USAID FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE	**REBUILDING LIVELIHOODS AND RESILIENCY IN ZIMBABWE**	LAND O'LAKES, INC. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Innovative Solutions for Global Prosperity

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

USAID CA # 674-A-00-10-00002-00

Submitted to

Snodia Chikanza, AOR
USAID/Zimbabwe
P.O Box 6988 Harare, Zimbabwe

Submitted by

Land O'Lakes, Inc.
P.O. Box 64281
St. Paul, MN 55164-0281 U.S.A.

March 2012
Updated Dec 2012
Updated June 2013

Table of Contents

Acronyms

CLW	Community Livestock Workers
GOZ	Government of Zimbabwe
IMPACTS	Integrated Monitoring Performance Assessment Computerized Tracking System
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
ISFM	Integrated Soil Fertility Management
LQAS	Lot Quality Assurance Sampling principles
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCC	Milk Collection Centre
PHH	Post-Harvest Handling
PMP	Performance Management Plan
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
ZDL	Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe

Introduction

Land O'Lakes was granted a 6-month no cost extension for its Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe project (ZDL) in April, 2013, extending the project's end date from May 31, 2013 to November 30, 2013. This modified Performance Management Plan (PMP) is in response to this no cost extension, aligning revised targets and indicators as approved by USAID when the extension was granted.

Background

Land O'Lakes' Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe project (ZDL) for dairy industry development in Zimbabwe aims to build livelihoods, increase incomes, promote food security, and scale-up dairy sector development activities and interventions in the dairy value chain to national levels. Livestock was once an important pillar of Zimbabwean livelihoods base, but herds and livestock productivity were decimated as households sold off much of their livestock and other assets to buy staple foods. Program activities focus on assisting vulnerable but viable smallholder farmers, particularly women-led households, to increase milk production, rebuild and improve dairy production capacity, improve rangeland/fodder flow management and preventative animal health services, stimulate market linkages between value chain actors, and promote the use of donkey draught power in support of dairy production.

Land O'Lakes' six-month no-cost extension will focus on activities that promote sustainability of structures put in place during the first two years of the program, along with an expansion of high value-add activities. Achievements to date include setting up a revolving cattle loan facility, which led to the purchase of 404 dairy cows, (301 direct USAID funding and 103 from repayments to date) and resuscitated a stock-feed revolving fund facility, both currently managed by the milk collection centers (MCCs). Additionally, the use of required milk hygiene equipment (cans and buckets) contributes to improvement of milk quality, allowing farmers to sell surplus milk through the formal market. Land O'Lakes has also assisted farmers to set aside 1,360 hectares for improved fodder production and rehabilitated 21 milk collection centers (MCCs) nationwide.

These MCCs have tested, bulked and chilled 2,369,535 litres of milk by March 2013, worth $1,184,768 as of March 2013, and have improved their productive asset base by over $700,000. In addition to repaying over $ 500,000 to the cattle banks, stock feed, drug, and milking equipment revolving funds.

Purpose of the PMP

The Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) is an important element in the USAID's managing for results programming system. It is a key tool for assessing, managing and documenting the progress of a project toward achieving objectives. The purpose of this PMP is to have an integrated M&E system, including economic growth and food security performance indicators, which will be used to measure program results in a timely and efficient manner.

The PMP is designed to:

- Enable collection of timely and consistent performance data.
- Provide detailed description of the performance indicators that will be tracked.
- Specify the source, method and schedule for collection of data.
- Assign responsibility for data collection to a specific team or individual.
- Provide justification for selecting the indicators.
- Describe the known data limitations; discuss the significance of the data limitations, and propose actions to address the data limitations.
- Describe where necessary procedures validate the measured values.
- Describe plans for data analysis, reporting, review and use.
- Identify, wherever possible, other evaluation and research activities that may have implications for the PMP and management of ZDL Project.

Guiding Principles for the PMP

The PMP is an important tool for managing and documenting project performance. It enables timely and consistent collection of comparable performance data, which allows project activity specialists and officers to make informed decisions on the overall management of the project as well as any necessary changes in the project design. The principles guiding the PMP design and development are:

- Organizational Learning: This PMP, in its design of data collection, analysis and dissemination of results, is based in part on the need to better understand the dairy and donkey production and business systems and their performance at the farm and at the milk collection centre. The indicators of input, process and impact that are suggested in the PMP are designed to understand the consequences of project initiatives on the performance of the ZDL project components at various stages of the program implementation.
- Performance-Informed Decision-Making: The PMP is designed to ensure that management decisions at all levels are informed by the best available information on project performance at specific times in the life of the project. This would enable both the Land O'Lakes ZDL team and the USAID Economic Growth team to take corrective action when necessary to improve project performance.
- Valid and Reliable Project Data: The effectiveness of the performance monitoring plan as a management tool will depend on access to data that is valid, reliable, and timely. To increase transparency, indicator and data quality assessments will be conducted quarterly to determine any obvious limitations in the quality of the data being collected in the PMP.
- Communicating Lessons Learned: An effective PMP should yield information that will enable the project team and USAID to communicate the achievement of the projects and to share the lessons learned to the key stakeholders. The ability to do so will depend on the type of information collected, type of analysis conducted, and the formats and media used for dissemination of results to the appropriate target audience.

- 'Living' Reference Document: The PMP will be a constant reference to monitor the progress of implementation and to guide the assessment of the results. The PMP will be reviewed annually, or as needed, to ensure that it accurately supports and monitors project implementation. This PMP document is not a final product. This document must be viewed as a living document requiring further review and changes. As the implementation of the project progresses, limitations to the proposed indicators may emerge. As new challenges emerge, the match between the SO, IR and the respective indicators need to be studied and modified if necessary. As the quality of the information system improves, there may be opportunities for further refining or changing the SO indicators and others. For these reasons and others, the indicators and the data elements need to be reviewed periodically to recommend modifications, if necessary.

Budgeting for Performance Management

Land O'Lakes realizes the value of ensuring a sufficient amount of project resources for M&E performance management activities. Key budget items, such as having adequate staff in-country, strong M&E data systems, and resources for surveys and assessments are necessary elements for successful project monitoring and evaluation. In addition to a full-time M&E position in Zimbabwe, oversight and support for performance management comes from the Chief of Party and ongoing technical assistance from Land O'Lakes global M&E team, based in Nairobi and the United States. For this project, monitoring and evaluation performance management costs are approximately 5 percent of the extension budget.

Results Framework

Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe
Goal: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households

AO3: Livelihoods Restored and Maintained/Economy Stabilized and Growing
(USAID IR 3.2.1: Improved Livelihoods, Income Generation and Employment)
AO4: Increased Income and Employment Generated by Agriculture Sector
(USAID IR 4.1 Increased Agricultural Production)

Project Outcomes:
4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation
4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation
4.5.2-42 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
4.5.2-43 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance
Gndr 2 Proportion of female participants in USG assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources
Gndr 4 Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social,economic and political opportunities
USAID ZIM2 Number of project beneficiaries in relevant leadership positions

ZDL A Increase in income of vulnerable households ($, %)
ZDL B Number of rural households reporting increased incomes from program intervention

IR 1: Increased milk production and collection

- **4.5-4 Gross margin per dairy cow in lactation**
- **4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance**
- **4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG interventions**
- **4.5.2.29 Value of Agricultural and Rural loans**
- **4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs receiving business development services from USG assisted sources**
- **4.5.2-38 Value of private sector investment in the agricultural sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation**

- ZDL1: Total volume (yield/cow/day) and value of milk produced per household (Lts/$/%)
- ZDL2: Number of households producing milk for collection by MCCs
- ZDL3: Volume and value of milk collected by MCCs (Lts/$)
- ZDL4: Number of MCCs collecting milk from producers (#)

IR 2: Increased capacity in preventative animal health, fodder production, and rangeland management

- **4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training**
- ZDL 5: Number of community based volunteers receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training as community livestock auxiliaries

IR 3: Increased use of donkeys for animal traction

- **4.5-4: Gross margin per donkey in traction business**

- ZDL6: Number of households contracted with trained service providers for land clearing, plowing and/or transportation (#)
- ZDL7: Number of individuals receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training in donkey management and animal traction

Criteria for Selecting Indicators

Project indicators selection came from several sources. A review and selection process of USAID Feed the Future recommended indicators was conducted to ensure alignment with the general reporting and effective measurement of impact and results for this type of project in this environment with the recommended target beneficiaries. In addition, the choice of indicators has been developed with the assistance of USAID in the implementation of similar project across the last 25 years**.**

Indicators selected for the ZDL project provide relevant data about progress towards results being monitored. The indicators are intended to provide data that will help the ZDL team to make better decisions, achieve results and improve organizational effectiveness. Taking measures only once is not useful in the ZDL project component, and hence, the indicators selected track trends over time so that comparisons can be made.

Below are the criteria that were used in selecting indicators for the ZDL project;

- **Validity** - Indicators must be precisely defined so that their measurement is unambiguous. The indicator should be a true reflection of the facts and the data collected using scientifically defensible measurement techniques. The indicators are verifiable and reproducible and can be interpreted in such a way that all the project stakeholders can understand.
- **Reliability**- The results should be the same regardless of who collects the data or when the measure is repeated. The indicator should be verifiable.
- **Comparability**- For the ZDL project, taking measures only once is not useful because there is no point of comparison. The indicators selected had to be able to reflect a trend of the indicator over time; for example, in milk volumes produced. This assists in visualizing the direction the community may be going in the near future.
- **Timeliness** - Indicators should describe when change is expected. An indicator needs to be collected and reported at the right time.
- **Aggregation of information**- Indicators that were able to aggregate information on broader issues, such as production or income, were selected. This was to avoid an endless list of indicators measuring the same issues, such as adoption of skills and techniques across the project activities.
- **Achievability/ Feasibility** – The indicators can be integrated easily into project staff's ongoing work, and the required data can be collected and measured. The information generated can be presented in an understandable, appealing way to all the project stakeholders.

Baseline Data and Target Setting

Baseline Survey – In August 2010, a statistically valid sample of potential beneficiaries was surveyed to establish current levels of the various food security, income, and production indicators in the PMP. The objectives of the baseline were to refine targets on each of the indicators and measurement of the program's performance and to provide a more precise definition and understanding of the socio-economic status and vulnerability of program beneficiaries. In September 2011, a similar baseline was carried out for the new project sites and the new indicators in the ZDL PMP. A structured questionnaire was administered to randomly selected beneficiaries, and qualitative data was collected to complement quantitative data and provide data for measuring other qualitative indicators. The objective of the baseline was to complement the initial baseline of the project and to understand the socio–economic status of the target population.

Factors considered in setting targets

- Secondary data from the dairy industry and data generated during the first phase of the ZDL project set the basis of what is achievable and what is not for the dairy component.
- The donkey pilot study on traction and transport in two areas during the first phase also generated learning experiences, which assisted in target-setting for the project extension.
- Learning experiences from other projects within and outside Zimbabwe
- Studying the limits to progress in attaining results and setting attainable targets

Critical Assumptions

There are a number of critical assumptions identified and listed below, which explain how the theory of change for the project fits into the larger context and mitigates any uncertainty and unexpected implementation challenges or issues. It is important to capture the critical assumptions at the outset of the project so they can be examined and reviewed as the program and operating environment change.

- Developing the livestock sector in Zimbabwe to true sustainability will require several years of intervention.
- The current, reasonably stable macro-economic policies are followed, without hyperinflation and price controls.
- All selected households actively participate in program activities.
- Targeted households do not sell productive assets due to food security and income shocks.
- The market functions as usual - Processors pay Milk Collection Centres (MCCs) for the milk they receive.
- Beneficiaries participate in available training sessions.
- Political situation remains stable, allowing farmers to take a medium-term view for investment.
- The ability to safely move throughout project areas remains stable, and project activities can carry on as planned.
- The weather patterns remain "normal" and there is well distributed rain in the usual pattern.
- The Government of Zimbabwe (GOZ) allows implementation of the project in all areas of the country.
- Capable Community Livestock Workers are identified by the community.
- There is no dumping of milk and milk products onto the Zimbabwe market.
- The processors are willing to buy raw milk and keep their plants open.

Managing for Results

The PMP provides the overall framework for Monitoring and Evaluation in the ZDL project. It serves as the basis for generating, analyzing and disseminating information useful to chart progress, designing plans and improving project implementation. The ZDL Chief of Party is the overall PMP coordinator, with the support of the M&E Specialist. Technical coordination and implementation of the PMP are the responsibility of M&E Specialist. Project activity specialists and officers of all components of the project use the PMP as a guiding document in their key areas of project implementation. At the end of each quarter there is a report regarding achievement for each indicator in relation to the specified outcome.

Collecting Performance Data

The Zimbabwe-based M&E Specialist has the responsibility of collecting data on the progress and performance of the ZDL activities. Working closely with project activity specialists and officers, the project M&E Specialist collects monitoring data in accordance with the data collection schedule. This individual is also provided with technical assistance by the Land O'Lakes global M&E team out of the Land O'Lakes Headquarters in the United States and Land O'Lakes Regional Office in Nairobi, Kenya. This M&E team reviews all data collected and provides oversight, feedback, and technical assistance relating to all aspects of project monitoring and evaluation.

Table below shows the projected assignment of data collection responsibilities.

MAJOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT STEPS	RESPONSIBILITY
Collecting performance data	M&E Specialist, Field officers
Reviewing performance information	M&E Specialist
Reporting performance results (Quarterly and Annual Reporting)	M&E Specialist, ZDL activity specialists, Chief of Party
Assessing data quality	M&E Specialist, ZDL activity specialists
Reviewing and updating the PMP	ZDL M&E Specialist, Land O'Lakes Global M&E Team, ZDL Chief of Party

It is anticipated that during the course of the project, data collection will be done at different levels: at the farm level, milk collection center level, milk processor level and service provider level. In addition to the collection of quantitative performance data, the project will collect qualitative data through direct observation, on-site interviews with key informants and informal group interviews. These techniques will result in very useful qualitative information on project processes, lessons learned, and success stories.

