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I. Introduction
This indicator compendium has been designed to support WV Field Offices to design and monitor quality CVP projects. Specifically, the compendium will enable officers responsible for designing, implementing and monitoring cash and voucher programming to 1) select appropriate indicators for baseline and monitoring and 2) ensure CVP interventions have the intended impact on individuals, families and communities, and if so, through which pathways. It provides a comprehensive – but non-exhaustive- list of outcome and output level indicators relevant to cash and voucher programming.

Cash and voucher programming (CVP) is not a standalone sector, but rather it is a modality used to meet objectives and improve outcomes related to a range of sectors, including basic needs, livelihoods, food security, nutrition, shelter, WASH, etc. As such, monitoring of CVP should focus on program objectives and results, in addition to output and process aspects like delivery mechanisms, modality and distributions.

The compendium also includes brief guidance on:
- What each indicator means;
- How to measure the indicator (including questions to include in monitoring tools);
- How to analyze and report collected data;
- Relevant levels of disaggregation;
- Where to find relevant guidance materials for additional information.

II. Guide to the Indicators
There are two main categories of indicators in this document:

a. Outcome Indicators: Outcome indicators (also called results indicators) aim to help us understand if and how target populations have changed. In this document, these are presented as either multi-sectoral or sector-specific indicators.

Importantly, this compendium features the MPCA Outcome Indicators (denoted with a *) developed by the Grand Bargain (GB) Cash Work Stream and released in July 2019. The list, which includes a set of cross-cutting indicators and sectoral indicators, was designed in line with the GB commitment to harmonize and simplify reporting requirements. World Vision has committed to testing these indicators whenever possible and relevant. This will enable WV to provide feedback to the GB Cash Work Stream to continually strengthen our collective ability to generate quality evidence and reporting about CVP. These indicators are currently under review by the global sector leads and a GB cash work stream reference group; this document will be updated once the revised list of harmonized indicators is available.

It should also be noted that the sector-specific outcome indicators provided are intended as examples of standard indicators that are often used and included in donor guidelines. The selection of any sector-specific indicator should be directly linked to the project’s objectives and the expected use of cash/voucher and defined in line with sector or cluster guidance. As such, the list is non-exhaustive but rather provides examples of possible indicators that could be
relevant depending on the project objective, complementary activities, and integration with wider programming.

b. **Output/Process Indicators**: Output indicators help us to monitor the quantity of assistance provided, to whom, and how that assistance is utilized. Process-oriented output indicators help us assess the efficiency and quality of the processes used to deliver that assistance (i.e. how assistance has been provided) and track whether the cash or vouchers are being distributed as planned, utilized and reaching the right people (e.g. registration, verification, transfers via the delivery mechanism).

   a. **Post payment and utilization indicators**: These indicators focus on tracking the outputs and processes of CVP activities to help ensure the right people received assistance at the right time and are able to use the provided assistance.
   b. **Access indicators**:
   c. **Accountability indicators**: These indicators help us monitor effectiveness of engagement with communities, including how communities where we work perceive our programming in terms of respecting their needs, concerns, capacities and preferences.
   d. **Do No Harm (DNH) indicators**: These indicators focus specifically on assessing how CVP programming may be affecting risks within communities and identifying potential problems or negative effects (e.g. CVP reinforcing gender stereotypes or exacerbating household tensions).
   e. **Market indicators**: These indicators focus on market dynamics and how these may/may not affect the implementation, outputs and results of CVP.

## III. Notes on Methodology

Although the methodology for measuring the indicators in this compendium will differ and depends on a number of factors in each field office, this section offers some general guidance on methodology.

- For baselines and assessments, it may not be possible to use a representative sample depending on the context and resource availability. Make sure to document the sampling approach used and to be clear about whether or not results can be considered indicative of the surveyed area or if they are statistically representative.
- For ongoing project monitoring, the sampling frame is typically the list of project participants or beneficiaries who are receiving assistance. You should select a representative sample of this population using probability sampling (e.g. random sampling, stratified sampling, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Methodology and Sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline/Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modality</strong>: Survey administered in-person or via phone calls. Use mobile data collection tools whenever possible to reduce the risk of human error in recording. <strong>Location</strong>: Baselines should be conducted in the locations where the project/programme will be present to provide a better understanding of the situation prior to implementation. <strong>Sample size¹ and selection</strong>: Depending on the operational constraints, aim for a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level. If it is not possible to survey that number of respondents, then select as many HH as you can. FOs may opt for simple random sampling, cluster sampling or stratified sampling depending on the resources and time available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Document the sampling frame for any data collection and specifically, whether you are sampling from an existing beneficiary list or an entire population. This is important because it will have significant implications on whether or not data is representative and should be highlighted in any resulting findings/reports.
Post Distribution Monitoring

**Modality:** Survey administered in-person or via phone calls.

**Sample size and selection:** The sample population should include all direct beneficiaries of cash/voucher programming, and sample size will depend on operational capacity and should be determined accordingly. As general guidance, aim for 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level. Using the distribution list you can use simple random sampling\(^2\) to select respondents.

**Frequency:** This will depend on the frequency of distributions. Surveys should be conducted within 2-4 weeks of assistance provision for optimum recall period.

Onsite Monitoring

**Modality:** In-person or via phone calls when not otherwise possible.

**Location selection:** Distribution points may be selected randomly or purposively depending on resource availability.

**Sample size and selection:** Randomly pick at least 10% of project participants per distribution point to enable disaggregation across sites. Aim for a balance between male and female respondents as much as possible.

**Frequency:** Monthly or more frequently depending on the distribution plan.

---

For more detailed methodology support, please contact the Cash MEAL Advisor, Marieta Fitzcharles (Marieta.fitzcharles@wvi.org).

**Some final notes:**

- This compendium is meant as a resource for field offices, but there is no requirement to use any of the indicators.
- As such, it is not expected that any one project or programme will adopt all of the indicators included here. The decision to select indicators should be informed by the project objective(s), the logical framework/project model, and the expected outcomes. Other factors that may impact indicator selection include the size of the team available, funding availability, location(s) of communities, and accessibility to project participants and areas of intervention.
- MEAL colleagues and sector/technical leads should be engaged in discussions around which indicators make sense to use, how and when to collect relevant data, the analysis of incoming data, and using data to inform both ongoing and new project implementation.
- Most of the data necessary to track indicators included in this compendium may be collected through baseline and/or evaluation surveys, assessments or onsite monitoring, all of which require funding (e.g. staffing/data collection teams, transportation to/from field sites, relevant equipment, etc.). As such, adequate budget should be included during proposal development and budgeting processes. It should be clear how any project specific measurement processes link to project specific evaluations and overall programme level processes.
- Measuring these indicators requires capacity/competencies and as such field offices need to work with DM CVP advisors and equip themselves with the necessary skill sets and tools.

---

\(^2\) Simple random sampling gives every member of the target population (in this case the distribution list) an equal chance of being chosen to participate in the survey. You can use simple random sampling by numbering the population/distribution list and using a random number generator or lottery method to select the relevant number of participants.
IV. Outcome Indicators

MULTI-SECTOR

Multi-sector outcomes are relevant for programming approaches that seek to address needs and priorities across more than one sector, like multi-purpose cash assistance. The indicators listed under ‘multi-sector’ below can be used to monitor programme results as experienced by project participants in terms of their access to basic needs, use of coping strategies, and their decision-making roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>MULTI-SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of households who report being able to meet the basic needs of their households according to their priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>C5G.026224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**

As per the CaLP Glossary, the concept of basic needs refers to the essential goods, utilities, services or resources required on a regular or seasonal basis by households for ensuring long term survival AND minimum living standards, without resorting to negative coping mechanisms or compromising their health, dignity and essential livelihood assets. Depending on the local context, this may be aligned with the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB).

**WHAT IT MEASURES**

This indicator assesses whether the household income, including the assistance, is sufficient to meet basic needs (as project participants define the term) before and after receiving cash/voucher assistance. Please note that the indicator does not attempt to measure the exact contributions of any cash/vouchers provided, but rather focuses on the overall ability of a household to meet their basic needs.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days
You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Measurement may be done through self-reporting from multipurpose cash beneficiaries, using a representative sample. The enumerator may use locally-validated wording. The question should not specifically mention the cash transfer, nor should the enumerator rigidly define ‘basic needs.’ If necessary, the enumerator can prompt by providing examples, such as food, water, and shelter.

Q1. **Is your household able to meet all/most/some/or none of your household’s basic needs as you define them?**

(Note to enumerator: do not define basic needs, but if a respondent needs prompting, use examples like food, water, shelter costs, clothes, electricity. These examples should be based on local context and may be adjusted/changed.)

