



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Food for Peace Emergency M&E Policy and Guidance Launch

February 20, 2019

Welcome and overview

- Historical background
 - 2017 APS
 - Food consumption score added
 - Review of market-based emergency program
 - Recommended minimum budget for M&E
 - 2019 APS
 - Born out of consultation process with partners
 - Nutrition indicators incorporated
 - More rigorous M&E requirements

Introduction to Policy and Guidance

- Background
 - Over 80% of FFP's emergency funding goes to protracted emergencies – FFP sees this as an opportunity to increase the rigor of M&E for EFSPs
- Purpose of new P&G
 - Encourage efficient and effective response
 - Ensure accountability to stakeholders (participants, Congress, implementing partners)
 - Document approaches partners are using
 - Enable learning and adaptive management
 - Standardize approach for FFP's diverse portfolio
 - Encourage partners to budget appropriately for M&E
 - Help build capacity
- Process for developing P&G
 - Series of consultations with IPs
 - FFP M&E team developed detailed outline and drafted each chapter one by one
 - Each chapter was reviewed by FFP global M&E team, country backstop officers (CBOs), regional advisors, market advisors, and OFDA M&E advisors
 - Internal clearance process – review by policy advisors, Division Chief, and FFP Deputy Director
 - Draft released through the Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) for one-month comment period – received 85 comments from partners, 175 comments from USAID staff
 - FFP held internal meetings to prioritize the feedback and made substantial revisions based on comments
 - FFP/IDEAL hosted global M&E partners meeting in Sept. 2019, during which more feedback was received and taken into consideration
- Next steps

- FFP continues to welcome feedback for future updates to the Policy and Guidance
- IDEAL has helped to start a humanitarian M&E (HuMEL) learning network, which met for the first time on Feb. 19. Contact IDEAL (Lloyd Banwart, lloyd@tangointernational.com) for more information.

Panel discussion with FFP M&E staff

Moderator: Lloyd Banwart, IDEAL

Panelists: Arif Rashid, Chung Lai, Adam Trowbridge, FFP

- How does FFP expect this guidance to evolve or change with the imminent merger?
 - There will be new guidance released, but it is not expected to differ substantially from the current guidance, which OFDA contributed to. However, the M&E team is always trying to improve their guidance, so the document will evolve based on feedback.
- How rigid is Policy and Guidance?
 - FFP never wants to mandate something that doesn't make sense in partners' contexts. Please talk to your AOR and M&E Advisor if you feel there is something recommended in the Policy and Guidance that is not appropriate or burdensome in your context.
- Does FFP plan on developing tools and templates for monitoring?
 - There is a template available for the LogFrame and indicator table, though FFP does not require its partners to use these templates. FFP is always looking for feedback from partners about what tools and templates will be helpful, and in many cases can develop these as requested by partners.
- Per the Policy and Guidance, qualitative data should be collected as part of final evaluation. Does FFP see a role for qualitative data at the design phase or earlier in implementation?
 - FFP encourages mixed methods where possible, but did not make this a requirement given contextual differences and the challenges this may cause (for example, in emergency activities, baselines are frequently done with registration – collecting qualitative data might be difficult at this time).
- Is the Policy and Guidance relevant for multi-year emergency activities?
 - This Policy and Guidance is for single year or 18-month emergency activities. For multi-year emergency activities, some guidance is provided in the multi-year emergency APS, but APS guidance alone will likely be inadequate. This is a pilot phase, so please reach out to your M&E Advisor for guidance in your context.
 - FFP sees multi-year emergency programs as distinct from shorter emergency activities. Interventions for multi-year programs are longer, so there may be a need to include additional indicators to capture outcomes like resilience; these are required if applicable. FFP is still in its early stages of thinking about M&E guidance for multi-year emergency programs and is interested in hearing from partners.
- How does FFP anticipate using data submitted by IPs?
 - As a community, we know we're not optimizing use of data we're collecting. FFP developed a new database for ARR submission (the *Partner Reporting Tool (PRT)*), which has already proved to be an improvement from FFP MIS. FFP is developing a platform where data can be analyzed easily by every CBO.
- What indicators should be used for complementary activities?
 - FFP has a limited selection of core indicators. If partners are proposing complementary activities not covered in FFP's indicators, partners should consider appropriate OFDA indicators or select from other indicator lists referenced in the Policy and Guidance.
- What guidance should be used for jointly-funded (FFP/OFDA) activities?

- If FFP is leading the award with OFDA contributing, use FFP guidance (and vice versa). For joint awards, both technical teams will review the application and may provide suggestions or request the inclusion of certain indicators.
- The Policy and Guidance states that the primary objective of third-party monitoring is verification. What is FFP's view on using third-party monitoring for other responsibilities?
 - From a risk management standpoint, participant verification is important. Depending on their capacity (and the capacity and bandwidth of your own M&E staff), those responsible for third-party monitoring may also be involved in baselines, routine performance monitoring, data collection (focus groups, observations) to inform programmatic decision-making.
- What does FFP recommend if conducting an evaluation is not feasible or unlikely to be informative?
 - If an evaluation is not feasible given the context, reach out to your AOR who will loop in the M&E Advisor for discussion.
- Will there be additional budget allocations from FFP to commission an independent external evaluation?
 - FFP is interested in external evaluations but recognizes it is not practical to do this for every emergency award. FFP would like to be strategic about how external evaluations are funded and is exploring the best way to resource for these – FFP will be reaching out to partners for feedback. When external evaluations will be conducted, partners must be part of the evaluation design and FFP should review the proposed budget.
- How does the FFP M&E team work with AORs to make decisions about approvals, adapting programs, using data, etc.?
 - Part of the challenge is that there are so many emergency activities and limited M&E Advisors. If a partner has concerns, please request a meeting with your AOR and your FFP M&E Advisor to ensure M&E considerations are part of discussion.
- Will there be opportunity for partners to provide feedback on the new Bureau for Humanitarian Affairs guidance?
 - There will be consultation about future guidance, likely through the FACG review process.
- Is there a budget allocation specified for M&E?
 - The Policy and Guidance recommends that approximately 3% of the budget should be devoted to M&E, but recognizes that this will vary because activities and contexts are different. FFP asks for a budget summary of M&E items in the M&E Plan so the M&E team can review and ensure that it is sufficient.
- Are partners required to follow new Policy and Guidance for ongoing emergency activity's cost extension applications?
 - If the original award was made or extended under the FY2019 or FY2020 APS, then the Policy and Guidance is applicable. FFP does not want partners to view the Policy and Guidance as a burdensome requirement; the intent of the Policy and Guidance is to help partners improve M&E practices. Once partners are applying under BHA guidance, there will be additional guidance that should be used.
- Will the guidance be translated?
 - The FFP team always thinks about translation. There are internal challenges, but we take that comment seriously and will explore the possibility.