Thus, a mixed method approach to monitoring and evaluation will be used throughout the project lifecycle. Against this background, the ZDL M&E Specialist, working with field officers, will conduct additional data collection activities to tease out some of the underlying dimensions of performance outcomes. Therefore, more rigorous, in-depth analysis on topics of special interest will complement the project's routine/formal performance monitoring efforts.

Processing and Analyzing Performance Data

Data analysis for the ZDL project will track trends over periods of time through comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods quarterly or annually against targets. A breakdown per association, MCC and gender is included in the analysis. Additionally, the seasonality factor is considered, if required. This data will be presented in the form of tables, bar charts and the narrative interpretation of the actual data. The monitoring and evaluation team will maintain high integrity data collection and analysis by utilizing the following tools:

1. Results Framework;
2. Performance Management Plan (PMP);
3. On-farm record books capturing farm inputs and outputs;
4. MCC records capturing milk volumes going through the center;
5. Status Surveys for project beneficiaries;
6. Farmer Survey for gross margins and net income;
7. Data Quality Spot Checks on-site at MCCs and individual farms

The ZDL project will continue to collect data from the MCCs on a quarterly basis, collecting, cleaning, and analyzing the data before submitting this data in quarterly reports.

Project Data Warehousing and Management System

Land O'Lakes is developing a new Oracle CRM On Demand database tool, Integrated Monitoring Performance Assessment Computerized Tracking System (IMPACTS) to collect, track, analyze and report progress towards achievement of project results and outcomes. Once functional, all project information will be entered into IMPACTS, and the flexibility inherent in this relational database will allow the same information to be used by project staff in variety of ways. For example, the technical and monitoring team will review the data collected by the field offices by component, by quarter and by technical area. When IMPACTS is fully functional on the web, it will allow us to offer USAID Zimbabwe the ability to monitor project activities on an as–needed basis and without having to wait for standard periodic progress reports.

Reporting Performance Results

Performance data for the ZDL project is collected monthly, project results are reported quarterly to USAID, and a major annual report is submitted at the end of each US government's fiscal year. Findings are reported to USAID in a narrative summary reinforced with appropriate tables and charts integrated into the narrative.

Performance reports include:

1. Introduction and Executive Summary
2. Project Objectives
3. Activities-Progress on planned activities under each objective and an analysis of project impact, if any
4. Environmental Issues-Implementation of Federal Regulation 22 CFR 216
5. Gender Issues
6. Lessons Learnt
7. Challenges
8. Networking and Collaborations

Reviewing and Updating the PMP

The PMP will serve as a "living" document that the ZDL team will use to guide overall project performance. One of the key principles of the PMP is that it serves as a useful tool for management and organizational learning; the PMP is not merely a mechanism to fulfill USAID reporting requirements. As such, it will be updated as necessary to reflect changes in ZDL strategy and ongoing project activities.

PMP implementation is therefore not a one-time occurrence, but rather an ongoing process of review, revision, and re-implementation. The PMP will be reviewed and revised annually—guided largely by suggestions generated during the ZDL review processes. When reviewing the PMP, the following issues shall be taken into account:

- Are the performance indicators working as intended in the design process?
- Are the performance indicators providing the information needed to properly gauge ZDL activities in each component (i.e., increased milk production and collection, rangeland management and donkey traction and transport)?
- How can the PMP be improved?

The M&E Specialist will document any major changes to the PMP and the rationale for these adjustments.

Assessing Data Quality

Data collection will be done by different activity officers. And as such, it is important that in the data collection process, appropriate standards for data quality are in place. Poor-quality data can create two problems; 1) providing poor information to project decision-makers; and 2) skewing information or inaccurately analyzing data being used for reporting purposes. In order to measure and attribute results accurately for both reporting and management needs, the ZDL M&E Specialist (supported by the Global M&E Team) will ensure that collected data on ZDL meets certain standardized evaluation criteria. The M&E Specialist will be responsible for carrying out quarterly data quality assessment reviews as well as ensuring the quality of any data collected by ZDL sub grantees.

Conducting Evaluations and Special Assessments

During the life of the project, formative and summative evaluations will take place. The process of implementing the program will be examined through process or implementation evaluations and will determine whether the program is operating as planned. This will be an ongoing process and the results will be used to improve the program. These process evaluations will focus on the number and type of participants reached and measure project outcomes such as adoption of skills by the households where the training participants are coming from.

In the month of September 2013, a statistically valid sample of program beneficiaries will be surveyed to determine progress on the various food security, income, and production indicators in the PMP. This evaluation will form the basis of the Final Results Report, which will be submitted to USAID and will showcase to the community the effectiveness of the project in increasing income and improving food security over the life of the program, according to the baseline taken in August 2010.

Performance Management Task Schedule

The performance management task schedule on the following page shows the anticipated timeline for when data will be collected on each ZDL component.

Perfomance management Task Schedule - Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe												
Perfomance Management Tasks- USAID fiscal year	**2011**		**2012**				**2013**				**2014**	
Quarters	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**Notes**
Prepare Perfomance Management Plan												
Review Results Framework and Intermediate Results												Delivered in the Results Framework
Review Perfomance Indicators												Delivered in the perfomance indicator reference sheets
Prepare Perfomance Indicator Reference Sheets												Delivered in the perfomance indicator reference sheets
Baseline												
Carry out assessment to validate baseline and expected results in new areas												Reported in the Quarterly report
Prepare and review data tables (Baseline and Targets)												Delivered in the Perfomance Data Tables
Review PMP by USAID												
Implement M&E System												
Develop M&E Instruments												Reported in the Quarterly report
Train M&E personel and Field Technicians												Reported in the Quarterly report
Collect perfomance data												
Collect perfomance data for Milk production and collection												Collection will be an on-going activity
Collect perfomance data for Small Livestock production												Collection will be an on-going activity
Collect perfomance data for Donkey traction												Collection will be an on-going activity

Collect perfomance data for rangeland management and Animal Health												Collection will be an on-going activity
Collect data on cross cutting issues- Gender and environment												
Collect data on gender indicators												Collection will be through sample surveys and evaluations
Review and report perfomance information												
Review Perfomance Information (outputs)												Internal Meetings
Review Perfomance Information (Outcomes)												Meetings with USAID
Prepare Quartely reports												Detailed schedule agreed with USAID
Prepare annual reports												Detailed schedule agreed with USAID
Data Quality assessments												
Perfom Data Quality Assessments												Will be considered when preparing quarterly reports
Review data quality procedures (ongoing)												Will be considered when preparing quarterly reports
Evaluations												
Midterm Review												
Conduct special studies												
Conduct final evaluation												
Review Perfomance information												
Annual PMP review												

Attachment A: Indicator Summary Table

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
Objective: Increased incomes and food security of vulnerable households						
4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	This indicator measures all types of employment opportunities created during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/Milk collection centre employment). Jobs which are considered are those lasting more than a month in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through length. All the jobs are converted to full-time equivalents (FTEs). For example, a full-time job that lasts 4 months would be counted as a 1/3 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not established as work hours may vary greatly.	This measure is a direct indicator of the program's results. The indicator measures the program's progress in creation of sustainable employment and related income. The program is addressing this through provision of assets in the form of dairy cattle for the farmers to improve milk productivity which in turn increases milk volumes at MCCs, thus increasing employment at farm level and MCC level. Improving donkey transport and traction business also results in employment of donkey entrepreneurs.	FTEs	Level 1. Location: Urban, rural Level 2. Duration: New, Continuing Level 3. Sex of job-holder: male, female Annually	Participating farmers Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2012: 382 FY2013: 557 Cummulative extension period target: 650

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	This indicator measures the new and continuing area (in hectares) of land under new technology during the current reporting year. For this project the relevant technologies include: • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging, for the fodder establishment and conservation plots; • Biological: New germ-plasm introduction of fodder crops which are higher yielding and have a higher nutritional value and higher yielding dairy breeds which have not been used before by the farmers; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter); • Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices and natural resource management practices that increase productivity. Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM), and Post-Harvest Handling (PHH) related to fodder establishment and conservation and dairy management.	This indicator tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate impacts.	Hectares	Level 1: Technology type: Crop genetics (including nutritional enhancement), animal genetics, pest management. Level 2: Duration: New and continuing Level 3: Sex: Male, female, association-applied Annually	Participating farmers Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011: 1300 FY2012: 1500 FY2013: 1700 Cummulative extension period taget: 1700

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Increase in number of households using improved technology or management as a result of program-supported intervention. For the purposes of this program, improved technology will include: dairy equipment (milk cooling tanks, cans, buckets, strainers, milk quality testing equipment). Improved management will mean: artificial insemination, better animal husbandry practices, business and accounting systems.	Improved incomes can be enabled through the use improved technology and management practices. This program will make significant efforts to aid program beneficiaries in the adoption of improved dairy management and technology in order to encourage greater household income and food security. Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the in the agricultural supply change will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity which is the Intermediate Result which this indicator falls under.	Number of households	Level 1: Duration – new and continuing Level 2: Sex: male, female Reported Quarterly	Dairy farmers; MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011: 1500 FY2012: 800 FY2013: 1200 Extension period target: 1200

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales attributed to Feed The Future (FTF) implementation	Incremental value of sales of milk produced per household as a result of program-supported interventions. Incremental sales indicate the value in US$ of the total amount of milk sold by the household relative to the past quarter. This indicator will collect both volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders at the farm level of targeted commodities for its calculation. The value of incremental sales indicates the value (in USD) of the total amount of agricultural products sold by farm households relative to a base year and can be calculated based on the total value of sales of a product (crop, animal, or fish) during the reporting year minus the total value of sales in the base year. Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator #4.5—4, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value here.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' dairy operations. Having higher and more valuable milk yields increases a smallholders' potential for increased income and household nutritional resources, which in turn may lead to better food security. Value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those smallholders. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by subsistence and semi-subsistence smallholders. Improving markets will contribute to the Key Objective of increased agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will reduce poverty and thus achieve the goal. Lower level indicators help set the stage to allow markets and trade to expand.	Volume: Litres /Value: US$	Targeted agricultural products Reported Quarterly	Dairy farmers/households; MCC records Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (monthly) and spot check verifications; review of on farm record books and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2012: US$326,571 FY2013: US$1,473,429 Extension cumulative period target: US$1,673,429

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-42 Number producer organizations that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Total number of producer organisations using improved technology or management as a result of program-supported intervention. For the purposes of this program, improved technology will include: dairy equipment (milk cooling tanks, cans, buckets, strainers, milk quality testing equipment). Improved management will mean: artificial insemination, better animal husbandry practices, business and accounting systems. Using technology and improved management is defined as the application of targeted technology or management practices at least twice during the course of the program.	Improved incomes can be enabled through the use of improved technology and management practices. This program will make significant efforts to aid program beneficiaries in the adoption of improved dairy management and technology in order to encourage greater household income and food security.	Number of organizations	Level 1: Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) Level 2: Duration: New, Continuing Reported Quarterly	Dairy farmers; MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2012: 15 FY2013: 20 Extension period cumulative target: 21

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-43 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security related manufacturing services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance	This indicator measures the sustainability of private sector investment through measuring the profitability and self sufficiency of the MCCs. The number of MCCs operating at or above breakeven point (demonstrating higher profitability) as a result of program-support interventions. The breakeven point is defined as gross revenue equalling the financial resources required for MCC operation.	This indicator measures the financial strength of targeted MCCs. Financial solvent MCCs are indicators of rural economic opportunity. This program seeks to aid MCCs increase their productivity, management capabilities, and reach. An increase in the number of MCCs operating above the breakeven point can indicate program success. A main goal of local capacity building is to leave behind viable businesses and service providers to contribute to the economic growth of the agriculture and food-security sector. Profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations is one way to demonstrate that viability and sustainability of the MCCs in which we invest.	Number	Type of entity Reported Quarterly	MCC records; USAID Crop Budget; USAID Cash Flow Tracking Sheet Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and Accounting Bureau System records from the MCCs	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY 2011: 6 FY2012: 10 FY2013: 15 Extension period cummulative target: 15

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
ZDL A Increase in income of vulnerable households ($, %)	Household income is the net sum of the value of all productive and income earnings from dairy and donkey business activities of the household, both in cash and in kind. The difference between the net average incomes among the beneficiary households at the start of the program with the present average earnings reflects an increase.	This measure is a direct indicator of the program's results. The indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Higher incomes guarantee access to better services and help to build and sustain the value chain and its institutions. It is assumed that increases in income result in better livelihoods and ability to provide for a family. The program is addressing this through improving milk productivity, increasing the volume and value for an increase in farmer incomes and improving donkey transport and traction business.	US$, Increase in household income (% per year)	Gender (Male/Female) headed households Reported Annually	Participating farmers Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2012: US$2885 FY2013: US$3455 Extension period target: US$3455

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
ZDL B Number of rural households reporting increased incomes from program intervention	This indicator is a measure of increase in income for targeted beneficiary households as a result of program supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, income is defined as the average of net earnings a household receives monthly from productivity activities. The difference between the average incomes among the beneficiary households at the start of the program with the present average earnings reflects an increase.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Average, net income is an important indicator of well-being and ability to maintain food security. It is assumed that increases in income result in better livelihoods and ability to provide for a family. The program is addressing this through improving milk productivity increasing the volume and value for an increase in farmer incomes.	Number	Gender (Male/Female) headed households Reported Annually	Participating farmers Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011:500 FY2012:800 FY2013:1200 Extension period target: 1200

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
IR 1: Increased milk production and collection						
4.5-4 Gross margin per dairy cow in lactation	The gross margin is defined as the difference between the total value of sales of milk and the cost of producing the milk. For this project gross margin per animal- dairy cow in lactation is a measure of net income for that livestock use activity. Input costs included should be those significant cash costs that can be easily ascertained. For dairy cows the cash costs include feed, pesticides, hired labor and veterinary services. Capital investments and depreciation do not need to be included in cash costs. Unpaid, family labor does not have to be valued and included in costs.	This measure is a direct indicator of the program's results. The indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Improving the gross margin for farm commodities will contribute to increasing agricultural GDP, will increase income, and will thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the goal indicator of reducing poverty. Higher incomes guarantee access to better services and help to build and sustain the value chain and its institutions. It is assumed that increases in incomes result in better livelihoods and ability to provide for a family. The program is addressing this through improving milk productivity, increasing the volume and value for an increase in farmer incomes and improving donkey transport and traction business.	US$/animal	Level 1. Targeted commodity Level 2. Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA) Reported annually	Participating farmers Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: US$26.7 Annual Target: FY2012: US$961.7 FY2013: US$1151 Extension period target: US$1151