- All
- Most
- Some
- None
- Don’t wish to respond

Q2. **(optional for additional info) If is ‘some’, which basic needs is your household unable to afford?** (revise list based on local context)

- Basic food needs
- Special food needs of your children 0-23 months (if relevant)
- Special food needs of pregnant and lactating women (if relevant)
- Water needs

---


- Hygiene needs
- Shelter/housing needs
- Healthcare needs of your households
- Special healthcare needs of your children 0-23 months (if relevant)
- Special healthcare needs of pregnant and lactating women (if relevant)
- Transportation needs
- Communication needs
- Education needs for children
- Clothing needs
- Utilities
- Other, specify:

Q3. (optional for additional info) For each of the unmet needs above: Why are you unable to fully meet this need?
- Financial reasons
- Not available in the market (goods/commodities only)
- Other, specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTED TOOL(S)</th>
<th>Baseline/Evaluation surveys</th>
<th>Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGGRGATE BY</td>
<td>Disaggregate across the response options (&quot;all&quot;, &quot;most&quot;). For BHA, further disaggregation by &quot;some&quot;, &quot;none&quot;, &quot;don’t know&quot; is also required) Sex &amp; Age of Head of Household (HoHH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES ON ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Calculate the total number of HH respondents for each answer (&quot;all&quot;, &quot;most&quot;, &quot;some&quot;, &quot;none&quot;, &quot;don’t know&quot;), and divide each by the total number of respondents. This will give you the percentage for each category. Report against this indicator with the % for each response as relevant (e.g. &quot;all&quot; and &quot;most&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANT DONOR LINKS</td>
<td>Required for BHA for multipurpose cash assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDANCE &amp; OTHER INFO</td>
<td>The phrasing of the indicator may be changed in order to reflect the minimum income standard relevant in your context, e.g. Poverty Line, Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket (SMEB), etc. E.g. Is your household able to buy all/most/some/or none of the items in the SMEB?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTOR(S) | MULTI-SECTOR
INDICATOR* | % of households by Livelihoods Coping Strategies (LCS) phase (Neutral, Stress, Crisis, Emergency)
HORIZON | C4D.024936

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
Proportion of households who are assessed at each level using the Livelihoods Coping Strategies. The Livelihood Coping Strategies (LCS) is a global WFP index, comprised of ten coping strategies.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
Livelihood coping strategies is an index to measure the extent of coping strategies households use as a response to lack of food or money to purchase food. It includes longer term behaviours such as asset depletion, spending savings, borrowing/going into debt and accepting exploitative work within a 30-day period. These strategies are divided into three categories:
- Stress strategies indicate a reduced ability to deal with future shocks as the result of a current reduction in resources or increase in debts.
- Crisis strategies are often associated with the direct reduction of future productivity.

---

### WHEN TO MEASURE

| WHEN TO MEASURE | Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days | You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys. |

### HOW TO MEASURE IT

| HOW TO MEASURE IT | Conduct interviews with a representative sample of households (one respondent per household) posing questions on the use of different livelihood coping strategies over the last 30 days. You can find the list of 10 suggested coping strategies and questions in WFP’s CARI guidance, here: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000107745/download/ on pages 45-46. When selecting strategies to include, select a combination of 4 stress strategies, 3 crisis strategies, and 3 emergency strategies (at least 10 strategies in total). Additional “neutral” strategies can be included in the module if relevant to the context, even if they will not influence the indicator’s result. It is also possible to modify the categorisation of different strategies; this should be decided prior to data collection and if needed reviewed in connection with data analysis. Note that the LCS is prone to significant seasonal differences. Try to collect baseline and evaluation data at the same time of year/season to ensure comparability. |

### SUGGESTED TOOL

| SUGGESTED TOOL | Baseline/evaluation surveys Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey |

### DISAGGREGATE BY

| DISAGGREGATE BY | Disaggregate HHs across “Neutral”, “Stress”, “Crisis” and “Emergency” levels. These thresholds may need to be modified based on the context and the number of coping strategies you assess. Within these levels, data should also be disaggregated by sex & age of HoHH. |

### NOTES ON ANALYSIS

| NOTES ON ANALYSIS | Group each household into the most serious coping strategy they used (1 = least severe, 4 = most severe): 1 – neutral/none 2 – stress 3 – crisis 4 – emergency For example, a household that employs two stress and one crisis strategy, would be classified as “Crisis”. A household that employs 1 stress, 2 crisis and 1 emergency strategy should be classified as “emergency”. The higher the level (highest = emergency), the longer the recovery process is expected to be. Some of the crisis and emergency strategies can even be irreversible. The objective of any food/cash assistance programme should be to lower the adoption of livelihood strategies overall and if possible prevent the adoption of crisis and emergency strategies (WFP “Essential Needs Assessment- Interim guidance note”, 2018 (link below). |

### RELEVANT DONOR LINKS

| RELEVANT DONOR LINKS | Optional for BHA for multipurpose cash assistance |

### GUIDANCE & OTHER INFO


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>MULTI-SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of households where women report being involved in decision making on cash transfer [or voucher] use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>C4D.032882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**

Women’s involvement in decision making is about women’s ability to feed into/participate in discussions about how to use cash/voucher assistance their household has received. The “decision making on cash transfer or voucher use” includes the type, quantity, and quality of items/goods to purchase or services to access.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**

Assesses whether or not women are engaged in decision making within their HH on how to use the cash transfers [or vouchers] provided.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed

Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Ask women members of the household whenever possible. It is recommended to note down whether a woman or man is asked these questions. (E.g. add a check box prior to these questions: Is the respondent a man or women?).

**Q1.** Are women involved in decision making about how to use cash/voucher assistance in this household?
- Yes
- No

**Q2. [optional, recommended]** If yes, how often are women involved in decision making about how to use cash assistance provided?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

**Q3: [optional, recommended]** What types of expenditure are women engaged in decision making about? (open ended, or options)

Possible options: food purchases, hygiene and personal care items, clothing purchases, use of funds for services, education costs

**SUGGESTED TOOL**

Baseline or needs assessment questionnaire/survey, evaluation survey

Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey

**DISAGGREGATE BY**

Sex and age of respondent

Modality of assistance (voucher or cash)

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**

Calculate the total number of HH respondents who answer yes to Q1 and divide by the total number of HH respondents to find the percentage.

**RELEVANT DONOR LINKS**

Optional for BHA for Food Assistance, including through cash/voucher programming.

**GUIDANCE & OTHER INFO**

N/A
The sector-specific indicators in the following pages are standard or commonly-used indicators within each sector. Noting that cash/voucher is a modality (and not a sector on its own), it is recommended to use standard indicators to monitor sector-specific outcomes to which cash/voucher is expected to contribute. The selection of which indicators to include should be made based on the objectives if your programme and in collaboration with sector/technical leads as relevant.

### FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>FOOD SECURITY &amp; LIVELIHOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of HHs who demonstrate improved coping strategies based on the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) Or Mean and median Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) score (BHA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HORIZON            | C5D.030057 |

#### Indicator Description

| DEFINITION | The reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) is an index of a household’s food security assessing the extent to which households use harmful coping strategies when they do not have enough food or enough money to buy food using a contextualized list of coping strategies. The result is reported by a numeric score. |

#### WHAT IT MEASURES

The reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) measures the behavior of households over a 7-day period when they did not have enough food or money to buy food, and specifically focuses on households’ use of 5 core strategies and standard weights (in parenthesis):
- eating less-preferred foods (1.0),
- borrowing food/money from friends and relatives (2.0),
- limiting portions at mealtimes (1.0),
- limiting adult intake (3.0), and
- reducing the number of meals per day (1.0)

rCSI is best used for monitoring purposes, and to identify changes in household behaviour especially in early stages of a crisis. The indicator is less relevant for severe and long-term emergencies where households have already run out of many food coping options, and in those situations rCSI can provide results that artificially inflate the share of households perceived as food secure. For this detailed guidance, please see the Coping Strategies Index – Field Methods Manual.

| WHEN TO MEASURE | Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys. |

| HOW TO MEASURE IT | The rCSI uses a standard list of 5 coping strategies with standard severity weighting (see above, “What it measures”). To measure, use surveys/interviews to determine how frequently people had to use each of these strategies in the recall period (past 7 days). During the data analysis, for each coping strategy, multiply the assigned “weight” with its frequency, receiving the “score” per each strategy. Sum the scores of all assessed strategies to identify the reduced Coping Strategy Index score. Households should be disaggregated by their rCSI score level. |

| SUGGESTED TOOL | Baseline/Evaluation survey Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey |

| DISAGGREGATE BY | Disaggregate HHs across rCSI score of low (0-3), medium (4-18), and high (19 and above), which correspond to IPC Phases 1, 2 and 3 and above respectively. These thresholds may need to be modified based on the context. |

---

NOTES ON ANALYSIS

1. Add the total number of days out of the last 7 days when the HH used each of the 5 coping strategies. Multiply the number of days (0-7) with the severity weight. E.g. if a HH used a strategy 2 days in the last 7, and the weight of the strategy is 2, their score for that strategy is 2 x 2 = 4. If they did not use the strategy at all, it will be 0.

2. For each household, sum the total scores for all of the strategies. This gives you the rCSI score for the household.

3. Find the % of households that fit within each grouping (low, medium, high).

The recall period of rCSI is seven days, and food security situation is likely to change relatively quickly especially in volatile contexts. rCSI is also affected by seasonality, shocks and the overall vulnerability context and data on rCSI is likely not to reflect the current conditions if there have been changes in these conditions after the last data collection.

For BHA specifically, the indicator refers to the mean and median score. The mean refers to the average (add all of the raw score values from all beneficiaries included in the survey then divide by the total number of beneficiaries included in the survey) and the median refers to the central tendency (arrange the observations in order from least to greatest value. If there are an odd number of observations, the median is the middle value. If there is an even number of observations, the median is the average of the two middle values. Basic statistical software can be used to calculate the median). BHA further requests the standard deviation and confidence interval at 95% confidence level (please see BHA’s guidance for additional info).

RELEVANT DONOR LINKS

On ECHO’s Key Objective/Outcome Indicator (KOI) list
Recommended by BHA for long-term interventions that include food costs as part of the transfer value and more than six months of transfers per household.

GUIDANCE & MORE INFO

Coping Strategies Index – Field Methods Manual:
https://fscluster.org/handbook/Section_two_rcsi.html
BHA Indicator Handbook:

SECTOR(S)

FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

INDICATOR*

% of households with poor, borderline and adequate Food Consumption Score (FCS)

HORIZON

C4D.030084
C4D.032505 (pre-set BHA disaggregation)

Indicator Description

DEFINITION

The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on dietary diversity, food frequency, and the relative nutritional importance of different food groups. A questionnaire is used to ask respondents about the frequency of their households’ consumption of nine food groups over the previous seven days.

WHAT IT MEASURES

The proportion of households in each Food Consumption Score threshold (poor, borderline or acceptable)

WHEN TO MEASURE

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.
**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

To calculate the FCS, the consumption frequencies of 9 standard food groups are summed and multiplied by the weighting of each standardized food group⁸.

