received</p>
#14. Agricultural/land area where climate resilient or sustainable agriculture are implemented	<p>Definition: This indicator measures total hectares of agriculture land areas where resilient or sustainable agriculture is implemented (see detailed description in indicator #14). Specifically, this measures land area where the project has introduced improvements in natural resources (land and water) management planning, strengthened institutional response mechanism and improved actual management and/or land and water use practices to increase climate resilience.</p> <p>This may include, but not limited to the below examples: 1) changes in land use related to cropland, grazing land, and soil restoration, including afforestation/deforestation; 2) area under changed crop growing methods, such as alternate wetting and drying for growing rice- with reduced methane emission; 3) grassland and peatland management; 4) inputs and investments (energy consumption and construction of new infrastructure).¹¹</p> <p>Measurement unit: Hectare</p>
#15 Agribusiness companies/enterprises/POs adopting climate resilient or sustainable agriculture interventions in their operations	<p>Definition: interventions are defined as interventions involving improvements in energy efficiency, water efficiency, resource efficiency, reduced food losses, and renewable energy solutions.</p> <p>Measurement unit: companies/enterprises/producer organizations</p>

Tier 3 Indicators: Definitions

Utilization	
1.1 Number and value of projects approved:	Definition: It follows the definition of project as defined by respective SE
1.2 Number and value of projects committed (Private Sector Window and BIFT only):	Definition: Number of projects and their associated dollar volume for which IFC has entered legal agreements that establish IFC's obligation to provide the financial products to clients for those projects.
1.3 Number and value of projects disbursed:	Definition: For the Country-led and PO-led projects, this indicator shows the economic efficiency of total dollars invested by tracking the aggregate amount of GAFSP funding disbursed, and the related ratio to the net amount available/allocated. The Private Sector Window will track principal outflow from the implementing entity under the GAFSP fund to client, in accordance with the Investment Agreement.

¹¹ Refer to FAO (2021) *Making Climate-Sensitive Investments in Agriculture: Approaches, Tools and Selected Experiences* for more details: <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb1067en/>

<p>1.4 Number of months between approval by the SC and disbursement by an SE (Country-led and PO-led projects only):</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the effectiveness of the release of funds.</p>
<p>Financial sustainability and leverage</p>	
<p>2.1 Leverage ratio, disaggregated into different funding sources from development partners, government, private sector, and communities and groups that are used for scaling-up phases of the project</p>	<p>Definition: The term leverage can be used interchangeably with other terms, including mobilizing, catalyzing, co-financing, and co-investment. For the Country-led and PO-led projects, co-financing is considered to be a subset of leverage that helps to achieve a “transformational” impact of the intervention. For both Windows, the indicator is calculated as the ratio of non-GAFSP funds over GAFSP funds that are invested in GAFSP-supported operations to reflect the co-financing component. For the Private Sector Window, this may include funding from IFC and other private sector sources.</p>
<p>Diversification</p>	
<p>3.1 Regional distribution of projects</p>	<p>Definition: Number of approved projects and associated US dollar volume by region.</p>
<p>3.2 Country distribution of projects—percentage of projects in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States</p>	<p>Definition: Number of approved projects and associated US dollar volume in FCV (fragility, conflict, and violence)¹ versus non-FCV countries.</p>
<p>3.3 Product distribution of projects—debt, equity, guarantees, advisory services (Private Sector Window and BIFT only):</p>	<p>Definition: The number of approved projects and associated dollar volume by product.</p>
<p>Inclusiveness—Volume of financing that goes to projects that are:</p>	
<p>4.1 Climate smart:</p>	<p>Definition: The GAFSP Country-led project currently applies a methodology developed by the World Bank to track engagement in the areas of climate change adaptation and mitigation. The system is designed to capture the financing of adaptation and mitigation co-benefits in projects across the Country-led track portfolio, even when climate change adaptation/mitigation is not the main project objective. Specifically, the approach tracks project/grant commitments with climate change co-benefits at the time of project approval—not the amount of emission reductions or increased climate resilience resulting from the financing associated with each operation. This approach is in line with the emerging SDG indicators for climate.</p> <p>For the Private Sector Window, IFC is scaling up its climate change mitigation work as well as incorporating adaptation and climate risk assessment and management into private sector investment through its Investment and Advisory Services businesses. In September 2016, IFC revised its climate definitions² to incorporate and recognize activities and investments that contribute to CSA as an approach to managing landscapes—cropland, livestock, forests, and fisheries—that aims to achieve three “wins”: (1) increased productivity to improve food security and boost farmers’ incomes; (2) enhanced resilience to drought, pests, disease, and other shocks linked to climate change impacts; and (3) reduced greenhouse gas emissions. IFC, together with its clients and partners, plans to support CSA, including through GAFSP, by providing investments and advisory operations that contribute to one or more of these three CSA “wins.”</p>