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producer organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance.	Increase in number of producer organisations who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity training as a result of program-supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, technical agricultural sector productivity training is defined as the dissemination of organized information on the management, financial, husbandry skills critical for profitable farming prepared in advance and specifically addressing current obstacles to production. In the case of training or assistance to farmer's association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' producer group management. Since the program aims to impact on dairy farmer producer groups in management, marketing and financial services, good MCC management gives an indication of the program's performance in this area. Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.	Number of Producer organisations	Level 1: Type of organization Level 2: New/Continuing Reported Quarterly	Dairy farmers; MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011: 8 FY2012: 15 FY2013: 20 Extension period target: 21
4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG interventions	A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. Beneficiaries include the households of people who participate in trainings where knowledge or skills in dairy and donkey management practices are imparted and the households that benefit from the livestock loan facilities, AI facility and milk hygiene equipment.	This indicator tracks access and equitable access to services in targeted area.	Number	Level 1: Duration New, Continuing Level 2. Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA) Reported Quarterly	Participating farmers, farm and MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011: 2600 FY2012:800 FY2013: 1200 Extension period target: 1200

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-29 Value of agriculture and rural loans	This indicator measures the value of agricultural credit made to farmers in the form of dairy cows, donkeys and milk cans and buckets and seed. A Dairy cow is defined as a higher potential breed of animal or their cross i.e. (Jersey, Red Swedish, Holstein, and Ayrshire.) This indicator sum loans made (i.e. disbursed) during the reporting year to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, and loans to MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain, as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.	This indicator measures the program's progress towards improving the productivity and management capacity of targeted beneficiaries. Heifer ownership provides key economic opportunities for smallholder farmers to realize improved household nutrition and the community benefits and was previously a strong source of income throughout rural Zimbabwe. Donkeys will improve transportation of milk to the milk collection centres. Milk cans and buckets will improve milk hygiene. Beneficiaries with stronger household resources are more likely to be food secure and have increased incomes. The program intends to procure and provide dairy cows, donkeys and milk cans and buckets to beneficiary farmers as a means to address this indicator. Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services.	US$	Level 1: Type of loan recipient Level 2: Sex of recipient: Male, Female, Joint Reported Quarterly	Land O'Lakes Records Baseline survey; data collection tool used by field technicians to capture the number of cows distributed	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011: US$390,000 FY2012: US$480,000 FY2013: US$675,000 Extension period target: US$675,000

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs receiving business development services from USG assisted sources	This indicator measures the total number of producer groups and farmer enterprises receiving business development services. For this project business development services include technical support for the Milk producer associations in strategic planning, financial management, milk centre operations including logistics, marketing and quality control and managing centre revolving funds.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving access to business development services thus contributing to the expansion of markets and trade. The resultant impact is the increase in agricultural productivity which will help achieve the goal of reducing poverty and hunger.	Number of Producer organisations	Level 1: Size: micro, small, or medium, as defined above Level 2: MSME Type: Agricultural producer, Input supplier, Trader, Output processors, Non-agriculture, Other Level 3: Sex of owner: Male, Female, Joint, n/a. Reported Quarterly	Training participant records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Targets: FY 2012: 800 FY 2013: 1200 Extension period target:1220
4.5.2-38 Value of private sector investment in the agricultural sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation	Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as animals for traction, storage bins, and machinery. Downstream investments include any type of transformation of processing of agricultural products as well as the transport of agricultural products to markets. "Leveraged by FTF implementation" indicates that the new investment was directly or indirectly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the FTF initiative	Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production.	US$	None	Project records on investment by agricultural sector investment	

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
ZDL1: Total volume and value of milk produced per household each month	The total volume and value of milk produced per household each month as a result of program-supported interventions. Volume is defined as the average number of Litres of milk production per household per month over the lactation period of the cow, represented by averaging milk production for a cross-section of animals at a specific period (usually a quarter) in the seasonal milk production cycle. Value is volume of milk produced at farm level multiplied by average selling price.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' dairy operations. Having higher and more valuable milk yields increases a smallholders' potential for increased income and household nutritional resources, which in turn may lead to better food security.	Volume: Litres per household per month (actual and percentage)/Value: US$	No disaggregation Reported Monthly	Dairy farmers/households; MCC records Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (monthly) and spot check verifications; review of on farm record books and MCC records.	Baseline: 50/US$25 Annual Targets: FY2011:100/ US$50 FY2012: 240/US$120 FY 2013: 300/US$150 Extension period target: 450/US$225
ZDL2: Number of households producing and marketing milk locally and to the MCC	Increase in number of households producing milk for marketing locally and collection by MCCs as a result of program-supported interventions. Milk production is defined as the act of milking, collecting, and distributing milk from a lactating heifer. Milk marketing is defined as the act of milk delivery to a MCC and receipt of payment remittance to a farmer from an MCC and selling milk at farm gate.	Owning a heifer and producing quantities of milk is both a potential source of household nutrition and income. This program intends to increase incomes for the benefit of increased food security. A key indication of both income and potential for income is the act of delivering milk to a MCC.	Number of households (actual and percentage)	Gender (Male/Female) Reported Monthly	MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; MCC records.	Baseline: 92 Annual Targets: FY2011: 300 FY2012: 800 FY 2013: 1200 Extension period target: 1200

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
ZDL3: Volume and value of milk collected by MCCs each month	Increase in the total volume and value of milk collected by MCCs each month as a result of program-supported interventions. Volume is defined as the average number of Litres of milk received per MCC per month. Value is price paid to farmer at MCC per liter of milk delivered.	This indicator measures progress towards increasing the functionality and viability of targeted MCCs. High-potential MCCs are key component of increased incomes and food security in rural Zimbabwe. Moreover, an increase in the volume and value of the milk collected at the targeted MCCs will serve as an important indication of program success.	Total volume of milk delivered to the MCC (actual and percentage)/Value: US$	No disaggregation Reported monthly	Dairy farmers; MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 148,346/US$ 74173 Annual Targets: FY2011: 600,000/US$ 300,00 FY2012: 690,000/US$ 345,000 FY2013: 793,500US$396,750 Extension period target: 1,160,986 /US$580,493
ZDL4: Number of MCCs collecting milk from producers	The number of MCCs collecting milk from producers as a result of program-supported activities. MCCs are defined as locally-run points of milk collection. Collecting milk from producers is defined as the act of receiving, aggregating, storing, and selling incoming milk.	This indicator measures progress to revitalizing the dairy industry in rural Zimbabwe. MCCs were once an important component of the rural economy. Recent economic hardship in Zimbabwe has rendered many non-functional however. This program aims to support the re-activation of these MCCs for the benefit of increased incomes and subsequently improved food security.	Number of MCC (actual and percentage)	No disaggregation Reported Quarterly	Dairy farmers; MCC records; field visit Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 6 Annual Targets: FY 2011: 8 FY2012: 15 FY2013: 20 Extension period target: 21

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
IR2: Increased capacity in preventative animal health, fodder production, and rangeland management						
4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	Increase in number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity training as a result of program-supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, technical agricultural sector productivity training is defined as the dissemination of organized information on the management, financial, husbandry skills critical for profitable farming prepared in advance and specifically addressing current obstacles to production. Productivity is defined as the average number of litres of milk production per cow per day over the lactation period of the cow, represented by averaging milk production for a cross-section of animals at a specific period (usually a quarter) in the seasonal milk production cycle.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' productivity. Since the program aims to impact on management of the dairy animals owned by smallholder farmers, milk yield gives an indication of the program's performance in this area. Sustainable increases in rural incomes can only be achieved through surplus production of subsistence requirements. Average yields for an improved animal can range from 6 to 30 litres per day, dependent upon genetic characteristics in association with differing levels of management and nutrition. The project aims to have an impact upon all the three factors of genetic composition, management and nutrition, the latter through feed conservation and access to supplemental feeds. Milk yield is therefore a critical indicator of performance for the project. Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, which is key to transformational development.	Number of individuals	Level 1: Type of individual: Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.); People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers); People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers) Level 2: Sex: male, female Reported Quarterly	Training attendance registers, MCC records Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual Target: FY2011: 2600 FY2012:800 FY2013:1200 Extension period target: 1200

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
ZDL 5 **Number of community based volunteers receiving short-term agricultural sector productivity training as Community Livestock Auxiliaries and able to improve farm productivity**	Community Livestock Auxiliaries (CLAs) are trained community volunteers and lead farmers that are trained in training-of-trainers lead systems. Increased number of CLAs trained in rangeland management and/or preventative animal health practices as a result of program-supported interventions.	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' productivity. Since the program aims to impact on management of dairy livestock owned by smallholder farmers, growth rate, milk yield gives an indication of the program's performance in this area. Sustainable increases in rural incomes can only be achieved through surplus production of subsistence requirements. The project aims to impact upon all the three factors of genetic composition, management and nutrition, the latter through feed conservation and access to supplemental feeds.	Number	Gender	Small-holder livestock and/or dairy farmers	Baseline 0 Annual targets: FY2012: 60 FY2013: 60 Extension period target: 60
IR3: Increased use of donkeys for animal traction						
4.5-4 Gross margin per donkey in traction business	Increase in gross margin per donkey in the donkey traction business is a measure of net income from the traction and transportation activities. The gross margin is defined as the difference between the total value of revenue from transport of milk and the cost of maintaining the donkey is the gross margin.	This indicator measures the increase in the net income at farm level for the targeted farmers. Positive gross margins are an indicator of rural economic opportunity. This program seeks to aid households increase their productivity, management capabilities, and reach. A positive gross margin at farm level can indicate program success.	US$	No disaggregation Reported Quarterly	Farmer records; USAID Crop Budget; USAID Cash Flow Tracking Sheet Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.	Baseline: 0 Annual targets: FY2012: US$623 FY2013: US$833 Extension period target: US$ 833

Illustrative Performance Indicators	Definition of Indicator	Justification / Management Utility	Unit of Measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting Frequency	Data Source	Baseline and Annual Targets
ZDL6: The number of households contracted with trained service providers for land clearing, plowing and/or transportation	Increase in the number of households contracted with trained service providers for land clearing, plowing and/or transportation as a result of program-supported interventions. Households with donkey will obtain business training designed to develop small contracting business to market services for animal traction.	This indicator measures the program's progress towards improving the household asset base of targeted program beneficiaries. Animal ownership provides key economic opportunities and was previously a strong source of income throughout rural Zimbabwe. Beneficiaries with stronger household resources are more likely to be food secure and have increased incomes.	Number of households (actual and percentage) other than households with donkey to use / contract the donkeys for traction / transport services.	Gender of household head Reported Quarterly	Donkey traction households	Baseline: 0 Annual Targets: FY2011: 200 FY2012: 200 FY2013:200 Extension period target: 200
ZDL 7: Number of individuals receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training in donkey management and animal traction	Increase in number of individuals who have received donkey management training as a result of program-supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, donkey management training is defined as the dissemination of organized information on the management, financial, husbandry skills critical for profitable farming prepared in advance and specifically addressing current obstacles to production	This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' management of donkeys. Since the program aims to impact on the use of donkeys in traction and transport, training in good donkey management gives the farmers a good background in how to manage donkeys and donkey business. Sustainable increase in rural incomes can only be achieved through surplus production of subsistence requirements.	Number	Gender	Donkey traction households	Baseline: 0 Annual Targets: FY2011: 200 FY2012: 200 FY2013:200 Extension period target: 200

Illustrtive performance indicators	Defination of indicator	Justification Management Utility	Unit of measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting frequency	Data Source	Baseline and annual targets
Gender indicators						
Gndr 2 Proportion of female participants in USG assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources	Proportion of female headed beneficiary households with an improved productive asset base out of the total number of households beneffited. Any physical asset which a household engages directly in the production of food, or income is referred to as a Productive Asset.	The project will undertake activities focused on improving dairy production and marketing in the target areas. Land O' Lakes has a deliberate policy to encourage women's participation in project activities, as women make up the most economically disadvantage group. This measures women's livelihoods and their ability to generate income; improvements will be partially evident in the form productive assets which women acquire. Thus the total value of the productive assets acquired and owned by the household is a key performance indicator in the project.	The unit of measure will be a proportion, expressed in the format of X/Y, where X is the number of females from program participants and Y is the total number of male and female participants in the programs.	Age	Project records	Baseline:30% 2013:45% Extension period target:45%
Gndr 4 Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social,economic and political opportunities	This indicator will be used to gauge the effectiveness of USG efforts to promote gender equality by measuring changes in target population attitudes about whether men and women should have equal opportunities in social, political, and economic spheres.	This indicator measures the program's progress towards improving perceptions by the target population on equal opportunity access by men and women.	The unit of measure will be a proportion, expressed in the format of X/Y, where X is the number of females from program participants and Y is the total number of male and female participants in the programs.es.	Proportions to be disaggregated by sex; Numerator, Denominator	Project records	Baseline:30% 2013:45% Extension period target:45%

Illustrtive performance indicators	Defination of indicator	Justification Management Utility	Unit of measurement	Disaggregate; Collection and Reporting frequency	Data Source	Baseline and annual targets
Gender indicators						
USAID ZIM2[1]: Number of project beneficiaries in relevant leadership positions	This indicator measures the number of project participants in relevant leadership positions. A project participant is any individual actively participating in any activity supported by the USG be it in the form of training, technical assistance, credit or input scheme of a USG assisted partner, and USG facilitated market linkages. Relevant leadership positions are defined as any post of leadership (Chairperson or vice; Secretary or vice; Treasurer or vice; committee members) of institutions (for example Milk Collection Centers, Farmers Unions, Irrigation Management Committees etc) that have a direct or indirect influence on the outcome of the Program's objectives.	The indicator will be used to measure the extent of USG supported programs are contributing to women taking leadership positions	Number	organisation type, sex	MCC governance records	2013:38 Extension period target:57

[1] This indicator alignes with GNDR 3 on the FTFMIS Indicator Table.