**Food Groups and Weights:**
1. Staples (2)
2. Pulses (3)
3. Vegetables (1)
4. Fruit (1)
5. Meat/fish (4)
6. Dairy (4)
7. Sugar (0.5)
8. Oil (0.5)
9. Condiments (0)

Sum all the consumption frequencies of food items of the same group over the past 7 days. For any food items consumed more than 7 times, code the value as 7 (the maximum).

Multiply the value obtained for each food group by its weight (see food group weights in parenthesis above and in linked guidance) and create new weighted food group scores. Sum the weighted food group scores, thus creating the food consumption score (FCS) for each household.

Households are then classified into three groups based on their weighted scores—poor, borderline, or acceptable—using the World Food Program's recommended cutoff points (Poor: 0-21, Borderline: 21.5-35, Acceptable: >35) OR the approved, country-specific cutoff points as per cluster/working group guidance.

| SUGGESTED TOOL | Baseline/Evaluation survey  
|                | Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey |
| DISAGGREGATE BY | Disaggregate by the food security level (poor, borderline, acceptable). Within the FCS levels, disaggregate data by sex and age of the HoHH.  
|                | For BHA specifically, disaggregate by HH composition: Adult Female No Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male No Adult Female (MNF), Female and Male Adults (F&M), Child No Adults (CNA) – see Horizon code: C4D.032505 |
| NOTES ON ANALYSIS | Base your categorization of households using the WFP’s recommended cutoff points for each level, OR the approved, country-specific cutoff points as per the working group/cluster. |
| RELEVANT DONOR LINKS | On ECHO’s Key Objective/Outcome Indicator (KOI) list  
|                | On BHA’s list of selections for MPCA (must select 3). Required for activities that include food costs as part of the transfer value. |

| SECTOR(S) | FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS |
| INDICATOR | Average Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) |
| HORIZON | C4D.026308  
|          | C1D.024577 (pre-set BHA disaggregation) |

**Indicator Description**

Household Dietary Diversity Score refers to the household’s economic access to a variety of food, but does not assess the quality of that food or a person’s diet.

---

**WHAT IT MEASURES**

This indicator measures household hunger and diet diversity using standardized questions and scoring. HDDS assesses a household’s economic access to food (i.e. its ability to produce, purchase or otherwise secure food for consumption by all household members). It does not provide data on the nutritional quality of a person’s diet.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Collect the following data by interviewing a sample of persons responsible for food preparation for the household on the previous day:

1) Check whether yesterday was a special day (religious festival or celebration) when unusually varied or limited diet was eaten - if so, do not proceed with collecting dietary data as it is likely that they will not reflect a typical diet.

2) List all meals which the household ate in the previous day in a Recording Meals Form (see example form in linked guidance below). Don’t include meals/foods that were purchased and eaten outside the home. These foods are excluded because the respondent may not know the foods which other household members purchased and ate outside the home. You can include foods that were 1) prepared in the home and consumed in the home or outside the home; or 2) purchased or gathered outside and consumed in the home. Due to this reason, HDDS indicator should not be used in contexts where eating outside the home is very common.

3) Double check each meal composition (e.g. porridge with or without milk).

4) Check for any snacks (including fruits) which were not mentioned.

5) Only then record in the questionnaire which food groups were eaten. Ask the respondent regarding eaten foods from groups that were not mentioned (for example: "Did your household members yesterday eat any eggs?"). Do not include foods that were consumed in amounts of less than 1 teaspoon.

6) Count the number of food groups. This gives you their Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) and should be between 0-12.

7) Calculate the indicator’s value by summing up the scores of all the assessed households and dividing the result by the total number of assessed households.

**SUGGESTED TOOL**

Baseline/Evaluation survey
Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey

**DISAGGREGATE BY**

Sex and age of HoHH
For BHA specifically, disaggregate by HH composition: Adult Female No Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male No Adult Female (MNF), Female and Male Adults (F&M), Child No Adults (CNA) – see Horizon code: C1D.024577

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**

HDDS works with 12 food groups (for details, see FAO’s guidelines at the link below). HDDS is also prone to seasonal differences; plan to collect baseline and evaluation data at the same time of a year to ensure data is comparable. Avoid collecting data during fasting periods (e.g. Ramadan).

Based on FAO’s guidelines: When training the data collectors, practice extensively which meals belong to which food group (allocate at least 3 hours full of examples and exercises). For example, while pumpkin flesh belongs to Vitamin A Rich Foods, pumpkin leaves belong to Dark Green Leafy Vegetables. If your questionnaire includes examples of different foods per each group, adjust them to the local context.

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**

Guidelines for measuring household and individual dietary diversity – FAO.
https://www.fantaproject.org/monitoring-and-evaluation/household-dietary-diversity-score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>FOOD SECURITY &amp; LIVELIHOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>% of households with moderate and severe Household Hunger Scale (HHS) scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>CID.024940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
The Household Hunger Score (HHS) is an index and can be used as a proxy for food insecurity. It measures the scale of a household’s level of food deprivation. Note that this indicator is based on the several measures of quantitative available of food but not does measure the quality of food.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
This index measures how frequently three food security incidents have occurred for anyone in a household over the last 4 weeks.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**
Try to direct questions at the person in the beneficiary household in charge of food preparation:

Q1. How many times in the last 4 weeks has anyone in your household experienced the following scenarios? (never = 0, rarely = 1, sometimes = 2, often = 3)
   1. There was no food at all in the house
   2. Someone in the household went to bed hungry
   3. Someone in the household went all day and night without eating

Once data is collected, categorize answers as follows for tabulation: never = 0, either rarely or sometimes = 1, often = 2.

Sum the totals for the three questions for each household; you should get a score between 0 (none of the events happened at all in the last 4 weeks) to 6 (all three events happened ‘often’ in the last 4 weeks). These can be analysed as follows:
- HHS score 0-1 = little to no hunger
- HHS score 2-3 = moderate hunger
- HHS score 4-6 = severe hunger

**SUGGESTED TOOL**
Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) surveys

**DISAGGREGATE BY**
Sex and age of HoHH
By level of HHS score category (little to no hunger, severe or moderate)

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**
Standard indicator disaggregation is done by score category (little to no hunger, severe hunger or moderate hunger) based on the sum of scores for each household as outlined above.

**RELEVANT DONOR LINKS**
Required for BHA for activities with a food security purpose in the LogFrame/ITT and any activities that include food assistance interventions.

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>FOOD SECURITY &amp; LIVELIHOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>% of households using cash assistance to invest in productive assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>CSG.026324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
Productive assets should be defined locally, but may include things like: seeds, livestock, machinery, tools.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
The proportion of households who use assistance to buy productive assets (to be defined locally, but may include things like: seeds, livestock, tools).
**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Q1. How has the cash assistance been spent? (insert relevant examples of productive assets)

1 = Food  
2 = Water  
3 = Shelter/housing (e.g. rent)  
4 = Education expenses  
5 = Repaid cash/food loans  
6 = household items  
7 = productive assets - tools  
8 = productive assets - agricultural inputs  
9 = productive assets - livestock  
10 = health services  
11 = medicines  
12 = preventive/protective materials (e.g. masks/gloves)  
13 = building/reconstruction  
14 = not yet spent  
15 = Other, specify____

**SUGGESTED TOOL**

Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey

**DISAGGREGATE BY**

Sex and age of HoHH  
By type of productive asset (may be grouped together in categories).

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**

Count the total number of HHs who indicate that they spent any amount of assistance on productive assets (i.e. those who select at least one of the productive assets options (7, 8, or 9 in the above example)) and divide by the total number of respondents. This will render the % of HHs for this indicator. Please note, if a household uses assistance to buy more than one type or productive asset, the HH should still only be counted 1 time in the calculation of the % for this indicator. For example, if a HH responds with all three options 7 and 8 and 9 in the above list, the HH should still be counted one time. If a HH only selects option 7, they will also be counted one time in the overall % calculation.

---

**SHELTER & NFIs**

**SECTOR(S)**

SHELTER

**INDICATOR**

% of HHs whose shelter solutions meet agreed technical and performance standards

**HORIZON**

C4D.024934

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**

Shelter solutions refers to the shelter (house, apartment, building, tented area, camp, etc.) where a household resides. Agreed technical standards and performance standards may refer to the global standards outlined in the Sphere guidelines, or be locally defined and described in national guidelines/working group/cluster guidance.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**

It measures the proportion of households who have access to shelter in line with minimum guidelines from Sphere OR national guidelines.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed  
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days  
You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Before designing your questionnaire, you will need to define minimum standards by working with the shelter technical lead. Standards (based on Sphere or working...
group/clusters) may include: types of materials used to make the shelter, access to fresh air, protection from wind/rain, having a cover, ensuring basic privacy, etc. Modify the questions below appropriately.

**Q1.** Is the living space sufficient to provide:
- thermal comfort? Yes/No
- fresh air? Yes/No
- protection from the elements (snow, rain, wind)? Yes/No
- basic privacy? Yes/No

**Q2:** Are you sleeping outside of a constructed building?
- Yes
- No

**Q3:** [If the answer to Q2 is yes] If yes, what type of materials is your shelter cover made of?
- tent
- tarp/plastic
- sheets, cardboard
- salvaged tin, wood
- no covering
- other: ____________

**Q4:** [optional for additional information] If yes, what is the main reason you are sleeping outside of a constructed building?
- I prefer to sleep outdoors
- I can’t afford to pay rent or other fees to sleep indoors
- There is no building close by where I can sleep
- Add other options as relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTED TOOL</th>
<th>Baseline/Evaluation survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISAGGREGATE BY**
- Sex and age of HoHH
  - For BHA, by HH composition: Adult Female No Adult Male (FN M), Adult Male No Adult Female (MNF), Female and Male Adults (F&M), Child No Adults (CNA)

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**
- This information should be used to understand the change in proportion of households who have access to shelter that meets minimum standards as per Sphere or national guidelines.
- Check how many HHs/ have access to minimum standards before any assistance is provided, and check again after assistance provision (suggested: 30 days after assistance is provided). Report the total number of households whose shelter meets minimum standards divided by the total number interviewed/surveyed.