<p>4.2 Gender sensitive</p>	<p>Definition: Gender-sensitive investment is investment that directly promotes women’s rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment. For the Country-led and PO-led track, in addition to routinely reporting the percentage of women among the total number of GAFSP beneficiaries, the CU reviews all projects for gender inclusion across three dimensions: (1) gender analysis on identifying a gender gap and how project can address the relevant gender gap during project preparation and design; (2) gender-gap informed actions: whether the project design defines specific interventions that contribute to closing gender gaps identified in the analysis. To meet the criteria, operations must propose concrete actions as part of the main components where the expected results (i.e., closing of the identified gender gap) are intended to last beyond the project period; and (3) indicators that measure the outcomes expected to be achieved through the gender-gap-closing activities.</p> <p>For the Private Sector Window, IFC uses gender-sensitive appraisal questions as part of the due diligence for direct agricultural investments as a means of raising awareness of the importance of gender sensitivity in agribusiness projects and business operations with the project sponsors. The analysis involves the disaggregation of quantitative data by sex and highlights the different roles and learned behaviors based on gender attributes. This framework informs company actions and interventions (which can lead to significant business benefits), produces and provides gender-disaggregated evidence for policy making, develops tools and expertise to identify and unlock barriers to women’s participation, ensures gender-inclusive implementation strategies, and makes gender visible and relevant in M&E processes. In particular, IFC applies a flag system, in which the AS (Advisory Services) Gender Flag is a yes/no indication of whether an investment project is designed and implemented with a gender lens. The Gender Flag is applied if the project/investment includes an analysis in the board paper on gaps between women and men that will be addressed either in the client’s workforce and leadership or among suppliers, customers, leaders, or community stakeholders. Based on the analysis, the board paper needs to spell out at least one gender intervention, which is then reflected in a monitoring indicator. The AS Gender Flag is applied if the project design explains which gender gaps between men and women will be addressed by the project (corporate leadership, suppliers, employees, customers, and so on) and how the project will reduce the gap, highlighting the activities that will be undertaken.</p>
<p>4.3 Nutrition related</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator will collate the GAFSP investments that contribute directly to the improved nutrition of recipient households. SEs are engaged in the global goal for improved nutrition as a priority, especially for women and infants, and have developed implementation plans for increasing these investments. Informed by joint work undertaken by the World Bank Group’s Health, Nutrition, Population, and Agriculture Global Practices, a tool is used to screen all Country-led projects for activities that include direct nutrition non-agricultural activities (those activities addressing immediate determinants of fetal and child nutrition, and couched in the health sector), and explicit and implicit nutrition-sensitive agricultural activities (activities addressing underlying determinants of fetal and child nutrition, couched in sectors outside health, such as agriculture). On the basis of this screening and review, a dollar amount is assigned across these categories, in order to track the number of projects that contribute to improved nutrition. The CU reports annually on the number of projects and estimated project financing that includes direct nutrition non-</p>

	agricultural activities and/ or explicit nutrition-sensitive agricultural activities only. It does not report on implicit nutrition-sensitive agricultural activities.
Development performance	
5.1 Percentage of projects rated successful on development outcome	Definition: As noted, SE project teams use a self-rating process for assessing development outcomes, but the CU leads an annual portfolio review for projects under the Country-led and PO-led track , and IFC carries out an annual portfolio assessment for the Private Sector Window.
Collaboration between Country-led, PO-led, BIFT, Private Sector Window entities:	
6.1 Number of joint events	Definition: These include events for joint strategy planning, lesson-learning during implementation of projects, and evaluation/application of lessons learned in recommendations for the improvement of GAFSP.
6.2 Number of projects across Country-led, PO-led, BIFT and Private Sector Window partnerships, also as % of total projects across all tracks/windows, respectively	Definition: These are operations that would include joint activities, active collaboration, and/or funding both from the Country-led and PO-led track and Private Sector Windows.
Stakeholder engagement	
7.1 Number of routine and ad hoc reports submitted by CU to individual donors in a timely manner	Definition: This includes requests from donors on GAFSP M&E results, portfolio performance, portfolio analysis, among others. This will be tracked systematically with a tracking tool.
7.2 Number of civil society organization representatives participating in key GAFSP activities, e.g., proposal development at country level, Steering Committee meetings, M&E/DIME and fundraising events both headquarters and national levels, project implementation	Definition: Number of civil society organization representatives participating in key GAFSP activities, e.g., proposal development at country level, Steering Committee meetings, M&E/DIME and fundraising events both headquarters and national levels, project implementation
Communications	
8.1 Number of projects with complete and timely updates in the GAFSP Portal	
8.2 # of unique visitors and return visitors to GAFSP website	Definition: This indicator measures the number of visitors to the GAFSP website (both users that visit the site once and returning users), measured a monthly basis, and then aggregate for six-monthly reporting.
8.3 # of engagements GAFSP campaigns make on social media	Definition: This indicator measures the number of times a social media post appears to users, measured on a monthly basis, and then aggregate for six-monthly reporting.
8.4 # of external events where GAFSP is represented	Definition: This indicator measures events that lead directly to the dissemination of GAFSP lessons and results and the mobilization of global partnerships for poverty reduction, food security, and nutrition in the poorest countries.
8.5 # of external events that GAFSP organizes and hosts	Definition: This indicator counts the number of virtual and in-person events that GAFSP organizes and hosts with partners, such as side events during global fora, panel discussions, roundtables, etc.

<p>8.6 # of comms products published that are externally facing, inc. blogs/stories/videos/etc.</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator includes all public communications materials that are published on the GAFSP website, including annual reports, blogs, stories, news releases, videos, etc.</p>
<p>Knowledge sharing and capacity building</p>	
<p>9.1 # of knowledge events sponsored</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator measures the number of technical and non-technical events and workshops organized by GAFSP in partnership with SEs, partners (such as DIME, Voices of the Hungry, and so on), civil society organizations, and the Private Sector Window (from M&E plan)</p>
<p>9.2 # of knowledge products published</p>	<p>Definition: This indicator counts the knowledge products related to technical reports and portfolio assessment that are published to SC and external audience: (e.g., GHG report, Annual report, Portfolio Review, portfolio assessment, thematic portfolio assessment, Knowledge Forum and MMI workshop reports)</p>