Attachment B: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS

The following section contains Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for each indicator presented in the Performance Monitoring Plan. If current results-level indicators are refined and/or additional indicators are developed, the ZDL M&E Specialist will create new indicator sheets based on the template provided in this section. Each reference sheet provides information on:

- Description of the Indicator: Indicator definition, unit of measurement and justification for the indicator selection;
- Plan for data collection: Data collection method, data sources, timeline for data collection, and person responsible for data collection;
- Plans for data analysis, presentation, review, and reporting; and
- Data quality: Any data quality issues, including any actions taken or planned to address data limitations.

Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households

Project Outcomes:

4.5-2: Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation

4.5.2-2: Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

4.5.2-5: Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

4.5.2-23: Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation

4.5.2-42: Number of private enterprises, producer organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

4.5.2-43: Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance

ZDL A: Increase in income of vulnerable households ($, %)

ZDL B: Number of rural households reporting increased incomes from program intervention

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures all types of employment opportunities created during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/Milk collection centre employment). Jobs which are considered are those lasting more than a month in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through length. All the jobs are converted to full-time equivalents (FTEs). For example, a full-time job that lasts 4 months would be counted as a 1/3 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not established as work hours may vary greatly. **Unit of Measure:** FTEs **Disaggregated by:** Level 1. Location: Urban, rural Level 2. Duration: New, Continuing: Level 3. Sex of job-holder: male, female **Justification/Management Utility:** This measure is a direct indicator of the program's results. The indicator measures the program's progress in creation of sustainable employment and related income. The program is addressing this through provision of assets in the form of dairy cattle for the farmers to improve milk productivity which in turn increases milk volumes at MCCs, thus increasing employment at farm level and MCC level. Improving donkey transport and traction business also results in employment of donkey entrepreneurs.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Participating farmers, participating farmer groups and Milk Collection Centers **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Annually **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (annually) against targets. A breakdown per association, MCC and gender will be included in the analysis. Additionally, the seasonality factor will be considered if required. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. The baseline value will be reported in the Jan- March 2012 quarterly report. The targets will also be calculated based on the results of the Annual Farmer Survey. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Annual Performance Reports and Annual performance data table every year to USAID/Zimbabwe.

D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Farmers are also unlikely to report with precision, especially for the labour employed on a temporary basis during the peak labour demand periods. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Seasonality can be mitigated by collecting information at least once per quarter by every participating farm and/or factor the seasonality effect, if required in analysis. Assist farmers in record keeping. Address this information need in the agreement with MCCs and farmers. Use a comprehensive questionnaire to guide farmers when providing this information. Land O'Lakes will use as necessary proxy indicators to estimate employment.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance**	
Date Established: February 2010	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the new and continuing area (in hectares) of land under new technology during the current reporting year. For this project the relevant technologies include: • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging, for the fodder establishment and conservation plots; • Biological: New germ-plasm introduction of fodder crops which are higher yielding and have a higher nutritional value and higher yielding dairy breeds which have not been used before by the farmers; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter); • Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices and natural resource management practices that increase productivity. Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM), and Post-Harvest Handling (PHH) related to fodder establishment and conservation and dairy management. **Unit of Measure:** Hectares **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Technology type: crop genetics (including nutritional enhancement), animal genetics, pest management, Level 2: Duration: New and continuing Level 3: Sex: Male, female, association-applied **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate impacts.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. Beneficiary sample surveys will the primary method of data collection. Periodic data collection by field technicians will supplement sample surveys. **Data Source(s):** Participating farmers **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Annually **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (annually) against targets. A breakdown per association, MCC and gender will be included in the analysis. Additionally, the seasonality factor will be considered if required.	

Presentation of Data: Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. The baseline value will be reported in the July-September 2011 quarterly report. The targets will also be calculated based on the results of the Annual Farmer Survey.

Review of Data: Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.

Reporting of Data: Submitted in Annual Performance Reports and Annual Performance Data Table every year to USAID/Zimbabwe.

D. Data Quality Issues

Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Farmers also unlikely to report with precision, owing to sensitive nature of this line of inquiry.

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Seasonality can be mitigated by collecting information at least once per month by every participating farm and/or factor the seasonality effect, if required in analysis. Assist farmers in record keeping. Address this information need in the agreement with MCCs and farmers. Use a comprehensive questionnaire to guide farmers when providing this information.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **4.5.2-5: Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Increase in number of households using improved technology or management as a result of program-supported intervention. For the purposes of this program, improved technology will include: dairy equipment (milk cooling tanks, cans, buckets, strainers, milk quality testing equipment). Improved management will mean: artificial insemination, better animal husbandry practices, business and accounting systems. **Unit of Measure:** Number of households **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Duration – new and continuing, and Level 2: Sex: male, female **Justification/Management Utility:** Improved incomes can be enabled through the use improved technology and management practices. This program will make significant efforts to aid program beneficiaries in the adoption of improved dairy management and technology in order to encourage greater household income and food security. Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the in the agricultural supply change will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity which is the Intermediate Result which this indicator falls under.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. Data collection by field technicians will be the primary method of collecting data. Surveys will be secondary, and will be used to verify collected data. **Data Source(s):** Dairy farmers; MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Measuring the adoption and long-term use of improved management practices and technologies cannot be achieved over a short duration of time.

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use a comprehensive questionnaire to guide farmers when providing information. Develop procedures to collect information on technology adoption.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales attributed to Feed The Future (FTF) implementation**	
Date Established: July 2011	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): Incremental value of sales of milk produced per household as a result of program-supported interventions. Incremental sales indicate the value in US$ of the total amount of milk sold by the household relative to the past quarter. This indicator will collect both volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders at the farm level of targeted commodities for its calculation. The value of incremental sales indicates the value (in USD) of the total amount of agricultural products sold by farm households relative to a base year and can be calculated based on the total value of sales of a product (crop, animal, or fish) during the reporting year minus the total value of sales in the base year. Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator #4.5—4, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value here. **Unit of Measure:** Volume: Litres /Value: US$ **Disaggregated by:** Targeted agricultural products **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' dairy operations. Having higher and more valuable milk yields increases a smallholders' potential for increased income and household nutritional resources, which in turn may lead to better food security. Value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those smallholders. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by subsistence and semi-subsistence smallholders. Improving markets will contribute to the Key Objective of increased agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will reduce poverty and thus achieve the goal. Lower level indicators help set the stage to allow markets and trade to expand.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (monthly) and spot check verifications; review of on farm record books and MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Dairy farmers/households; MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in QPDT/ADPT tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data.	

Review of Data: Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.

Reporting of Data: Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.

D. Data Quality Issues

Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Home consumption volumes may not be accurately measured.

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Seasonality will be mitigated by collecting information monthly. Continuously training of farmers on keeping proper and accurate records.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **4.5.2-42: Number producer organizations that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance**
Date Established: July 2011 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Total number of producer organisations using improved technology or management as a result of program-supported intervention. For the purposes of this program, improved technology will include: dairy equipment (milk cooling tanks, cans, buckets, strainers, milk quality testing equipment). Improved management will mean: artificial insemination, better animal husbandry practices, business and accounting systems. Using technology and improved management is defined as the application of targeted technology or management practices at least twice during the course of the program. **Unit of Measure:** Number of organizations **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) Level 2: Duration: New, Continuing **Justification/Management Utility:** Improved incomes can be enabled through the use of improved technology and management practices. This program will make significant efforts to aid program beneficiaries in the adoption of improved dairy management and technology in order to encourage greater household income and food security.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of MCC records. **Data Source(s):** MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. The baseline value is based on 2010 data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Measuring the adoption and long-term use of improved management practices and technologies cannot be achieved over a short duration of time.
Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use of the MCC Perfomance management tool to assess technology adoption

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **4.5.2-43: Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security related manufacturing services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance**	
Date Established: February 2010	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the sustainability of private sector investment through measuring the profitability and self sufficiency of the MCCs. The number of MCCs operating at or above breakeven point (demonstrating higher profitability) as a result of program-support interventions. The breakeven point is defined as gross revenue equalling the financial resources required for MCC operation. **Unit of Measure:** Number **Disaggregated by:** Type of entity **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the financial strength of targeted MCCs. Financial solvent MCCs are indicators of rural economic opportunity. This program seeks to aid MCCs increase their productivity, management capabilities, and reach. An increase in the number of MCCs operating above the breakeven point can indicate program success. A main goal of local capacity building is to leave behind viable businesses and service providers to contribute to the economic growth of the agriculture and food-security sector. Profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations is one way to demonstrate that viability and sustainability of the MCCs in which we invest.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of Accounting Bureau System records from the MCCs **Data Source(s):** MCC records; USAID Crop Budget; USAID Cash Flow Tracking Sheet **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.	

D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Many target MCCs are currently either non-functional or of low capacity. These factors often result in poor data collection practices and ability to accurately track financial status. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** During initial site visits, Land O'Lakes staff will evaluate targeted MCCs for their data collection practices, record keeping ability, book keeping ability. Adjustment in data collection strategies for this indicator may be required. If needed, Land O'Lakes may re-design its data collection strategy and assign its own staff to track progress under this indicator. Moreover, several of Land O'Lakes activities for this program involve beneficiary training on financial management and accounting. Improvements in capacity may result in better data collection and ability to track progress.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **ZDL A. Increase in income of vulnerable households ($, %)**	
Date Established: February 2010	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): Household income is the net sum of the value of all income earnings from dairy and donkey business activities of the household, both in cash and in kind. The difference between the net average incomes among the beneficiary households at the start of the program with the present average earnings reflects an increase. **Unit of Measure:** US$, Increase in household income(% per year) **Disaggregated by:** Gender (Male/Female) headed households **Justification/Management Utility:** This measure is a direct indicator of the program's results. The indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Higher incomes guarantee access to better services and help to build and sustain the value chain and its institutions. It is assumed that increases in income result in better livelihoods and ability to provide for a family. The program is addressing this through improving milk productivity, increasing the volume and value for an increase in farmer incomes and improving donkey transport and traction business.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Participating farmers **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Annually **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (annually) against targets. A breakdown per association, MCC and gender will be included in the analysis. Additionally, the seasonality factor will be considered if required. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. The baseline value will be reported in the July-September 2011 quarterly report. The targets will also be calculated based on the results of the Annual Farmer Survey. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Annual Performance Reports and Annual performance data table every year to USAID/Zimbabwe.	
D. Data Quality Issues	

Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Farmers also unlikely to report with precision, owing to sensitive nature of this line of inquiry.
Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Seasonality can be mitigated by collecting information at least once per month by every participating farm and/or factor the seasonality effect, if required in analysis. Assist farmers in record keeping. Address this information need in the agreement with MCCs and farmers. Use a comprehensive questionnaire to guide farmers when providing this information.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Objective: Increase incomes and food security of vulnerable households** **ZDL B. Number of households reporting increased incomes from program intervention**	
Date Established: February 2010	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator is a measure of increase in income for targeted beneficiary households as a result of program supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, income is defined as the average of net earnings a household receives monthly from dairy and promoted donkey activities. The difference between the average incomes among the beneficiary households at the start of the program with the present average earnings reflects an increase. **Unit of Measure:** Number **Disaggregated by:** Gender (Male/Female) headed households **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Average, net income is an important indicator of well-being and ability to maintain food security. It is assumed that increases in income result in better livelihoods and ability to provide for a family. The program is addressing this through improving milk productivity increasing the volume and value for an increase in farmer incomes.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Participating farmers **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Annually **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.	
D. Data Quality Issues	
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Farmers also unlikely to report with precision, owing to sensitive nature of this line of inquiry.	

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Land O'Lakes will use as necessary proxy indicators to estimate incomes.

IR 1: Increased milk production and collection

- **4.5-4** Gross margin per dairy cow in lactation
- **4.5.2-11:** Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance
- **4.5.2-13:** Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG interventions
- **4.5.2-29:** Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans
- **4.5.2-37:** Number of MSMEs receiving business development services from USG assisted sources
- **4.5.2-38** Value of private sector investment in the agricultural sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation
- **4.5.2-38** Value of private sector investment in the agricultural sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation
- **ZDL1:** Total volume (yield/cow/day) and value of milk produced per household (Lts/$/ %)
- **ZDL2:** Number of households producing milk for collection by MCCs (#)
- **ZDL3**: Volume and value of milk collected by MCCs (Lts/$)
- **ZDL4**: Number of MCCs collecting milk from producers (#)

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe
IR 1: Increased milk production and collection
4.5-4 Gross margin per dairy cow in lactation

Date Established: July 2011 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013

A. Description

Precise Definition(s): The gross margin is defined as the difference between the total value of sales of milk and the cost of producing the milk**.** For this project gross margin per animal- dairy cow in lactation is a measure of net income for that livestock use activity. Input costs included should be those significant cash costs that can be easily ascertained. For dairy cows the cash costs include feed, pesticides, hired labor and veterinary services. Capital investments and depreciation do not need to be included in cash costs. Unpaid, family labor does not have to be valued and included in costs.

Gross margin per animal = net revenue divided by the number of dairy cows
Unit of Measure: US$/animal
Disaggregated by: Level 1. Targeted commodity
Level 2. Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)
Justification/Management Utility: This measure is a direct indicator of the program's results. The indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Improving the gross margin for farm commodities will contribute to increasing agricultural GDP, will increase income, and will thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the goal indicator of reducing poverty. Higher incomes guarantee access to better services and help to build and sustain the value chain and its institutions. It is assumed that increases in incomes result in better livelihoods and ability to provide for a family. The program is addressing this through improving milk productivity, increasing the volume and value for an increase in farmer incomes and improving donkey transport and traction business.

B. Plan for Data Collection

Data Collection Method: Sample surveys and review of farmer and MCC records.
Data Source(s): Participating farmers
Timing / Frequency of Data Collection: Annually
Responsible Organization/Individual(s): Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist.
Location of Data Storage: Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.