**RELEVANT DONOR LINKS**
- On BHA’s list of selections for MPCA (must select 3). One of optional indicators for activities that include shelter costs as part of the transfer value.

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>SHELTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of HHs who are assessed to be living in safe and dignified shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>C4D.032582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**
- Safe: Refers to people’s physical and personal wellbeing and integrity as well as to their freedom from physical, environmental, social, spiritual, political, emotional or psychological harm (Sphere Glossary)
Dignified: Supporting people's dignity, which is "the capacity to make one's own deliberate choices and consequently to be acknowledged as a free subject. It reflects the integrity of the person and is seen as the source from which all human rights derive...The foundation of life with dignity is the assurance of access to basic services, security and respect for human rights" (Sphere Glossary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT IT MEASURES</th>
<th>It measures the proportion of households who have access to shelter in line with minimum guidelines from Sphere or national guidelines.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHEN TO MEASURE</td>
<td>Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HOW TO MEASURE IT | The enumerator should use locally-appropriate language about safety and dignity and this may be self-reported:  
|                  | Q1. Do you feel that the place where you live is safe (alternative wording: secure)?  
|                  | - Yes  
|                  | - No  
|                  | - Do not know  
|                  | [optional, if no] Why do you feel that the place where you live is not secure? (open ended or offer options based on the context where you operate)  
|                  | Q2: Is your current shelter dignified (alternative wording: does your current shelter afford you privacy and security?)  
|                  | - Yes  
|                  | - No  
|                  | - Do not know  
|                  | If the answers to the two above questions are YES, then the household has access to “safe and dignified shelter solutions”. If any answer is No or do not know, the HH should not be considered as living in a safe and dignified shelter.  
|                  | If there is a technical team/unit available to assess the data, consider including:  
|                  | Q1: Does the shelter solution and materials meet locally agreed technical and performance standards?  
|                  | Yes  
|                  | No  
|                  | Q2: Is the shelter solution culturally acceptable?  
|                  | Yes  
|                  | No  
|                  | Q3: Has the construction been done in accordance with safe building practices and standards?  
|                  | Yes  
|                  | No  
|                  | Q4: (optional) Does the construction demonstrate involvement of the affected population?  
|                  | Yes  
|                  | No  
| SUGGESTED TOOL | Baseline or assessment questionnaire/survey  
|                  | Evaluation survey  
|                  | Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey  
| DISAGGREGATE BY | Sex and age of HoHH  
| NOTES ON ANALYSIS | If the answers to the two required questions (Q1-2 above) are YES, then the household has access to “safe and dignified shelter solutions”. If any answer is No or do not know, the HH should not be considered as living in a safe and dignified shelter.  
|                  | Check how many HHs/respondents have access to safe and dignified shelter before any assistance is provided, and check again after (suggested: 30 days after assistance is
| RELEVANT DONOR LINKS | On ECHO’s Key Result Indicator (KRI) list  
| | On BHA’s list of selections for MPCA (must select 3). One of optional indicators for activities that include shelter costs as part of the transfer value  
| | A useful IndiKit overview can be found here: [https://www.indikit.net/indicator/26-shelter-and-nfi/119-access-to-adequate-shelter](https://www.indikit.net/indicator/26-shelter-and-nfi/119-access-to-adequate-shelter)  

| SECTOR(S) | SHELTER  
| INDICATOR | % of assisted households that effectively used the provided cash/vouchers for shelter (re)construction  
| HORIZON | CSG.026335  

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**

Effectively used means - as a minimum- that the cash/vouchers (either all or a very high %) was used for (re)constructing the shelter. However, you might also want to add further requirements, such as (re)constructing the shelter according to certain quality standards, ensuring minimum covered floor areas, etc.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**

The indicator measures the number of households that effectively used the provided cash/materials for shelter (re)construction.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed  
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days  
You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Interview a representative sample of the beneficiaries about the extent to which they used the provided cash/vouchers for the given purpose:

Q1: How much of the provided cash/voucher did you already use? (all, some, none)  
- All  
- Some  
- None

Q2: (if all or some) How much of the cash/voucher did you use for shelter (re)construction? (enquire also about any additional requirements)  
___ (integer in local currency/currency of distribution)

Depending on the resources available, you may also choose to visit a random sample of the targeted shelters to observe how cash/vouchers were used + whether any additional requirements were met.

**SUGGESTED TOOL**

Baseline/Evaluation survey  
Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey

**DISAGGREGATE BY**

Sex and age of HoHH

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**

Divide the amount provided in Q2 by the total amount of assistance provided (e.g. if $30 USD was used for shelter materials out of a total of $75 provided, calculate $30/$75 = 0.40. Multiply by 100 to get the percentage that was used for shelter materials. This gives you 40%). If the percentage is 50% or higher, this should be counted as meeting this indicator. This threshold may be modified based on local standards and agreed upon thresholds at the working group/cluster or national level.

---

Sum the total number of households with 50% or higher used for shelter materials/(re)construction and divide by the total number of HHs surveyed (including those who answered “none” to Q1). Multiply by 100 to find the percentage to be reported for this indicator.

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**
You may need to modify the 50% threshold above based on local guidelines and coordination. Check with shelter technical teams to agree on the analysis for this indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>Non-Food Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of HHs reporting adequate access to household non-food items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>C4D:032S10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
Access refers to the ability to secure or use a good, service or facility. Full access “means that there are no practical, financial, physical, security-related, structural, institutional or cultural barriers to accessing services or facilities.” For this indicator, ‘access’ means both availability and affordability – people can find the products they need in the market, and they have enough money to buy them (adapted from the Sphere glossary).

Non-food items (NFIs): The Sphere Handbook includes standards for non-food items (NFIs). NFIs include things such as clothing, bedding, cooking utensils, and fuel and lighting. The Shelter and NFI cluster may also have definitions for minimum NFIs in a given context; this definition may also be used.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
This indicator assesses whether the household income, including the assistance, is sufficient to meet the household’s non-food item needs.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed

Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**
The enumerator may wish to use examples from Sphere when asking the household about access to these items (since the term “non-food items” may not be a commonly used term). The enumerator does not need to and should not ask individually about each type of NFI11.

**Q1. Are you able to find the non-food items that your household needs in the market?**
- Yes
- No

**Q1a. (optional for additional info) If not, which items are you not able to find available?** List appropriate items, for example:
- Blankets
- Sleeping mats or mattresses
- Clothing and footwear
- Jerry cans/other water storage containers
- Buckets
- Cleaning supplies (broom, mop, brush, etc.)
- Hygiene supplies (toothbrush, feminine hygiene products, personal care items)
- Cooking pots, utensils, plates, cups, etc.
- Cooking equipment (stove, etc.)
- Fuel for heating
- Fuel for cooking

*(add others as relevant)*

---

Q2. Are you able to purchase the non-food items that your household needs in the market?
- Yes
- No

Q2a. If not, why not?
- I don’t have money to purchase non-food items I need
- Shop keepers/vendors will not sell me the non-food items I need
- I cannot get to the market in order to buy the non-food items I need because of road blocks, road closures, or other non-financial barriers
- I cannot get to the market in order to buy the non-food items I need because I can’t afford the transportation (e.g. bus fare, taxi, etc.)
- Other: __________________ (explain)

SUGGESTED TOOL
Baseline or needs assessment questionnaire/survey
Endline or evaluation survey
Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey

DISAGGREGATE BY
Sex and age of HoHH
Other vulnerability
For BHA, by HH composition: Adult Female No Adult Male (FN), Adult Male No Adult Female (MN), Female and Male Adults (FM), Child No Adults (CN)

NOTES ON ANALYSIS
1) First, identify the what the relevant non-food items needs are within the community (through secondary data, a needs assessment, or similar).
2) If possible, conduct a pre-assistance baseline survey, using a representative sample of the intended beneficiaries, to assess household’s access to non-food items before assistance.
3) After the cash-based assistance is provided, assess, as a part of your post-distribution monitoring survey among a representative sample of the target households, their access to non-food item needs.
4) Across different stages of the project, calculate the number and percentage of households who report having access to the needed non-food items. This should be done by calculating the total number of respondents who answer “yes” to Q1 AND Q2. If the answer to either Q1 or 2 is ‘No’, then the HH does NOT have adequate access to necessary non-food items.

RELEVANT DONOR LINKS
On BHA’s list of selections for MPCA (must select 3)

GUIDANCE & MORE INFO
Sphere Handbook on Non-Food Items
Multipurpose Cash Assistance PIRS
https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/10-1-19_Multipurpose_Cash_Assistance_PIRS.docx

NUTRITION
*NB: Unlike the other sectors included in this document, there are currently no standard nutrition indicators included on the Grand Bargain MPCA Outcome Indicator draft list. As such, any inclusion of nutrition-specific indicators within a MPCA project should be based on clear links to the project objectives and expected use of the cash for nutrition needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>NUTRITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>Proportion of children receiving minimum dietary diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>CID:029797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

| DEFINITION | Percent of children aged 6-23 months who received food from at least five out of eight food groups during the previous day |
| WHAT IT MEASURES | Minimum dietary diversity is a proxy measure of diet adequacy, specifically micronutrient adequacy. Consumption of foods from at least 5 food groups on the previous day means |
that in most populations the child had a high likelihood of consuming at least one animal-source food, one fruit or vegetable and a staple food (grain, root or tuber) during that day.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed  
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

**Q1:** Which food groups have children aged 6-23 months old in your HH consumed in the last 24 hours?
- Breastmilk
- Grains, roots/tubers
- Legumes/nuts
- Dairy products
- Flesh foods (meat, poultry, liver/organ meats)
- Eggs
- Vitamin A rich fruit/vegetables
- Other fruits/vegetables

Consumption of any amount of food from each food group is sufficient to “count”, i.e., there is no minimum quantity, except if an item is only used as a condiment (less than 1 teaspoon).

This question should be asked to caregivers about *each child* aged 6-23 months.

**SUGGESTED TOOL**
Caregiver survey  
Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey

**DISAGGREGATE BY**
Sex and age of HoHH and sex/age of each child(ren)  
Recommended age groups for disaggregation are: 6–11 months, 12–17 months and 18–23 months of age.

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**
Count the number of children who consumed least 5 of the 8 food groups in the past 24 hours and divide by the total number of children across caregivers. This is the proportion/percent of children who are receiving minimum dietary diversity.

**RELEVANT DONOR LINKS**
Optional for BHA activities with objectives related to Maternal Infant and Young Child Nutrition in Emergencies.

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**
Data4Diet guidance – Tufts University  
https://indexxnutrition.tufts.edu/data4diets/indicator/minimum-dietary-diversity-mdd

Global Nutrition Monitoring Framework:  
https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/259904/9789241513609-eng.pdf?sequence=1

Note, the WHO guidance from 2010 refers to 7 food groups, but in 2017 and expert panel revised this to 8 groups to include breastfeeding. This updated information is reflected in the above links.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTOR(S)</strong></td>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATOR</strong></td>
<td>% of HHs receiving multipurpose cash that delayed or did not seek care when in need of healthcare due to financial barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HORIZON</strong></td>
<td>C5G.026342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

"Delayed or did not seek" means that they put off medical attention or services necessary for wellbeing and general health needs.

"Due to financial barriers" refers to reasons for not obtaining medical attention or services are related to the costs associated with accessing said healthcare and could include (but are not limited to): transportation costs, costs of child care to enable certain HH members to leave the home, fees for accessing health services, etc.)
**WHAT IT MEASURES**
This indicator measures the proportion of households that needed to, but delayed or did not seek medical attention because of financial barriers.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

**Q1.** In the past 30 days, did you or your household members face any challenges accessing the health center/hospital/clinic and other health services?
- No
- Yes
- Do not know

**Q2.** If yes to Q1, what is the sex of the household member who faced challenges accessing a health center/hospital/clinic?
- Man (18 years +)
- Women (18 years +)
- Boy (17 years or under)
- Girl (17 years or under)

**Q3.** If yes to Q1, what was the main reason?
- The health service is too far away
- Health services were closed/shut-down
- The health center has poor WASH infrastructure
- I couldn’t pay for health services (fees, charges)
- I couldn’t afford to get to health services (transportation to health services, costs for childcare)
- I couldn’t go to the health service because of travel restrictions (e.g. curfew, road closures)
- No one in my household was well enough to travel
- I/my household was denied services. (please explain: _________________)
- Other, please explain: _________________

**SUGGESTED TOOL**
Baseline/evaluation surveys
Post distribution monitoring questionnaire

**DISAGGREGATE BY**
Sex and age of person unable to access health services (if applicable)
Other vulnerability

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**
Use the number of HHs who answered 'yes' to the first question and selected "I couldn’t pay for health services" or "I couldn’t afford to get to health services" for question 3. Divide this by the total number of HHs asked to find the % of households.

---

**SECTOR(S)**
HEALTH

**INDICATOR**
% of HHs receiving cash/voucher that were able to access a service from a qualified/certified provider (including consultation, diagnostic tests and treatment)

**HORIZON**
CSG:026343

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
Qualified/certified provider (including consultation, diagnostic tests and its treatment) should be defined based on local standards, but a certified provider would be someone with relevant state/national qualifications (degrees, certificates, titles, etc.) to provide medical care/services.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
Proportion of households that are able to access health services they need (helps show changes in access over time)

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days
You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW TO MEASURE IT</th>
<th>Q1. In the last 30 days, has everyone in your HH in need of medical attention been able to access relevant services from a qualified individual/company/service provider?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1b. [optional]</td>
<td>If yes, from who/which service? (add relevant local options)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. If not, was there a financial reason why you were unable to access medical care from a qualified provider?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2b. [optional]</td>
<td>if not, what was the reason?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I did not have time to seek relevant medical attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I prefer to see other people/groups about my health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify: ______________ (e.g. traditional healers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I thought I would get better/heal on my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- (add other relevant options)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTED TOOL</th>
<th>Baseline/evaluation surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post distribution monitoring questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGGREGATE BY</th>
<th>Sex and age of person/people unable to access services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other vulnerability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NOTES ON ANALYSIS | Use the number of HHs who answered “yes” to the first question. Divide this by the total number of HHs who answered “Yes” or “No” to Question 1 to find the % of households who were able to access necessary qualified medical assistance (i.e. do not include HHs who answered “Not applicable” in the denominator) |

## EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of HHs with school-age children with at least 1 school-age child who had to miss school because of costs associated with schooling (during the recall period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HORIZON     | C5G.026344                                                             |

### Indicator Description

**Definition**: Preconditions for use in CVP: 1) There must be clear understanding of how cash grants can be used to support economic barriers to school attendance, 2) Quality learning facilities must be available in the target area in the first place.

“School-age children” include children who should be attending school based on national guidelines and education requirements (usually, 5-17 years old).

“Missing school” may refer to a locally-determined number of days or time period based on a baseline assessment or review of enrolment and attendance rates within local school system.

“Costs associated with schooling” should be determined through an assessment, but may include (but are not limited to): transportation, school supplies, uniform, enrolment fees, etc.). These include one-off and recurring costs.

**What It Measures**: This indicator helps us understand if there are financial barriers to school enrolment and attendance.

**When To Measure**: Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed. Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days.

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.
**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Q1. **Have any school-aged children in your HH (ages X - Y) missed school in the past year?** (please define ‘missed” school as insert a minimum threshold to be counted for this indicator (e.g. Have any 5-17 year-old children in your HH missed more than 1 month of school in the past year?)
- Yes
- No

Q1b [optional]: **How many children? _____[integer]**

If there are more than 1 children missing school within the HH, ask the following question about the oldest child who is missing school:

**Q2. If yes, what is the main reason he/she has missed school?**
- Schools have closed (for reason(s) other than regularly planned holidays)
- Schools are open but lack willing teachers
- Lack transportation to schools
- Parents prefer that children stay home
- Children want to stay home
- Children are needed to contribute to family income
- Transportation costs to/from school
- Initial/Upfront costs (enrolment/registration/tuition/uniform)
- Recurring costs (books, supplies, canteen fees, replacing uniforms, etc.)
- Schools lack school feeding program
- School lack safe hand wash facilities (hence do not go to school)
- School lack Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) facility
- Other (specify)_________

Q3. [optional for more information] **If yes, how long did they miss school?**
- Less than one month
- Less than 6 months
- 6 months - 1 year
- More than 1 year

**SUGGESTED TOOL**
- Baseline/evaluation surveys
- Post distribution monitoring questionnaire
- Caregiver surveys

**DISAGGREGATE BY**
- Age or grade levels of children
- Gender of children
- Specific target group (e.g. minority groups, children with disabilities, etc.)

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**
Calculate the total number of household respondents who respond "Yes" to Q1 and specify the reasons as "transportation costs" or "initial/upfront costs" or "ongoing/recurring costs" for Q2.
Divide by the total number of households responding to find the proportion/percentage for this indicator.
This indicator can be self-reported by beneficiaries.

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**

**WASH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>WASH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of HHs using an unsafe water source because they cannot afford to use a safer water source</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator Description

### DEFINITION

“unsafe water sources” should be defined in coordination with WASH technical colleagues and refers to any water source that does not meet safety standards as defined by the sector, national level guidelines, or international standards (e.g. Sphere).

### WHAT IT MEASURES

This indicator measures the proportion of households that are using unsafe water for drinking and cooking, as a result of not being able to afford safer water.

### WHEN TO MEASURE

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed

Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

### HOW TO MEASURE IT

Survey questions adapted from OFDA’s PIRS for multipurpose cash assistance:

**Q1**: Over the last week, what was the main water source(s) you used to collect your water for drinking and cooking? (select one)

- piped water into house
- piped water to yard/plot/outside house
- public stand post or tap
- surface water (river, creek, canal, irrigation channel, pond)
- tube well/borehole
- protected dug well
- unprotected dug well
- protected spring
- unprotected spring
- bottled/plastic packaged water
- water kiosk vendor
- water truck
- rainwater harvesting/catchment
- Other: ______________
- Do not know

**Q2. If an unsafe water source was selected in Q1**: How many days in the last 14 days did your HH use this water source?

__________ days (integer)

**Q2b**: What is the main reason that you collected water from this source?

- This source is closer to my house
- I could not afford other source[s]
- This water source is cheaper than others (and I want to spend less)
- I think this source is safe/clean
- I don’t know

**Q3**: If you used any other sources for drinking and cooking in the last two weeks, which source did you use? (select one)

- N/A (no other sources used)
- piped water into house
- piped water to yard/plot/outside house
- public stand post or tap
- surface water (river, creek, canal, irrigation channel, pond)
- tube well/borehole
- protected dug well
- unprotected dug well

---

Q4. If an unsafe water source**: how many days in the last 14 days did your HH use this water source?  
_________ days (integer)

Q4b: What is the main reason that you collect water from this source(s)?
- This source is closer to my house
- I could not afford other source[s]
- This water source is cheaper than others (and I want to spend less)
- I think this source is safe/clean
- I don’t know

* Typically considered ‘safe’ water sources- to be confirmed with WASH technical team.  
** ‘Unsafe’ water options should be confirmed locally with the WASH technical team.

| **SUGGESTED TOOL** | Baseline/evaluation surveys  
| Post distribution monitoring questionnaire |
| **DISAGGREGATE BY** | Sex and age of HoHH  
| Other vulnerability  
| For BHA, by HH composition: Adult Female No Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male No Adult Female (MNF), Female and Male Adults (F&M), Child No Adults (CNA) |
| **NOTES ON ANALYSIS** | Identify the total number of HHs who selected an unsafe source in Q1 AND selected “I cannot afford other sources” for Q2b. Add this to the number of HHs who selected an unsafe source in Q3 AND selected “I cannot afford other sources” for Q4b. Divide the sum by the total number of respondent households to find the % of HHs using unsafe water because they cannot afford to use a safer water source. |
| **RELEVANT DONOR LINKS** | On BHA’s list of selections for MPCA (must select 3- consider this indicator if access to safe water is part of the project objective). |
| **GUIDANCE & MORE INFO** | When the standards include water quality, the survey enumerator should be trained to be able to assess the safety of the water that is used (for instance chlorination procedure in the HH water container) and/or work with WASH technical colleagues to ensure water sources are tested and defined clearly as unsafe/safe.  