C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)

Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (annually) against targets. A breakdown per association, MCC and gender will be included in the analysis. Additionally, the seasonality factor will be considered if required.
Presentation of Data: Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. The targets will be calculated based on the results of the Annual Farmer Survey.
Review of Data: Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.
Reporting of Data: Submitted in Annual Performance Reports and Annual performance data table every year to USAID/Zimbabwe.

D. Data Quality Issues

Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Farmers also unlikely to report with precision, owing to sensitive nature of this line of inquiry.
Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Seasonality can be mitigated by collecting information at least once per month by every participating farm and/or factor the seasonality effect, if required in analysis. Assist farmers in record keeping. Address this information need in the agreement with MCCs and farmers. Use a comprehensive questionnaire to guide farmers when providing this information. Land O'Lakes will use as necessary proxy indicators to estimate incomes.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **4.5.2-11: Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance**
Date Established: July 2011 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Total number of private enterprises, producers` associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, fishing associations, water users associations, women`s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations, including those focused on natural resource management, that received USG assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. Organizations assisted should only include those organizations for which implementing partners have made a targeted effort to build their capacity or enhance their organizational functions. In the case of training or assistance to farmer`s association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity. **Unit of Measure:** Number of Producer organisations **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Type of organization Level 2: New/Continuing **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' producer group management. Since the program aims to impact on dairy farmer producer groups in management, marketing and financial services, good MCC management gives an indication of the program's performance in this area. Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of MCC records. **Data Source(s):** MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.

Reporting of Data: Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.

D. Data Quality Issues

Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Many target MCCs are currently either non-functional or of low capacity. These factors often result in poor data collection practices and ability to accurately track financial status.

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: During initial site visits, Land O'Lakes staff will evaluate targeted MCCs for their data collection practices, record keeping ability, book keeping ability. Adjustment in data collection strategies for this indicator may be required. If needed, Land O'Lakes may re-design its data collection strategy and assign its own staff to track progress under this indicator. Moreover, several of Land O'Lakes activities for this program involve beneficiary training on financial management and accounting. Improvements in capacity may result in better data collection and ability to track progress.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG interventions**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. Beneficiaries include the households of people who participate in trainings where knowledge or skills in dairy and donkey management practices are imparted and the households that benefit from the livestock loan facilities, AI facility and milk hygiene equipment. **Unit of Measure:** Number **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Duration New, Continuing Level 2. Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA) **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator tracks access and equitable access to services in targeted area.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Participating farmers, farm and MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (annually) against targets. A breakdown per association, MCC and gender will be included in the analysis. Additionally, the seasonality factor will be considered if required. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Annual Performance Reports and Annual performance data table every year to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Double counting of individuals attending the different training sessions **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Recording the individuals who attend the training based on the household. This also assists in tracking the number of people in a household who have received training on the different project interventions.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **4.5.2-29: Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the value of agricultural credit made to farmers in the form of dairy cows, donkeys and milk cans and buckets and seed. A Dairy cow is defined as a higher potential breed of animal or their cross i.e. (Jersey, Red Swedish, Holstein, and Ayrshire.) This indicator sum loans made (i.e**.** disbursed) during the reporting year to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, and loans to MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain, as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO. **Unit of Measure:** US$ **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Type of loan recipient Level 2: Sex of recipient: Male, Female, Joint **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress towards improving the productivity and management capacity of targeted beneficiaries. Heifer ownership provides key economic opportunities for smallholder farmers to realize improved household nutrition and the community benefits and was previously a strong source of income throughout rural Zimbabwe. Donkeys will improve transportation of milk to the milk collection centres. Milk cans and buckets will improve milk hygiene. Beneficiaries with stronger household resources are more likely to be food secure and have increased incomes. The program intends to procure and provide dairy cows, donkeys and milk cans and buckets to beneficiary farmers as a means to address this indicator. Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: data collection tool used by field technicians to capture the number of cows distributed **Data Source(s):** Land O'Lakes Records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Spatial – geographical distribution, ccomparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and scatter charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.

Reporting of Data: Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **4.5.2-37: Number of MSMEs receiving business development services from USG assisted sources**
Date Established: February 2012 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the total number of producer groups and farmer enterprises receiving business development services. For this indicator project business development services include technical support for the Milk producer associations in strategic planning, financial management, milk centre operations including logistics, marketing and quality control and managing centre revolving funds. **Unit of Measure:** Number of Producer organisations **Disaggregated by:** Level 1: Size: micro, small, or medium, as defined above Level 2: MSME Type: Agricultural producer, Input supplier, Trader, Output processors, Non-agriculture, Other Level 3: Sex of owner: Male, Female, Joint, n/a. **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress in improving access to business development services thus contributing to the expansion of markets and trade. The resultant impact is the increase in agricultural productivity which will help achieve the goal of reducing poverty and hunger.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Training participant records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Double counting of individuals attending the different training sessions **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Recording the individuals who attend the training based on the household.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe
IR 1: Increased milk production and collection
4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation

Date Established: February 2012 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013

A. Description

Precise Definition(s): "Private sector" includes any privately-led agricultural activity whether it is managed by an individual/household or a formal company. A CBO or NGO may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural activity. The "food chain" includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as animals for traction, storage bins, and machinery. Downstream investments include any type of transformation of processing of agricultural products as well as the transport of agricultural products to markets. "Leveraged by FTF implementation" indicates that the new investment was directly or indirectly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the FTF initiative.
Unit of Measure: US$
Disaggregated by: None

Justification/Management Utility: Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production. Agricultural growth is critical to achieving the FTF goal to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger".

B. Plan for Data Collection

Data Collection Method: Data collection tool used by field technicians ; review of MCC records.
Data Source(s): Project records on investment by private sector
Timing / Frequency of Data Collection: Quarterly
Responsible Organization/Individual(s): Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist.
Location of Data Storage: Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.

C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)

Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets.
Presentation of Data: Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data.
Review of Data: Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.
Reporting of Data: Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.

D. Data Quality Issues

Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **ZDL 1: Total volume and value of milk produced per household each month**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): The total volume and value of milk produced per household each month as a result of program-supported interventions. Volume is defined as the average number of Litres of milk production per household per month over the lactation period of the cow, represented by averaging milk production for a cross-section of animals at a specific period (usually a quarter) in the seasonal milk production cycle. Value is volume of milk produced at farm level multiplied by average selling price. **Unit of Measure:** Volume: Litres per household per month (actual and percentage)/Value: US$ **Disaggregated by:** None. **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' dairy operations. Having higher and more valuable milk yields increases a smallholders' potential for increased income and household nutritional resources, which in turn may lead to better food security.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (monthly) and spot check verifications; review of on farm record books and MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Dairy farmers/households; MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Monthly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in QPDT/ADPT tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Home consumption volumes may not be accurately measured.

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Seasonality can be mitigated by collecting information at least once per month by every participating farm and/or factor the seasonality effect, if required in analysis. Continuously training of farmers on keeping proper and accurate records.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **ZDL 2: Number of households producing milk for collection by MCCs**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Increase in number of households producing milk for collection by MCCs as a result of program-supported interventions. Milk production is defined as the act of milking, collecting, and distributing milk from a lactating heifer. Collection at an MCC is defined as the act of milk delivery to a MCC and receipt of payment remittance to a farmer from an MCC. The number of households delivering milk are counted as all households that are linked to formal marketing channels through the MCC by the project. **Unit of Measure:** Number of households (actual and percentage) **Disaggregated by:** Gender (Male/Female) **Justification/Management Utility:** Owning a heifer and producing quantities of milk is both a potential source of household nutrition and income. This program intends to increase incomes for the benefit of increased food security. A key indication of both income and potential for income is the act of delivering milk to a MCC.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; MCC records. **Data Source(s):** MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Monthly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and bar charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Many target MCCs are currently either non-functional or of low capacity. These factors often result in poor data collection practices. Data collection and recordkeeping at MCCs may be inconsistent. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** During initial site visits, Land O'Lakes staff will evaluate targeted MCCs for their data collection practices and record keeping ability. Adjustment in data collection strategies may be required. If needed, Land O'Lakes may record this data at the household-level.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **ZDL 3: Volume and value of milk collected by MCCs each month**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Increase in the total volume and value of milk collected by MCCs each month as a result of program-supported interventions. Volume is defined as the average number of Litres of milk received per MCC per month. Value is price paid to farmer at MCC per liter of milk delivered. **Unit of Measure:** Total volume of milk delivered to the MCC (actual and percentage)/Value: US$ **Disaggregated by:** None. **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures progress towards increasing the functionality and viability of targeted MCCs. High-potential MCCs are key component of increased incomes and food security in rural Zimbabwe. Moreover, an increase in the volume and value of the milk collected at the targeted MCCs will serve as an important indication of program success.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. **Data Source(s):**; MCC records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Monthly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** There is a high frequency of farmers selling milk through informal channels and reluctance to disclose information on the quantities of milk disposed. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Triangulation of data using cattle censuses, on farm records and periodic data checks

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 1: Increased milk production and collection** **ZDL 4: Number of MCCs collecting milk from producers**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): The number of MCCs collecting milk from producers as a result of program-supported activities. MCCs are defined as locally- run points of milk collection. Collecting milk from producers is defined as the act of receiving, aggregating, storing, and selling incoming milk. **Unit of Measure:** Number of MCCs (actual and percentage) **Disaggregated by:** None. **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures progress to revitalizing the dairy industry in rural Zimbabwe. MCCs were once an important component of the rural economy. Recent economic hardship in Zimbabwe has rendered many non-functional however. This program aims to support the re-activation of these MCCs for the benefit of increased incomes and subsequently improved food security.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. **Data Source(s):**; MCC records; field visit **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Data may indicate new, active MCCs; however, monitoring this progress will be limited to the duration of the subject intervention. MCCs will require longer-term support to achieve sustainable progress. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Develop strong partnerships with local organizations; seek continue program beyond current period of program.

IR 2: Increased capacity in preventative animal health, fodder production, and rangeland management

- **4.5.2-7:** Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training
- **ZDL 5:** Number of community based volunteers receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training as community livestock auxiliaries

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe
IR 2: Increased capacity in preventative animal health, fodder production, and rangeland management

4.5.2-7: Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training

Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013

A. Description

Precise Definition(s): Increase in number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity training as a result of program-supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, technical agricultural sector productivity training is defined as the dissemination of organized information on the management, financial, husbandry skills critical for profitable farming prepared in advance and specifically addressing current obstacles to production. Productivity is defined as the average number of litres of milk production per cow per day over the lactation period of the cow, represented by averaging milk production for a cross-section of animals at a specific period (usually a quarter) in the seasonal milk production cycle.

Unit of Measure: Number of individuals

Disaggregated by: Level 1: --Type of individual:

- Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)
- People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)
- People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)

Level 2: Sex: male, female

Justification/Management Utility: This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' productivity. Since the program aims to impact on management of the dairy animals owned by smallholder farmers, milk yield gives an indication of the program's performance in this area. Sustainable increases in rural incomes can only be achieved through surplus production of subsistence requirements. Average yields for an improved animal can range from 6 to 30 litres per day, dependent upon genetic characteristics in association with differing levels of management and nutrition. The project aims to have an impact upon all the three factors of genetic composition, management and nutrition, the latter through feed conservation and access to supplemental feeds. Milk yield is therefore a critical indicator of performance for the project. Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, which are key to transformational development.

B. Plan for Data Collection

Data Collection Method: data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records.

Data Source(s): Training attendance registers, MCC records

Timing / Frequency of Data Collection: Quarterly

Responsible Organization/Individual(s): Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist.

Location of Data Storage: Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.

C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)

Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Double counting of individuals attending the different training sessions **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Recording the individuals who attend the training based on the household. This also assists in tracking the number of people in a household who have received training on the different project interventions.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe
IR 2: Increased capacity in preventative animal health, fodder production, and rangeland management
ZDL 5: Number of community based volunteers receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training as community livestock auxiliaries

Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013

A. Description

Precise Definition(s): Community Livestock Auxiliaries (CLAs) are trained community volunteers and lead farmers that are trained in training-of-trainers lead systems. Increased number of CLAs trained in rangeland management and/or preventative animal health practices as a result of program-supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, technical agricultural sector productivity training is defined as the dissemination of organized information on the management, financial, husbandry skills critical for profitable farming prepared in advance and specifically addressing current obstacles to production. Productivity in preventative animal health and/or rangeland management is defined as the cumulative practices that reduce animal morbidity (lower growth rate or milk production), reduced animal mortality (death rate), and/or improve rangeland/pasture/fodder management resulting in improved productivity or environment due to improve rangeland organic matter cover and water retention capacity.

Unit of Measure: # of individuals trained/estimated weight gain of animals, estimated litres of milk produced

Disaggregated by: Gender (male/female)

Justification/Management Utility: This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' productivity. Since the program aims to impact on management of dairy livestock owned by smallholder farmers, growth rate, milk yield gives an indication of the program's performance in this area. Sustainable increases in rural incomes can only be achieved through surplus production of subsistence requirements. The project aims to impact upon all the three factors of genetic composition, management and nutrition, the latter through feed conservation and access to supplemental feeds.

B. Plan for Data Collection

Data Collection Method: Data collection tool used by field technician at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmers.

Data Source(s): Small-holder livestock and/or dairy farmers

Timing / Frequency of Data Collection: Quarterly

Responsible Organization/Individual(s): Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist.

Location of Data Storage: Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.

C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)

Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets.

Presentation of Data: Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data.

Review of Data: Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe.

Reporting of Data: Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.

IR 3: Increased use of donkeys for animal traction

- **4.5-4:** Gross Margin per donkey in traction business
- **ZDL6:** Number of households contracted with trained service providers for land clearing, plowing and/or transportation (#)
- **ZDL 7:** Number of individuals receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training in donkey management and animal traction

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 3: Increased use of donkeys for animal traction** **4.5-4 : Gross margin per donkey in traction business**	
Date Established: July 2011	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): The gross margin is defined as the difference between between the total value of revenue from transport of milk and the cost of maintaining the donkey For this project gross margin per animal- donkey in traction business is a measure of net income for that livestock use activity. Input costs included should be those significant cash costs that can be easily ascertained. For donkeys the cash costs include feed, pesticides, hired labor and veterinary services. Capital investments and depreciation do not need to be included in cash costs. Unpaid, family labor does not have to be valued and included in costs. **Unit of Measure:** US$ **Disaggregated by:** None. **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the increase in the gross income at farm level for the targeted farmers. Positive gross margins are an indicator of rural economic opportunity. This program seeks to aid households increase their productivity, management capabilities, and reach. A positive gross margin at farm level can indicate program success.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Baseline survey; sample surveys and data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmer and MCC records. **Data Source(s):** Farmer records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. The baseline value is based on 2010 data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.	
D. Data Quality Issues	
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data.	