This indicator can be supplemented with testing data about the most common water sources in the area. For example, to meet OFDA’s minimum expectation regarding market assessments for access to safe water, partners should test the 3-4 most common water sources available in the market in the areas targeted for multipurpose cash distribution. These can be identified during the initial assessment, or during the beneficiary selection/verification process.  
The local water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) cluster may also have this information. Testing is done because, while households will have their own perspectives about which sources of water are ‘safe,’ this may not necessarily align with the actual safety of the water source as defined for this indicator. |

<p>| <strong>SECTOR(S)</strong> | WASH |
| <strong>INDICATOR</strong> | % of HHs who have reduced essential WASH related basic needs expenditures |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HORIZON</th>
<th>CID:032517</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFINITION</strong></td>
<td>WASH-related basic needs: The primary purpose of WASH related basic needs expenditures is to enable water, sanitation, or hygiene related behaviors. Examples of these include (but are not limited to): water treatment products, water transport/storage containers, soap, materials for anal cleansing, miscellaneous hygiene items (shampoo, razors, toothpaste, toothbrushes, nail clippers, etc.), menstrual hygiene management materials, diapers, cleaning materials and products. Expenditures: Money spent on these particular needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHAT IT MEASURES</strong></td>
<td>The proportion of households that report spending less money on WASH essential needs, including but not limited to: water treatment products, water transport/storage containers, soap, materials for cleansing, hygiene items, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHEN TO MEASURE</strong></td>
<td>Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOW TO MEASURE IT</strong></td>
<td>The reduction in essential WASH related basic needs expenditures is measured using a representative household survey. This guidance has been adapted from the OFDA Multipurpose Cash Assistance PIRS. The enumerator might use examples instead of &quot;WASH-related items&quot; when asking the household about access to these items (since the term “WASH-related basic needs expenditures” may not be commonly used). The enumerator should not ask individually about each type of item. Q1: During the past two weeks, did your household purchase more, fewer, or the usual amount of [essential WASH related items]? - More - Fewer - The usual/same Q1b: [if “fewer”] What is the main reason for the reduction in purchasing essential WASH related items? (may be open ended or, for ease of analysis, provide options:) - The store/market is too far - The store/market was closed - Couldn't afford to buy the items - Couldn't afford transportation or other associated costs to get to the store/market - [Add options as relevant] Q2 [optional] What are the main essential WASH related items that were not purchased? (may be open ended or for ease of analysis, provide list of options)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUGGESTED TOOL</strong></td>
<td>Baseline/evaluation surveys Post distribution monitoring questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISAGGREGATE BY</strong></td>
<td>Sex and age HoHH Other vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTES ON ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td>This information should be used to understand if the household reduced expenditures for WASH related basic needs (and for which items), and if this is a coping strategy in response to having insufficient income to meet their basic needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

If the household has reduced expenditures for a non-economic reason, e.g. they no longer buy diapers because a baby has just finished needing diapers, then the household should not be counted as having reduced their WASH-related item expenditure for purposes of this indicator.\(^{14}\)

**RELEVANT DONOR LINKS**

On BHA’s list of selections for MPCA (must select 3—consider this indicator if access to WASH basic needs is part of the project objective).

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR(S)</th>
<th>WASH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR*</td>
<td>% of HHs practicing open defecation because they cannot afford to pay to use a public latrine and/or to build a latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON</td>
<td>C5G.026345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**

Open defecation refers to the practice of defecating in fields, bodies of water or other open spaces. Unsafe disposal of excreta can lead to environmental contamination and increased breeding of vectors that spread disease. Specifically, for this indicator, a latrine includes: a simple pit latrine; a ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrine; a flush latrine (pour-flush or cistern-flush) connected to a pit, septic, or sewer; and a chemical toilet; and the use of a potty for children/infants whereby excreta are then disposed of in a toilet.\(^{15}\)

**WHAT IT MEASURES**

This indicator measures the proportion of households that practice open defecation or unsafe disposal of excreta, as a result of not being able to afford the use of a public latrine and/or to build a latrine. It measures the affected population's access to functioning latrine facilities - a crucial precondition for ensuring a sanitary environment and preventing diseases.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**

Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed

Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days

You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**

Q1: The last time you defecated, where did you do so? (change wording depending on context and appropriateness. E.g. When someone in your household has to use the bathroom, where do they do so?) Possible Options:

- Flush or pour/flush toilet flushed to:
  - (i) Flush to piped sewer system
  - (ii) Flush to septic tank
  - (iii) Flush to pit latrines
  - (iv) Ventilated improved pit latrine
  - (v) Pit latrine with slab
  - (vi) Composting toilet
  - (vii) Flush to somewhere else / don’t know

- Pit latrine with no slab/open pit
- Bucket toilet
- Hanging toilet/latrine
- No Facility/bush/field
- Other (Specify) __________
- Don’t Know

Q2: During the past two weeks, did you practice open defecation?

- Yes

---


\(^{15}\) Ibid.
Q3: What is the main reason that you practiced open defecation?
[open answer, or provide options- examples below]:
- Temporary problem with the latrine/toilet (e.g. it is under maintenance)
- I prefer not to use the latrine/toilet (because of the odor, location, etc.)
- I don’t feel safe using the latrine or toilet
- Convenience (latrine is further away, I was on my way somewhere, etc.)
- Cost of having a latrine (building it, materials, maintenance, etc.)
- Cost associated with accessing public latrines (fees, maintenance, etc.)
Other Specify)__________

SUGGESTED TOOL
Baseline/evaluation surveys
Post distribution monitoring questionnaire

DISAGGREGATE BY
Sex and age HoHH
Other vulnerability

NOTES ON ANALYSIS
This information should be used to understand the change in proportion of households who cannot afford to use latrine or build a latrine.
Calculate the total number of household respondents who select "No facility/bush/field" for Q1 and/or “Yes” to Q2 AND “cost of having a latrine” OR “Cost associated with accessing public latrines”.
Divide by the total number of respondents to find the percentage.

RELEVANT DONOR LINKS
On BHA's list of selections for MPCA (must select 3- consider this indicator if access to latrines/toilets part of the project objective).

GUIDANCE & MORE INFO
Global WASH Cluster –MPCA + WASH
https://washcluster.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/CTK/pages/285278229/MBP+monitoring

SECTOR(S) | WASH
--- | ---
INDICATOR | % of households with access to appropriate hygiene items and material for practicing adequate hand washing
HORIZON | C5G.026346

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
Define "appropriate hygiene items and material for practicing adequate hand washing" based on the context (e.g. jerry cans, soap, water source) and in line with agreed-upon standards (e.g. Sphere, working groups, national standards)

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
This indicator measures the proportion of households that have access to relevant hygiene items and materials to wash their hands.

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days
You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**
Q1. Do you have access in/near your dwelling to a designated place for handwashing?
- yes
- no
- don’t know
If the survey is being conducted in person, please also observe where the handwashing station is and include any relevant notes:
Q2. If yes, do you also have access to soap/detergent?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Q3. [Optional for additional info] If “no” to either question 1 or 2, what are the greatest challenges your household faces in practicing handwashing with soap/detergents? (select multiple)
- I cannot afford to buy hygiene products (i.e. soap, detergents)
- I cannot go to the market/shop to buy hygiene products due to the cost of getting there (transportation, gas, bus fare, etc.)
- I cannot go to the market/shop due to road closures, blocks, checkpoints, or other barriers
- The market/shops are not open
- There is no or limited water to use for handwashing
- The hand washing facilities/spaces are not available
- My household has no problem with handwashing
- I don’t know
- Other, Specify:

| SUGGESTED TOOL | Baseline/evaluation surveys
| POST DISTRIBUTION | Post distribution monitoring questionnaire
| DISAGGREGATE BY | Sex and age HoHH, Other vulnerability
| NOTES ON ANALYSIS | Calculate the total number of Households who respond yes to both questions 1-2. Divide by the total number of HHs asked to find the % of households with access to appropriate hygiene items and material for practicing adequate handwashing.

| SECTOR(S) | WASH
| INDICATOR | % of beneficiary households with adequate access to water for drinking, cooking, and personal and domestic hygiene at agreed standards
| HORIZON | C1B.23167

**Indicator Description**

**DEFINITION**
"Adequate access": Emergency WASH standards are usually set up by the Government or the national WASH cluster/sector coordination platform. If not, SPHERE standards can be applied.

**WHAT IT MEASURES**
This indicator measures the proportion of households that have access to adequate water for drinking and household use (cooking, cleaning, washing, hygiene).

**WHEN TO MEASURE**
Baseline or assessment before 1st cash/voucher is distributed
Evaluation after the last transfer, preferably within 30 days
You may also collect relevant data using bi-monthly/quarterly PDM surveys.

**HOW TO MEASURE IT**
**Approach 1:**
Q1. How many liters of water do you use in a day? (drinking, food, cooking, household hygiene) _____ liter per day
Given the difficulty of estimating the amount in a unit like “liters”, you may opt to adapt this question to the local context by using a more familiar standard of measurement (e.g.
bucket, jerry can, etc.). You will then need to convert this standard unit of measurement into liters.

**Q2. From which source(s)?** Possible sources:
- piped water into house
- piped water to yard/plot/outside house
- public stand post or tap
- surface water (river, creek, canal, irrigation channel, pond)
- tube well/borehole
- protected dug well
- unprotected dug well
- protected spring
- unprotected spring
- bottled/plastic packaged water
- water kiosk vendor
- water truck
- rainwater harvesting/catchment
- Other
- Do not know

**Approach 2:** If respondents are unlikely to know the number of litres (or other measurement) they use per day, consider using the questions below instead, which are not attached to standards but instead allow the respondents to judge whether or not they are meeting their water needs:

**Q3. Is your household currently able to meet your needs for clean, safe, drinking water?**
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

**Q4. Is your household currently able to meet your needs for water for domestic use (personal hygiene, cooking, washing)?**
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

**SUGGESTED TOOL**
Baseline/evaluation surveys
Post distribution monitoring questionnaire

**DISAGGREGATE BY**
Sex and age of HoHH, Other vulnerability

**NOTES ON ANALYSIS**
Approach 1: If using a HH survey, count the total individuals who answered Q1-2 in line with the relevant guidelines and divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to find the proportion or percentage.

Approach 2: If using self-reporting, count the total number of respondents who answered “yes” to both Q3-4 and divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to find the proportion or percentage.

**RELEVANT DONOR LINKS**
Similar indicator on ECHO’s Key Results Indicator (KRI) List (Number of people having access to sufficient and safe water for domestic use)

**GUIDANCE & MORE INFO**
This indicator can be partly self-reported by beneficiaries, but survey enumerators should be properly trained in WASH monitoring to interpret beneficiaries’ answers. When the standards are related to the quantity of water per person and per day, the survey enumerator should be able to calculate it based on the HH answers.
### Output and Process Indicators

#### POST-PAYMENT & UTILISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>HOW TO MEASURE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>OPTIMAL TIME TO MEASURE</th>
<th>DISAGGREGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of people assisted with cash/voucher</strong>&lt;br&gt;C4B.26118</td>
<td>The number of individual people assisted with (and directly benefiting from) cash/vouchers. This should include any members of recipient families who benefit from distributed multipurpose cash assistance (not only the head of household or person attending a distribution).</td>
<td>Count/sum the total number of individuals benefitting from cash/voucher assistance.</td>
<td>Financial and distribution records (e.g. receipt forms, digital tracking (LMMS), etc.)</td>
<td>Each distribution</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH (and family members for total people reach – MWG) Other vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total USD value or cash or vouchers transferred to beneficiaries</strong>&lt;br&gt;C4D.033173</td>
<td>Total value/amount of cash transferred to beneficiaries (or value of vouchers) as a total value ($USD or local currency)</td>
<td>Count/sum the total value of cash/voucher assistance provided to individuals with each distribution.</td>
<td>Bank and finance records</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount/value of vouchers redeemed by beneficiaries</strong>&lt;br&gt;C4D.033193</td>
<td>The value of all the redeemed vouchers at the contracted shops in exchange of approved goods and services ($USD or local currency)</td>
<td>Count/sum the total value of cash/voucher assistance provided to individuals that is withdrawn/utilized by program recipients.</td>
<td>Vendor sales records Bank and finance records</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Vendor Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of beneficiaries who withdraw the full amount of cash transfer value by end of cash assistance program</strong>&lt;br&gt;C4B.23225</td>
<td>Withdraw: take out of the bank, ATM, mobile money account/online account etc. Full amount of cash transfer value: the total cash transfer. This helps WV track if and when project beneficiaries are accessing all of their assistance.</td>
<td>Track balance of cash funds available per household/recipient using financial records from the FSP/bank. Review weekly/monthly bank/finance reports and count how many recipients have withdrawn the full amount of assistance at the end of each reporting period (e.g. quarterly, bi-annually, at project end)</td>
<td>Bank and finance records</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of households who withdraw less than the cash transfer value</strong>&lt;br&gt;C4B.19142</td>
<td>Withdraw: take out of the bank, ATM, mobile money account/online account etc. Less than the transfer value: any amount less than the total cash transfer. This helps WV track if and when project beneficiaries are accessing all of their assistance.</td>
<td>Track balance of cash funds available per household/recipient using financial records from the FSP/bank. Review weekly/monthly bank/finance reports and count how many recipients did not withdraw the full amount of assistance.</td>
<td>Bank and finance records</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of households who do not use the full voucher by end of project/transfer period</strong>&lt;br&gt;CSG.026347</td>
<td>Use: spend/utilize the cash value of the voucher provided</td>
<td>Track balance of vouchers distributed per household/recipient using financial records (from the bank and/or vendors). Review weekly/monthly bank/finance reports and count how many recipients did utilize the full amount of the voucher.</td>
<td>Vendor and/or Bank/finance records</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of households who received their cash transfers/vouchers in accordance with established timeline</strong>&lt;br&gt;C4B.19143</td>
<td>Received: got/obtained the cash/voucher Established timeline: the timeframe in which beneficiaries were informed that cash/vouchers would be provided</td>
<td>Q1. Did your household receive your cash or voucher entitlement on time? Yes/No Calculate the total number of respondents who select &quot;Yes&quot;. Divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the percentage.</td>
<td>PDM survey OSM survey</td>
<td>Monthly/Quarterly PDM or OSM at each distribution</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of households who report receiving the correct amount of cash transfers/vouchers</strong>&lt;br&gt;CSG.026348</td>
<td>Received: got/obtained the cash/voucher Correct amount: the amount of cash/voucher value that the recipient was told they would receive (by project staff/FSP)</td>
<td>1. Do you know the value of your cash/voucher entitlement? Yes No 2. If yes, what was your entitlement? ___ (in local currency) 3. During the most recent distribution, did you receive your full entitlement? Yes No</td>
<td>PDM survey OSM survey</td>
<td>Monthly/Quarterly PDM or OSM at each distribution</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACCESS INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>HOW TO MEASURE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>WHEN TO MEASURE</th>
<th>DISAGGREGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of households who save part of their income</td>
<td>C4D.030457</td>
<td>Saving: not using/spending part (or all) of household income</td>
<td>Q1. How much of your household income did you save last month? (insert relevant options in local currency)</td>
<td>PDM survey</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households who report experiencing any problem(s) related to getting their cash/voucher</td>
<td>CSG.026327</td>
<td>Problems related to getting their cash/voucher: This relates any issue or problem beneficiaries might face getting to/from a distribution point (e.g. hawala, FSP, office, bank branch, etc.) including: the time it takes to go/come, the cost of going/coming, security risks involved with going/coming, or other problems.</td>
<td>1. Did you face any problems related to getting your cash/voucher assistance? Yes/No</td>
<td>PDM survey</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># and % of households who report facing problems using their cash/voucher assistance</td>
<td>CSG.026327</td>
<td>Problems: any issue, challenge or difficulty Costs incurred: this includes costs/money spent on getting to/from the distribution/collection point OR getting to/from shops/markets where individuals can use the cash/voucher provided. These may be transportation costs or other opportunity costs (i.e. child care costs, loss of income due to missed work, etc.)</td>
<td>1. Did you face any problems related to using/spending your cash/voucher assistance? Yes/No</td>
<td>PDM survey</td>
<td>Age/Sex of HoHH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of households who report that they faced connectivity challenges to access their money during the last [online/mobile] payment process C5G.026326

Connectivity issues - this is in relation internet or telecommunications connectivity that impact peoples’ ability to access online accounts, mobile money transfers, send/receive funds, etc.

Q1. Did you face any difficulties or challenges due to connectivity that impacted your ability to access your cash/voucher assistance?
   Yes / No
Q2. If no, what issues did you face? (Allow space for free text, or offer options)
   Calculate the total number of respondents who select "Yes" and divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the percentage.

Average time spent traveling to and from the nearest market with available key commodities C5G.026328

Average time: the minutes/hours it takes project participants to reach a market(s) with the key commodities they need in sufficient quantity.

Key commodities: based on a consultative process, key commodities should be defined by the community. These will likely overlap with commodities included in a MEB.

Q1. How long (in minutes/hours- TBD based on context) did it take you to travel to the market where you can buy the key commodities you need?
   _______ Minutes OR insert relevant options.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner C5G.026225</th>
<th>Safe: Assistance prevents and minimizes as much as possible any unintended negative effects of the intervention which can increase people’s vulnerability to both physical and psychosocial risks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible: Aid agencies arrange for people’s access to assistance and services— in proportion to need and without any barriers (e.g. discrimination); and pay special attention to individuals and groups who may be particularly vulnerable or have difficulty accessing assistance and services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable: Aid agencies use power responsibly through an active commitment to include the people affected by humanitarian crises in decision-making and use appropriate mechanisms through which affected populations can measure the adequacy of interventions and address concerns and complaints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory: Beneficiaries and affected populations have been involved in the decision-making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Based on ECHO’s protection mainstreaming indicator guidance, include all 7 questions below:
  - Safe: Questions #5,6
  - Q5. Did you feel safe while receiving the assistance? Yes/No
  - Q6. Did you feel you were treated with respect by NGO staff during the intervention? Yes/No
  - Q6b. If not, please describe why not: (free text)

- Accessible: Questions #2,15
  - Q2. Was the assistance appropriate to your needs or those of the people affected by the intervention? Yes/No
  - Q15. Do you think there are people deserving who were excluded from the assistance? Yes/No

- Accountable: Questions #18,18.1
  - Q18. Have you or anyone you know in your community ever raised any concern on the assistance you received to the NGO using one of the above mechanisms? Yes / No
  - Q18.1. If yes, are you satisfied with the response you have received? Yes / No / Partially / Response never received