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Lack of data accuracy and potentially limited record keeping at farm level; Seasonality of production also has to be considered since production varies due to weather conditions. Home use activities may not be accurately measured.

Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Data collection at least once per month by every participating farm and/or factor the seasonality effect, if required in analysis.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 3: Increased use of donkeys for animal traction** **ZDL6: The number of households contracted with trained service providers for land clearing, plowing and/or transportation**
Date Established: February 2010 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Increase in the number of households contracted with trained service providers for land clearing, plowing and/or transportation as a result of program-supported interventions. Households with donkey will obtain business training designed to develop small contracting business to market services for animal traction. **Unit of Measure:** Number of households (actual and percentage) other than households with donkey to use / contract the donkeys for traction / transport services. **Disaggregated by:** Gender of household head **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress towards improving the household asset base of targeted program beneficiaries. Animal ownership provides key economic opportunities and was previously a strong source of income throughout rural Zimbabwe. Beneficiaries with stronger household resources are more likely to be food secure and have increased incomes.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: and data collection tool used y field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmers **Data Source(s):** Donkey traction households **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **IR 3: Increased use of donkeys for animal traction** **ZDL7: Number of individuals receiving short term agricultural sector productivity training in donkey management and animal traction**
Date Established: July 2011 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description
Precise Definition(s): Increase in number of individuals who have received donkey management training as a result of program-supported interventions. For the purposes of this program, donkey management training is defined as the dissemination of organized information on the management, financial, husbandry skills critical for profitable farming prepared in advance and specifically addressing current obstacles to production. **Unit of Measure:** Number of households **Disaggregated by:** Gender (Male/Female) **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress in improving small scale farmers' management of donkeys. Since the program aims to impact on the use of donkeys in traction and transport, training in good donkey management gives the farmers a good background in how to manage donkeys and donkey business. Sustainable increase in rural incomes can only be achieved through surplus production of subsistence requirements.
B. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: Data collection tool used by field technicians at periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications; review of farmers. **Data Source(s):** Donkey traction households **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.

Cross Cutting Issues: Gender

Gndr 2	**Proportion of female participants in USG assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources**
Gndr 4	**Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social,economic and political opportunities**
USAID ZIM2	**Number of project beneficiaries in relevant leadership positions**

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe
Gndr 2: Proportion of female participants in USG assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources

Date Established: January 2013 **Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013

A. Description

Precise Definition(s):

Proportion of female headed beneficiary households with an improved productive asset base out of the total number of households beneffited. Any physical asset which a household engages directly in the production of food, or income is referred to as a Productive Asset. Productive economic resources include: assets - land, housing, businesses, livestock or financial assets such as savings; credit; wage or self-employment; and income.

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

Unit of Measure: The unit of measure will be a proportion, expressed in the format of X/Y, where X is the number of females from program participants and Y is the total number of male and female participants in the programs.

Disaggregated by: Age

Justification/Management Utility:

The project will undertake activities focused on improving dairy production and marketing in the target areas. Land O' Lakes has a deliberate policy to encourage women's participation in project activities, as women make up the most economically disadvantage group. This measures women's livelihoods and their ability to generate income; improvements will be partially evident in the form productive assets which women acquire. Thus the total value of the productive assets acquired and owned by the household is a key performance indicator in the project.

B. Plan for Data Collection

Data Collection Method: Review of program beneficiary records

Data Source(s): Project records,

Timing/Frequency of Data Collection: Data will be reported in quarterly reports

Responsible Organization/Individual(s): Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist.

Location of Data Storage: Electronic raw data and analyses of survey results including hard copies of questionnaires will be stored by the M&E Specialist in the Land O'Lakes, Harare office.

C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)

Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets.

Presentation of Data: Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** none **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **Gndr 4: Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social, economic and political opportunities**	
Date Established: January 2013	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator will be used to gauge the effectiveness of USG efforts to promote gender equality by measuring changes in target population attitudes about whether men and women should have equal opportunities in social, political, and economic spheres. Any program in any sector that has gender equality or women's empowerment as an objective should report against this indicator. This indicator will be particularly relevant to programs that seek to address or change social norms, especially those around gender. Illustrative programs include those designed to raise broad awareness of human rights, programs that train journalists to report more responsibly on gender issues, education programs designed to change social norms and gender roles, programs designed to increase the political participation of women, youth development and empowerment, or behavior change in the health sector, among others. **Unit of Measure:** The unit of measure is a proportion, expressed in the form of X/Y, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores on the equal opportunity survey have increased over time and the denominator is the total number **Disaggregated by:** Proportions to be disaggregated by sex; Numerator, Denominator **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator measures the program's progress towards improving perceptions by the target population on equal opportunity access by men and women	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Respondents will be selected by simple random sampling at a significance level of 95% with a significance interval of 5 to achieve a reasonably high precision in estimates. Data will also be collected using a data collection tool used by field technicians during periodic field visits (quarterly) and spot check verifications. **Data Source(s)**: Project records, Target households records, baseline and post – intervention surveys **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection**: Data will be collected annually through sample surveys **Responsible Organization/Individual(s)**: Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage**: Electronic raw data and analyses of survey results including hard copies of questionnaires will be stored by the M&E Specialist in the Land O'Lakes, Harare office.	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets.	

Presentation of Data: Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.
D. Data Quality Issues
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe **USAID ZIM 2[2]:Number of project beneficiaries in relevant leadership positions**	
Date Established: January 2013	**Date Last Reviewed:** June 2013
A. Description	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of project participants in relevant leadership positions. A project participant is any individual actively participating in any activity supported by the USG be it in the form of training, technical assistance, credit or input scheme of a USG assisted partner, and USG facilitated market linkages. Relevant leadership positions are defined as any post of leadership (Chairperson or vice; Secretary or vice; Treasurer or vice; committee members) of institutions (for example Milk Collection Centers, Farmers Unions, Irrigation Management Committees etc) that have a direct or indirect influence on the outcome of the Program's objectives **Unit of Measure:** Number **Disaggregated by:** organisation type, sex **Justification/Management Utility:** The indicator will be used to measure the extent of USG supported programs are contributing to women taking leadership positions.	
B. Plan for Data Collection	
Data Collection Method: Data collection tool used business development officers; review of governance records **Data Source(s):** MCC governance records **Timing / Frequency of Data Collection:** Quarterly **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project field technicians/Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist. **Location of Data Storage:** Land O'Lakes/Zimbabwe.	
C. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)	
Data Analysis: Comparative analysis by comparing consecutive periods (quarterly) against targets. **Presentation of Data:** Progress compared with targets in tables and charts and in the narrative of the interpretation of the actual data. **Review of Data:** Land O'Lakes M&E Specialist, COP, Regional Office and HQ review the data before presentation to USAID/Zimbabwe. **Reporting of Data:** Submitted in Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports to USAID/Zimbabwe.	
D. Data Quality Issues	
Initial Data Quality Assessment: Assessment will occur after receiving initial data. **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None. **Action Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A.	

[2] This indicator alignes with GNDR 3 on the FTFMIS Indicator Table.

Attachment C: Baseline Tools

FOCUS GROUP GUIDE INSTRUCTIONS
QUALITATIVE TOOL
Building Livelihoods and Food security in Zimbabwe through Interventions in Livestock and Dairy Value Chains

SUMMARY: **This guide will assist in planning and facilitating a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with a group of 6-8 selected respondents who are farmers in the community**

The goal of a FGD is to obtain insight into the personal views, practices, and experiences of individuals in a group.

LOGISTICS: At minimum, one focus group should be held in each Milk collection centre, goat and poultry community. Each FGD should have between 6-8 farmers who are willing to participate and openly share their thoughts and opinions. Recruit farmers as participants for the FGD from the community participating in the project. The groups where possible should be homogenous, meaning male only or female only.

In order for a FGD to be successful, you must make sure that the participants are all comfortable with each other enough to share their thoughts and opinions. In order to increase the comfort level of the respondents, it is suggested to be aware of the types of divisions between general members of the community and divide the groups accordingly. For example, in some communities a FGD works best with both men and women or a group of people with mixed ages and experience; in others communities, single gender groups or groups where all participants are about the same age are more effective. Use your best judgment to determine what would work the best in your context.

It is anticipated that each FGD would last about 1.5 to 2 hours at a time. Try to schedule the FGD at a time that is most convenient for the participants and does not burden or take them away from their personal responsibilities. If possible, offer food and/or drinks for participants to have before/after the FGD.

FGDs should be held in a safe and accessible central location for all participants. For this survey, the farmers choose the most convenient place for us to meet. The environment should be a neutral one that allows participants to comfortably express themselves without receiving any visual or other reminders of a need for caution. Seat all 6-8 participants in a circle or around a table so they can see each other when they speak.

FGD FACILIATION DIRECTIONS: A lead FGD facilitator (M&E Specialist) will be responsible for leading all the FGDs, including asking the questions, moderating the discussion, and probing for follow-up and clarification on certain points. Another member of the baseline team (Field Facilitator/ Business Development Specialist) will also participate in each FGD as the person designated to listen carefully to the discussion and take notes carefully about what is being said. If possible, the note taker should try to capture any direct quotes that are well-said and capture the opinions/mood/feeling of any point in the FGD.

Note takers should focus on three things:
1. *Observations of the group*. Are people excited or lacking in interest? Do people have a lot to say, or are they reluctant to speak? Are some people dominating the discussion while others are silent? Is the group cohesive or are there great differences of opinion?
2. *Quotes illustrating the varied opinions being presented.* There is much value in capturing the exact words that are used by participants. These words are the actual "data," the essence of the meeting. Try to capture as much of the conversation as possible using the exact words that people speak. These quotes will be included in the final report.
3. *Summary of key discussion points.* As each question is posed, individuals will offer their opinions, but there is often some nonverbal communication that also relays the group's perceptions, feelings, and thoughts on the issue. These reactions should be captured by the note taker and summarized along with the general discussion. Note that the group does not have to reach consensus. The summary can give all sides of the issue.

The list of questions for the FGD, the discussion guide, is provided (see below). Each question will be asked one by one, allowing as many participants to speak on each topic. Please be sure to ask all of the questions, even if the time is limited.

There are two types of problems that you might have when conducting focus group discussions. One problem may be that people can wander off the topic. It is important to keep people focused and to tell them up front that you will interrupt them if the discussion is going too far off topic. The other problem is getting people to discuss issues openly. Sometimes a question will not provoke people to respond adequately to an issue. You may need to let them think for a few minutes, or you may have to rephrase the question or probe to get them to explore some related or underlying issues. It is also important that participants know that their comments will be in confidence and will be reported anonymously.

KEY TIPS: There are a number of key tips or points to remember when facilitating the focus group:

- Allow the individual respondents to talk openly and freely without interrupting – unless they are going off topic; there are no right or wrong answers in a FGD; we need to understand their opinions, perspectives, and experiences, even if they are different from our own.
- All of the questions are important, so keep track of the time so you get a chance to ask all of the questions.
- Be a good listener so that you can identify key issues to explore more in-depth. Be empathetic but remain objective throughout the focus group session.
- Engage all participants in the discussion and encourage those who do not openly share in responses to your questions, by asking them directly, **'What do you think? Has that been your experience? Would you like to add anything else?'**

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE:

Thank you for coming today to this discussion about farming in this community. My name is _____ and I am with Land O'Lakes International Development and I will be guiding the discussion. My colleague is _____, a specialist in _____, and he/she will be taking some notes about our conversation because what you share is very important and we do not want to miss anything you say.

Today we will be talking about your experiences being a farmer in this community. We are also interested in learning about your farm and farming practices. We encourage you to be open and honest in sharing information. Your answers to the questions should not be considered "right" or "wrong". Some of you may have differing opinions or thoughts, so please understand that it is okay to disagree. All of our experiences and stories are equally important. Please be assured that all your responses are confidential and our summary report will make no references to names.

Before we begin, let's go around the room and introduce ourselves. But instead of telling us just your name, why not tell us your name and what types of activities you do at your farm.

Discussion Topic	Key Concepts to be Explored	Guide Questions
The Community's livelihoods	**Natural environment** Land	• Can you tell me about the land that you use for grazing your livestock? (Probe: communal, size, paddocks etc. • How are grazing patterns different in the wet and dry season? • Do people plan their grazing patterns as a community? • What is the general appreciation of good rangeland management by community members? • What support do community leaders give in ensuring effective rangeland practices? • What role does the community play in promoting good rangeland management?
	Water resources	• Can you describe where people find drinking water? What about water for animals? Water for crops or farming?
	Material for animal shelter	• What materials do most households use to construct animal shelters?
	Wildlife	• Can you tell me about any wildlife in the area? • How is the coexistence with the wildlife in the area?

	Livestock diseases in the past 5 years	• Which livestock diseases have affected the area in the past 5 years? • To what extent do farmer groups, women groups or cooperatives support disease prevention and treatment? • What roles do community members play in the administering of veterinary treatment? • To what extent do community members support the development of Community Livestock Auxiliaries or other Village Based Trainers?
	Natural disasters	• What kind of natural disasters have happened in the area in the past 5 years? • How did the community cope with the mentioned disasters? • What do groups of people in the community do to prevent disasters arising from natural causes or livestock diseases?
	Physical Resources which can be accessed by the whole community Road and transport networks	• What kind of a road network exists in the area? • What kind of transport is typically used to move people, agricultural produce, and milk?

	Farming implements	• What kind of farming implements are generally used by the people in the area? (Probe equipment like tractors, ox drawn ploughs, hoes) • What other sources are available for accessing farm implements?
	Dipping services	• Please describe dipping services exist in the area • What type of irrigation equipment is available in the community?
	Irrigation equipment	• Do all farmers irrigate their crops? Please elaborate.
	Income sources Sources of income	• How do the people earn income for their day to day living? • What are the income generating activities that are common in the area?
	Off farm enterprises in the area	• Are there any off farm enterprises in the area?
	Savings and credit facilities	• What type of credit and savings exist in the target communities? • How does the community perceive informal lending schemes (if any) within the community? • Do credit and savings schemes play any role in mitigating effects disasters? • How do credit and savings schemes contribute (if

		at all) to building people's resiliency to disasters?
	Markets Market for produce	• What are the markets that your household sells farm produce to in the area (Probe for milk, goat, poultry, eggs and beef markets) • Are there products produced which are marketed elsewhere or have no market in the area? • Are there any commodities that are marketed as a group by the farmers?
	Sources of agricultural inputs	• Where does your household get agricultural Inputs (seed, fertilizer, herbicides, farm implements, animal feed and drugs)?
	Animal husbandry practices Animal Health Animal nutrition Animal breeding Rangeland management	• Every farmer has different methods and strategies in animal production. Can you describe some of the animal husbandry practices you are using? • What are some other husbandry practices that you have seen in this community? • I'm wondering about what you do to maximize your output. Let's start by discussing the things you might do to maximize the output of your animals. What are some of these things? (Probe for: On production and marketing of Goats, dairy cows- milk , poultry)

	Cropping systems	• What types of crops are normally grown in this area? • Every farmer has different methods and strategies in maximizing crop yield. Can you describe some of the practices you are using to maximize crop yields? • I'm wondering about what you do to maximize your crop yield. Let's start by discussing the things you might do to maximize the yield of your crops. What are some of these things? (Probe for: seed spacing, seed depth, row spacing, fertilizer use, crop protection products, etc.)
	Extension services in the area	• People sometimes go to different places to get advice, instruction or to learn more about farming. What types of places or to which people have you gone for farming advice or instruction? (Probe for: cooperatives, other farmers, agricultural sales staff, extension agents, etc.) • Which of these places or persons works the best for you? Why? Do they each have a different role—do you go to them at different times or use them differently? Why is this person/organization trusted? • You also may have a less formal "help" network, that is, people you know who will help you with your farm, with planting, or with inputs. Can you describe some of these networks? Do you ever provide this type of support for or to other farmers?

		• What could be done to teach farmers about improved farm management practices?
	Community Health Disease prevalence	• Which diseases are most common in the area and why? • How do these diseases affect the different sections of that community (Probe the sections according to young, middle aged, old, the well to do, the poor and the chronically ill)
	Community coping mechanisms	• Are there services available to assist people who suffer from communicable diseases? • Is the community involved in dealing with health issues • What services/ organizations are available to assist people infected or affected by HIV or AIDS? (Probe for services available to assist OVC , and HBC facilities) • Has there been any training on community health in the area? (Probe for types of training, topics, and who was offering the trainings)
Food security	Food sources Types of food consumed in the area	• What are the staple food sources in the area • Where do people usually get their food (Probe for own production, purchased food, barter trade) • Can you tell us about your participation in public food assistance programs? • What does your family do when food is scarce? (Probe for borrowing, batter trade etc.)

Challenges and recommendations	Challenges and possible recommendations	• What do you think are some of the biggest challenges or problems related to farming in this area? (Probe: livestock rearing, field crop production and horticulture. Compare how livestock production fares against the other agricultural activities) • What are farmers doing to address these challenges or problems?

THE ENUMERATOR MUST READ AND INTERPRET THE PASSAGE BELOW TO THE RESPONDENT PRIOR TO THE INTERVIEW

LAND O' LAKES

Building Livelihoods and Food Security in Zimbabwe through Interventions in the Livestock and Dairy Value Chains

Dear Respondent,

You have been selected randomly from the many persons who are targeted for the Land O' Lakes intervention in this area. The purpose for the interview is to help us understand your current situation so that in future we plan the right activities together and measure performance.

Your participation is voluntary, please feel free to ask for clarification; in instances where you feel so strongly that you don't want to answer, you have the right to do that. All the information which you will provide will be treated as strictly confidential and will not be shown to other individuals or organizations. When we compile the report, we will not attribute any statement to you, but treat everything as general.

Before starting the interview you are required to solicit for the following information from the Respondent informally. This is meant to help you interview the targeted farmer. If any of the responses to the questions 1 and 2 is 'No' please do not interview the person.

THANK THE RESPONDENT AND MOVE ON TO THE NEXT FARMER

Pre-interview discussion A MUST!

1. Do you normally/usually reside in this community? _____
2. Are you the head of the Household? _____

Response Status: 1=Complete 2=Refusal 3=Non-Contact 4=Incomplete (*State Reason)* ☐

……

BASELINE SURVEY

HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

July 2010

IDENTIFICATION PARTICULARS

1. Province……
   1=Mashonaland East 2=Matebeleland North 3= Manicaland 99=Other ☐

2. District…… ☐
   1=Seke 2=Bubi 3=Hwange 4= Mutasa 5= Makoni 99=Other

3. Ward …….. ☐

4. Milk Collection Centre (MCC)……. ☐
   0=None 1=Marirangwe 2=Cynara 3=Tsonzo 4 = Sangano

5. Farmers Group (Association)…… ☐
   0=None 1= Marirangwe Dairy farmers
   2=Tsonzo Dairy farmers
   3= Sangano Dairy Farmers

6. Household Number…… ☐☐☐

7. Locality/Village ……. ☐☐

8. Name of Respondent ……..

9. Age and Sex of Respondent……**Age** ☐☐ **Sex** (1=Male, 2=Female) ☐

10. Marital Status of Respondent…… ☐
    1=Monogamously Married 2=Polygamous Married 3=Divorced 4=Widowed 5=Single

11. Name of Head of Household ……..

12. Age and Sex of Head of Household…….**Age** ☐☐ **Sex** (1=Male, 2= Female) ☐

13. Have you ever been a member of an Association or other community organization?

…….

1=Yes, 2=No

ASSIGNMENT RECORD:

E-Code	Name of Enumerator	Signature	Date Interview Completed

S-Code	Supervisor's Name	Signature	Date Checked

1. SECTION 1.0: DEMOGRAPHICS

1.1. How many people are members of this household? **.....** ☐☐

1.2 How many are;

1.2.1 Children under 12 years (born after 1998)		**1.2.2** Adult members (12 complete years and above)	
1.2.1.1. Males	**1.2.1.2.** Females	**1.2.2.1.** Males	**1.2.2.2.** Females
☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐

1.3. How many members of this household have been chronically ill for the last 3 months or have been living a sickly life? ☐☐
.....

1.4. What is the current occupation of the Head of the HH..... ☐
1=Formal 2=Farmer 3=Trader 99.Other…

1.5 How long does your work take per day…….. ☐
1=1-3hr 2=4-6hr 3.=7-8hr 4=More than 8hr

☐☐☐☐☐
1.6 What is the household monthly income? …….

1=USD 0- 100 2= USD101-200 3=USD 201- 300 4=Over USD 300

1.7 What type of house does the HH live in? .....☐☐☐☐

1=Grass thatched 2=Mud house 3=Iron roofed 4= Asbestos/tile roof

1.8 Are you interested in Livestock farming? ☐
.....
1=Yes 2=No

2. SECTION 2.0: NUMBER OF EATING OCCASSIONS, STAPLE SOURCES, DIETARY DIVERSITY AND MONTHS OF INADEQUADE HOUSEHOLD FOOD PROVISIONING

2.1. What was the **main** source of the STAPLE foods for the household for each of the last 12 months?

2.1. MONTHS											
Jun 10	May 10	Apr 10	Mar 10	Feb 10	Jan 10	Dec 09	Nov 09	Oct 09	Sep 09	Aug 09	Jul 09
2.2.1	**2.2.2**	**2.2.3**	**2.2.4**	**2.2.5**	**2.2.6**	**2.2.7**	**2.2.8**	**2.2.9**	**2.2.10**	**2.2.11**	**2.2.12**

Codes:
0=None
1=Own production
2=Purchase with income
3=Food Aid
4=Gift
5=Bartering commodities with food.
6=Purchase with Loan/credit
7=Selling assets to buy food
8=Purchase from remittances
10=Working for food
99=Other (Specify)

2.2. **(Household Dietary Diversity Score - HDDS):** Now I would like to ask you about the types of foods that you or anyone else in the household consumed yesterday and the day before yesterday? ***NOTE:*** *Firstly establish that these days were* ***normal*** *or* ***usual*** *days and not* ***Special*** *days – Refer to the manual for more instructions.*

2.2.1. FOOD CODE	**FOOD TYPES**	**2.2.2.** Did your household **consume** these food types Yesterday	**2.2.3.** Did your household **consumed** these food types the day before Yesterday
		1=Yes, 0=No	1=Yes, 0=No
	Did your household consume any of the following foods (TIME) during the day or at night? ***ENUMERATOR****: READ THE LIST OF FOODS ROW AFTER ROW. PLACE AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE IN THE BOX IF HOUSEHOLD CONSUME THE FOOD IN QUESTION*		
A	Sadza or any other foods made from millet, sorghum or maize?		
B	Any rice, bread, other foods made from wheat?		
C	Any pumpkin, carrots, squash, or sweet potatoes that are yellow or orange inside?		
D	Any Irish potatoes, cassava or any other foods made from roots or tubers?		
E	Any dark, green, leafy vegetables such as covo, cassava leaves, bean leaves, rape, spinach or sweet potato leaves?		
F	Any other vegetables?		
G	Any fruits?		
H	Any beef, pork, lamb, goat, rabbit wild game, chicken, duck, or other birds??		

2.2.1. FOOD CODE	FOOD TYPES	2.2.2. Did your household **consume** these food types Yesterday	2.2.3. Did your household **consumed** these food types the day before Yesterday
I	Any eggs?		
J	Any fresh or dried fish?		
K	Any beans, peas, or lentils?		
L	Any sour milk yogurt, fresh milk or other milk products?		
M	Any oil, fat, or butter?		
N	Any sugar or honey?		
O	Any beverages such as coffee, tea?		

2.3 From the food types in the previous questions, are you currently consuming any foods that you could not have two years ago? ☐

1=Yes
0=No If No Skip to 2.5

2.4. What are these food types that you are currently consuming that you could not have two years ago? (***Enumerator***: use the Food Codes from the column 2.3.1):

2.4.1. ☐ **2.4.2.** ☐ **2.4.3.** ☐

2.5. How many children between 6 – 59 Months does the household have? ☐☐

If Zero Go to 2.9.

2.6. *(Enumerator: Select the child whose birthday is closest to the date of interview)*
Name of selected Child **…….…….. SEX** (1: Male, 2: Female) ☐

AGE IN MONTHS ☐☐

2.7 **(Individual Dietary Diversity Score - IDDS):** Now I would like to ask you about the types of foods that the above selected child consumed yesterday and the day before yesterday? ***NOTE:*** *Firstly establish that these days were* ***normal*** *or* ***usual*** *days and not* ***special*** *days – Refer to the manual for more instructions.*

2.7.1. FOOD CODE	FOOD TYPES	2.7.2. Did children **consume** these Food Types Yesterday	2.7.3. Did children **consume** these Food Types the day before Yesterday
		1=Yes, 0=No	1=Yes, 0=No
	Did (CHILD) consume any of the following foods (TIME) during the day or at night? ***ENUMERATOR****: READ THE LIST OF FOODS ROW AFTER ROW. PLACE AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE IN THE BOX IF HOUSEHOLD CONSUME THE FOOD IN QUESTION*		
A	Any porridge or gruel?		

2.7.1. FOOD CODE	FOOD TYPES	2.7.2. Did children **consume** these Food Types Yesterday	2.7.3. Did children **consume** these Food Types the day before Yesterday
		1=Yes, 0=No	1=Yes, 0=No
B	Any [BRAND NAME OF COMMERCIALLY FORTIFIED BABY FOOD, E.G., Cerelac]?		
C	Sadza or any other foods made from millet, sorghum or maize?		
D	Any sadza, bread, rice, noodles, biscuits, cookies, or any other foods made from grains?[3]		
E	Any Irish potatoes, white yams, manioc, cassava, or any other foods made from roots?		
F	Any pumpkin, carrots, squash, or sweet potatoes that are yellow or orange inside? [4]		
G	Any dark green leafy vegetables? [5]		
H	Any ripe mangoes, papayas (or other local vitamin A-rich fruits)?		
I	Any other fruits or vegetables?		
J	Any liver, kidney, heart or other organ meats?		
K	Any beef, pork, lamb, goat, rabbit [or insert wild game meat such as antelope or deer]?		
L	Any chicken, duck, or other birds?		
M	Any eggs?		
N	Any fresh or dried fish or shellfish?		
O	Any foods made from beans, peas, or lentils?		
P	Any nuts?		
Q	Any cheese or yogurt?		
R	Any food made with other oil, fat, or butter?		
S	Any other solid or semi-solid food?		
T	Any other milk such as tinned, powdered, fresh animal milk?		

2.8. **(Month of Inadequate Household Food Provisioning – MIHFP)** Now I would like to ask you about your household's FOOD supply during different months of the year. When responding to these questions, please think back over the last 12 months. (*FOOD supply refers to food that may have been produced, purchased, gifted etc…)*

	QUESTIONS AND FILTERS	CODINGS	SKIP
1.	In the past 12 months, were there months in which you did not have enough FOOD to meet your family's needs? 1=Yes 0=N0	.....|___|	**IF NO GO TO 3.1**
2.	DO NOT READ THE LIST OF MONTHS. PLACE A ONE IN THE BOX IF THE RESPONDENT IDENTIFIES THAT MONTH AS ONE IN WHICH THE HOUSEHOLD DID NOT HAVE ENOUGH FOOD TO MEET THEIR NEEDS.		

[3] Grains include millet, sorghum, maize, rice, wheat, or other local grains. Start with local foods, e.g. sadza, then follow with bread, noodles, etc.

[4] Items in this category should be modified to include only vitamin A-rich tubers or vitamin A-rich red, orange, or yellow vegetables that are consumed in the country.

[5] These include cassava leaves, bean leaves, kale, spinach, pepper leaves, taro leaves, amaranth leaves, or other dark green leafy vegetables.

	If yes, which were the months (in the past 12 months) in which you did not have enough FOOD to meet your family's needs?		
A	June 2010	**A**……..|___|	
B	May 2010	**B**……..|___|	
C	April 2010	**C**……..|___|	
D	March 2010	**D**……..|___|	
E	February 2010	**E**……..|___|	
F	January 2010	**F**……..|___|	
G	December 2009	**G**……|___|	
H	November 2009	**H**……|___|	
I	October 2009	**I**……...|___|	
J	September 2009	**J**……..…|___|	
K	August 2009	**K**……..…|___|	
L	July 2009	**L**……..…|___|	

SECTION 3.0: AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION

3.1 Are you currently involved in crop production? *(Yes =1, No =0)* ☐

(If answer is 'Yes' please fill in the Table below, if 'No' skip to question 4.0)

	2009/2010 Agriculture season		
Type of crop	**3.1.1 Production (Kg)/bags**	**3.1.2 If sold already, Total Value (USD)**	**3.1.3 If NOT sold Total Value if sold today (USD)**
Maize			
Sorghum			
Millet			
Tubers (Irish potato, Sweet potato & cassava)			
Spices (green/red pepper, chili, paprika, etc.)			
Green vegetables (rape, green beans, cabbage, etc.)			
Tomato			
Onion			
Unshelled nuts (groundnuts, bambara nuts)			
Shelled nuts (groundnuts, bambara nuts)			
Peas (cow peas, pigeon peas)			
Rice			
Pumpkins			
Water melon			
Squash			
Tobacco			
Sunflower			
Soya bean			
Napier Fodder			
Banner Grass			
Other, specify:			

3.2 SEED STORED

	Code FOR ANSWER	IF NO SKIP TO
3.2.1 Do you have any seed in storage (Yes =1 No = 0)		4.0
3.2.2. Type of seed stored Traditional only =1, Recycled only = 2 Commercial only = 3, Traditional & Commercial = 4		

SECTION 4.0: LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

4.1LIVESTOCK RAISED

4.1.1. Do you own any livestock? *(Yes =1, No =0)* ☐

(If answer is 'Yes' please fill in the Table below, if 'No' skip to question 4.3)

4.1.2

4.1.2a Type of livestock & other productive animals	4.1.2b Number owned	4.1.2c Type of breed (1= Pure, 2=Cross, 3= Traditional) (Multiple answers)			4.1.2d Total Value if sold today (USD)	4.1.2e Total Value sold in the past 6 months USD	4.1.2f Total cost of transport, labor, levies, permits, slaughter fees, herding while awaiting slaughter incurred during selling in the last 6 months (USD)
Goats							
Dairy Cattle							
Beef Cattle							
Sheep							
Donkeys							
Poultry- Broilers							
Layers							
Indigenous chickens							
Dogs							
Others1, specify:							

4.2 Dairy (Skip If 4.1.2a Dairy cattle = 0)

4.2.1 What is the method of grazing the dairy animal…… ☐☐ ……..
1=Open range 2=Paddock grazing 3=Zero grazing
99=Other

4.2.2 What type of grass do you mainly feed the cattle on? ..... ☐☐ .....

1=Natural pasture 2=Cultivated pasture 3=Fodder
4=Supplements 99=Other

4.2.3 How many times are the cattle fed per day…… ☐☐
1=Once 2=2 times 3=3 times 4=More the 3 times

4.2.4 How many times have your cattle (if any) been vaccinated or treated for any disease or received any known and approved veterinary intervention in the last 12 months?

4.2.4a Veterinary intervention	Number of times the animals benefitted		
	4.2.4 .b By the Department of Agriculture	4.2.4 c By other veterinarians	4.2.4 .d By yourself
Vaccinations			
Dipping			
De-worming			

4.2.5 How many of your cattle (if any) been treated for any disease or received any known and approved veterinary intervention in the last 12 months?

4.2.5a Veterinary intervention	Number of animals which benefited		
	4.2.5 .b By the Department of Agriculture	4.2.5 c By other veterinarians	4.2.5 .d By yourself
Treatment for disease			
Artificial insemination			
De-worming			
De-horning			
Castration			
Any other veterinary intervention			

4.2.6 LIVESTOCK SUPPORT & OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

4.2.6a Structure	4.2.6.b Number/Kg owned
Livestock drinking trough (#)	
Cattle kraal (#)	
Milking parlor	
Livestock feeding trough (#)	
Feeding paddocks (#)	
Livestock sheds (#)	
Barns (#)	
Stock feed stored (Kg)	
Sprayer (for ticks and others)	
Other, specify:	

4.2.7 ACCESS TO WATER, FEED & DIPPING SERVICES

	4.2.7a Immediately accessible =1	4.2.7 b Takes a few hours (1 to 2 hours) = 2	4.2.7c Takes several hours (more than 2 hours) =3	4.2.7d Not accessible in this community =4
4.2.7.1. How do you rate access to water for livestock?				
4.2.7.2. How do you rate access to pasture for livestock?				
4.2.7.3 How do you rate your access to dipping services?				

4.3 Goats Skip If 4.1.2a Goats = 0)

4.3.1 What is the method of grazing the goats…… ☐☐
1=Open range 2=Paddock grazing 3=Zero grazing
99=Other

4.3.2What type of grass do you mainly feed the goats on? ..... ☐☐

1=Natural pasture 2=Cultivated pasture 3=Fodder
4=Supplements 99=Other

4.3.3 How many hours are the Goats fed per day…… ☐☐
1= 1 - 2 hours 2= 3- 4 Hours 3= 5- 6 Hours 4=7-8 hours 5 = More than 8 hours

4.3.4 How many times have your goats (if any) been vaccinated or treated for any disease or received any known and approved veterinary intervention in the last 12 months?

4. 3.4a Veterinary intervention	Number of times the animals benefitted		
	4. 3.4 .b By the Department of Agriculture	4. 3.4c By other veterinarians	4. 3.4.d By yourself
Vaccinations			
Dipping			
De-worming			

4.3.5 How many of your goats (if any) been treated for any disease or received any known and approved veterinary intervention in the last 12 months?

4.3.5a Veterinary intervention	Number of animals which benefited		
	4.3.5 .b By the Department of Agriculture	4.3.5 c By other veterinarians	4.3.5.d By yourself
Treatment for disease			
Artificial insemination			
De-worming			
De-horning			
Castration			
Any other veterinary intervention			

4.4 Poultry (Skip If 4.1.2a Poultry = 0)

4.4.1 What is the method of feeding the poultry…… ☐☐
1=Open range 2=Prepared feed

4.4.2 If 4.4.1 =1How many hours are the poultry fed per day? | | |

1= 1 - 2 hours 2= 3- 4 Hours 3= 5- 6 Hours 4=7-8 hours 5 = More than 8 hours

SECTION 5.0: LABOUR ACTIVITIES for Livestock

5.1 5.1.1 Now I would like to find out about labour for your Livestock rearing activities during the last 6 months: (***Enumerator:*** *Note that if the respondent says YES in 4.1.1.a, continue with the rest of the questions, otherwise go to the next labour activity)*

5.1.1.a. Labour Activity		**5.1.1.b.** Did the household use any labour for…. 1=Yes 0=No	**5.1.1.c.** Labour type	**5.1.1.d.** Number of Males who provided labour for this activity	**5.1.1.e.** Number of female who provided labour for this activity	**5.1.1f** Cash payment/Value of in kind payment for hired labor in the past 6 months
1=Construction of livestock shelter	Parlous/Kraals					
	Goat shelter					
	Fowl runs					
2=Milking						
3=Forage production	Dairy					
	Goats					
4=Feed Preparation	Dairy					
	Goats					
	Poultry					
5=Calf rearing						
Kid rearing						
6=Veterinary Services	Dairy cows					
	Goats					
	Poultry					
7=Transportation/ Marketing	Dairy cows					
	Goats					
	Poultry					

Codes for 5.1.1.c
1=Household labour/members
2=Hired labour for in kind payment
3=Hired labour for cash payment
4= Permanent workers
99=Other (Specify)

5.1.2 How much did you pay the permanent workers in total in the last 6 months? …

SECTION 6.0: HOUSEHOLD INCOME & ACCESS TO SAVINGS AND CREDIT

6.1. HOUSEHOLD INCOME	
Source of income	**Total income (USD) from current season (October 2009 to May 2010)**
All field crops sold	
All garden crops & citrus fruits sold	
Livestock sold	
Milk and other dairy products	
Labor/Employment	
Remittances	
Small Business/Trade	
Other sources of income (gifts, piece works, trading in non agriculture, etc)	
6.2. ACCESS TO CREDIT AND SAVINGS	
I have no access to credit and do not save = 1 I have access to savings only = 2 I have access to credit only = 3 I have access to both credit and savings = 4	INSERT CODE

6.3 DAIRY PRODUCTION, SALES AND CONSUMPTION (Answer if 4.1.2- Dairy Cattle=yes)

6.3.1 Please tell me more about the **COWS** your household is currently raising and their milk production during the Dry season (June 2009 – Nov 2009) and Rainy season (Dec 2009 – Mar 2010).

6.3.1. Dairy animal Type	**6.3.2 Total number of cows**	**6.3.3. Number of lactating cows during dry season**	**6.3.4. Average liters per day during dry season**	**6.3.5. Number of lactating cows during wet season**	**6.3.6 Average liters per day during wet season**	**6.3.7. 3 Biggest problems in raising animals *(See codes below)***
1)Traditional Breed						
2) Cross Breed						
3) Jersey						
4)Other						
5)Other						
6)Other						

Codes for 6.3.7.
0=None
1=Animal Diseases
2=Poor nutrition and Pasture Management
3=Limited Grazing Land
8=Poor infrastructure (roads, water supply, electricity)
9=Unavailable supporting services (veterinarian, A.I.)
10=Unavailable finance (operating capital)
11=High input costs (feed, medicines, equipment, other)
12=High labor costs

4=Water access
5=Poor Milk production techniques
6=Lack of market for Milk
7=Low milk price
13=Unavailable land for feed production
14=Unavailable information on markets
15=Unavailable information on production issues
99= Other

6.4 How many days in a month did you normally produce milk during the Dry season (Jun 2009 – Nov 2009) and Wet season (Dec 2009 – Mar 2010).

6**.4.1. Period**	6**.4.2. Average Number of days of milking per month**
1) Dry season (Jun-Nov)	
2) Wet season (Dec-Mar)	

6.5. How much money did you spend for commercial cows feed during the Dry season (Jun 2009– Nov 2009) and Wet season (Dec 2009 – Mar 2010).

6**.5.1. Period**	6**.5.2. Amount of money spent on cattle (USD)**
1) Dry season (Jun-Nov)	
2) Rainy season (Dec-Mar)	

6.6. How much milk has your household currently produced during the last 7 days?

6.6.1. Date	**6.6.2. Number of cows milked**	**6.6.3. Litres produced**	**6.6.4. Liters sold to MCC**	**6.6.5. Litres sold within village/locality**
1)				
2)				
3)				
4)				
5)				
6)				
7)				

6.7. From 6.6. (Litres unsold), what did you do with the unsold milk?

6.7.1. Usage	**6.7.2. 1=Yes ; 0=No**	**6.7.3. Litres per day**
1) Household consumption		
2) Used to feed calves		
3) Given to other households		
99) Other-Specify		

6.8 How do the children consume the milk in the household? | | |

0=Never consume
1=As a beverage
2=Other part of a meal (eg in porridge)
3=Both
99=Other (Specify)

6.9. How many litres did the household deliver to the MCC and how much money was received for the delivered milk at the last monthly payment from the MCC?

6.9.1. Last month of delivery		6.9.2. Liters sold	6.9.3. Amount(USD)
Month Name	6.9.1.Code		

6.10 How much money did you make in the month of June 2010 from the sale of the milk produced by the household?

6.10.1. Use of milk	6.10.2. Liters disposed	6.10.3. USD
1) Sales within village/locality		
2) Barter		

6.11. What are the 3 most important things you use your **dairy income** on?

6.11.1= ☐☐
6.11.2= ☐☐
6.11.3= ☐☐

CODES:
1=Purchase of staple food
2=Purchase of non staple foods
3=Purchase of household goods (e.g. radios, TVs, e.t.c.)
4=Education/school fees
5=Marriage
6=Savings/Banking
7=Purchase of clothing
8=Travel
9=Agricultural Inputs
10=Medicines for animals
11=Farm implements
12=Groceries (e.g. soap, colget, sugar, e.t.c)
99=Other Specify

6.12. Who decides how to use the proceeds from the milk sales? ……

1= Male Head of Household
2= Female Head of Household
3= Both male and female
99= Other

SECTION 7.0: EXTENSION SERVICES

7.1. I would like to ask you about the extension services that you or any other member of your household have received

7.1.1. Service	7.1.2. During the last 12months, did someone in the HH receive technical assistance on . . . ? 1=Yes 0=No	7.1.3. Have someone in the HH used/ applied this technical assistance? 1=Yes 0=No	7.1.4. Do you and your family members think the technical assistance is useful? 1=Yes 0=No	7.1.5Main source of this technical assistance 1=AREX extension officers 2=NGO (specify) 3=Private (e.g. vets) 4= Veterinary services 99=Other (specify)
1) Record Keeping				
2) Animal Nutrition				
3) Animal Health				
4) Dairy Management				
5) Calf Rearing				
6) Milk Handling and Hygiene				
7) Dairying as a business				
8) Feed establishment				
9) Feed Conservation				
10) Artificial Insemination				
11) Stocking				
12) Market Linkages (Selling Milk to MCC)				

If 7.1.4 has at least a YES response, then:

7.2. How have the Technical Assistance been useful in improving your dairy income? (Could you provide an example?)

1……

2……

3……

7.3. Is there anything else you want to say about the extension services provided?

……

……

……

END OF INTERVIEW
THANK THE RESPONDENT