- Participatory: #1
  - Q1. Do you know of anyone in your community who has been consulted by the NGO on what needs are and how the NGO can best help? Yes/No

For each question individually, add up the total number of respondents who chose 'YES' and divide this by the total number of respondents who answered the question. This will give a % respondents who answered ‘Yes’ for each of the seven questions. This information is used to obtain scores for each question and to calculate a total mark for the group of surveyed beneficiaries. Refer to detailed scoring instructions here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1C2klQf99Gy4rG63w9h8NLCD5jfxv8/view.
different stages of the project, including needs assessment, project design, response, and monitoring; specific mechanisms are in place to enable beneficiaries and affected populations to provide feedback and complaints. Assistance supports the development of self-protection capacities and assists people to claim their rights.

| % of beneficiaries who know how to redeem vouchers/collect cash assistance | Q1. Do you know how to redeem your voucher/ access the cash assistance? Yes/No
| PDM Survey | TBD in line with programme implementation |

[For additional info] Q2. If “Somewhat” or “No”, what part of the voucher redemption/cash collection process is unclear? Insert relevant options or examples:

I don’t know how to withdraw money from an ATM, how to access funds from a FSP, etc.

| % of beneficiaries who are satisfied with the assistance provided | Q1. How satisfied are you with the assistance you received?

| PDM Survey | TBD in line with programme implementation |

Very satisfied / satisfied / rather unsatisfied / very unsatisfied

Q2. If “rather unsatisfied” or “very unsatisfied”, please describe why:

- I would prefer to receive vouchers/cash/in-kind (as relevant)
- I need more assistance
- I would prefer to receive assistance at different time(s)

| % of the target beneficiaries who are aware of the available complaints response mechanism | Q1. Were you informed about the complaints response mechanism for this project?

| PDM Survey/ OSM Survey | TBD in line with programme implementation |

- Yes
- No
- Don’t remember

Q2. [Optional for additional info] If yes, which channel for providing information about the CRM did you find most useful? (select one – modify as relevant to local context)

- Face to face
- Radio
- TV
- PA system/megaphones
- Printed materials (flyers, leaflets)
- Social media (fb, WhatsApp)
- Phone (calls/SMS)
- Other – please give details

| % of beneficiaries who are satisfied with the complaints and feedback mechanism | Q1. Are you satisfied with the following aspects of the complaints and feedback mechanism?

| PDM Survey | TBD in line with programme implementation |

Yes/No for each of the suggested categories:

I) Information provided about the CRM;
II) Communication channels used to provide information about the CRM;
III) Communication channels available to submit complaints or feedback;
IV) Timeliness of the response to your complaint/feedback.

Q2. If no, what would increase your level of satisfaction? (give space for each category - Free text)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries who are satisfied with the distribution process (CSG.026331)</th>
<th>Q1. How satisfied are you with the distribution process for the cash/voucher assistance you received?</th>
<th>TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions)</th>
<th>Age Sex Vulnerability group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. If &quot;rather unsatisfied&quot; or &quot;very unsatisfied&quot;, please describe why: ______ (free text).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. I was treated poorly by WV staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. There were no safety measures at the distribution (e.g. social distancing, handwashing, sanitizer, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculate the total number of respondents who select &quot;very satisfied&quot; or &quot;satisfied&quot; and divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the percentage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries who report that agents/Financial Service Providers (FSPs) treated them with respect (CSG.026332)</th>
<th>Q1. How were you treated by FSP representatives/agents? (or modify the indicator to ask about other individuals/entities who may have been involved in cash/voucher disbursement or utilization)</th>
<th>TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions)</th>
<th>Age Sex Vulnerability group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was treated respectfully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was treated with indifference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was treated disrespectfully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | Count all the people who answer "I was treated respectfully", divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries who report that World Vision or partner staff treated them with respect (CSG.026333)</th>
<th>Q1. How were you treated by World Vision (or partner name) representatives?</th>
<th>TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions)</th>
<th>Age Sex Vulnerability group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was treated respectfully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was treated with indifference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | Count all the people who answer "I was treated respectfully", divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries who report that they were informed/aware of the key information about World Vision (CSA.26164)</th>
<th>Q1. Were you informed of the following information about World Vision? Yes/No for each category: 1. Information about what/who World Vision is 2. Expected WV staff behaviour 3. How to complain and give feedback 4. WV programmes and activities</th>
<th>TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions)</th>
<th>Age Sex Vulnerability group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2. (Optional for additional info) Of the channels used to share information about WV, which one did you find most useful? (select one – modify as relevant to local context)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face to face.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA system/megaphones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printed materials (flyers, leaflets).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media (fb, WhatsApp).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone (calls/SMS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other – please give details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculate the total number of respondents who say &quot;Yes&quot; for each category used divided by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the percentage for that category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To report on this indicator, take the average percentage across the four main categories to combine the averages for the 'overall' level of awareness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries who report that they were</th>
<th>Q1. Were you informed of the following project information? Yes/No for each category: 1. the transfer value you would receive.</th>
<th>TBD in line with programme implementation</th>
<th>Age Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

average % across the various categories to combine the averages for an 'overall' satisfaction with CRM.
**DO NO HARM INDICATORS**

*Before including these indicators and/or asking these questions it is important to consider Do No Harm principles and ensure you are not putting anyone at risk, or if there are better ways to capture the needed information in your context. Work with a protection colleague and/or DNH specialist to identify appropriate questions and the best way forward.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of beneficiaries who report experiencing increased tensions as a result of CVP</th>
<th>Increase in tension: may be felt or perceived and related to any aspect of daily life, including decision-making, roles/responsibilities, attitude/behaviour</th>
<th>Try to speak to different members of the HH (not just the HoHH) if the situation/context allows without risk of doing harm.</th>
<th>PDM Survey</th>
<th>TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions)</th>
<th>Age, Sex, Vulnerability group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Do you believe that receiving cash/voucher assistance has increased tensions in any way?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Q1b. If yes, within your household or within your community?</td>
<td>- Within my household</td>
<td>PDM Survey</td>
<td>Monthly/Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Do you believe that receiving cash/voucher assistance has increased tensions in any way?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Q1c. If within the community, between who:</td>
<td>- People who received assistance and those who did not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Do you believe that receiving cash/voucher assistance has increased tensions in any way?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>- People who received different amounts of assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### % of beneficiaries who report decreased trust within their community as a result of the cash/voucher programme

This indicator relates to the perception of individuals about the level of trust between community members, whether between different people who are all receiving assistance, or people who are receiving assistance with those who are not, or others.

- People within the same family/household
- Other, specify:
  - Q1d. If yes within the community, please explain/describe why (free text, or provide some options). Examples:
    - People think selection criteria is unfair
    - People think assistance should be provided to everyone
    - People think other people are not truthful about their situation
    - Other (describe)

Calculate the total number of respondents who say “Yes” to Q1 and divide by the total number of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the percentage.

| Q1. Have you noticed any changes in the level of trust amongst different community members or groups since the project started? | Yes | No |
| Q2. If yes, were these changes negative or positive? | Negative | Positive |
| Q2a. If negative, please describe: ______ | |
| Q2b. If positive, please describe: ______ | |
| Q3. If yes, were these changes related to the cash/voucher project? | Yes | No |
| Q3a. If yes, how so? (describe)________________________ | |

Count the total number of individuals who responded “Yes” to Q1 and “Negative” to Q2 and “yes” to Q3. Divide by the total number of respondents and multiply by 100 to get the %.

**PDM survey**

TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions, volatility)

**Suggested:** Monthly/Quarterly

| Age | Sex | Vulnerability group |

### % of beneficiaries who perceive the project as benefiting different groups within the community equally

This indicator refers to how individuals view the targeting and selection process for project inclusion and whether or not the project aids/helps different people and groups in an equal and fair way.

Q1. Do you think this project assists people of different nationality, age, sex, religion, and socio-economic status within the community equally?
- Yes/No for each category:
  - nationality
  - age
  - sex
  - religion
  - socio-economic status
  - other as relevant

Q2. If no, which group (or groups) of people benefit differently? [insert relevant options or leave free text]

Q2b. How so (please describe): ______ (free text)

Count the total number of respondents who answer “Yes” to Q1 and divide by the total # of respondents. Multiply by 100 to get the %.

**PDM Survey**

TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions, volatility)

**Suggested:** Monthly/Quarterly

| Age | Sex | Vulnerability group |

### #/frequency of reports of cash, voucher and/or in-kind being diverted to unintended recipients/actors

This indicator aims to track if there are incidents of cash/voucher (or in-kind) diversion from project recipients to other, unintended recipients (e.g. any person/group party to a conflict – armed groups, combatants, etc.)

Q1. Have you heard of anyone giving, or being forced to give, all or part of their cash/voucher/in-kind assistance to another person or group?
- Yes, I heard of someone giving assistance by choice to another person/group
- Yes, I heard of someone being forced to give their assistance to another person/group
- No

Q2. If yes, to whom/which group?
- (insert relevant options or leave free text)

Track the total number of “yes” responses to Q1 and any accounts mentioned in KIIs.

**PDM Survey**

TBD in line with programme implementation (duration, frequency of distributions, volatility)

**Suggested:** Monthly/Quarterly

| Age | Sex | Vulnerability group |

### #/frequency of reports of cash, voucher and/or in-kind being diverted to unintended recipients/actors

| CSG.026339 | CSG.026338 | CSG.026339 |
## MARKET INDICATORS

| **# of critical market actors directly assisted through market system rehabilitation activities**<br>CSG.031335 | market actors: includes producers, suppliers, traders, or processors that have directly received cash, access to finance, or training to help them restart or improve their market function. Critical market actors will be defined in your project, but refers to market actors who perform essential functions to a market system that plays a major role in disaster-affected people’s survival or livelihoods and who are not able to perform these functions as needed because of the disaster. These actors might be anywhere in the value chain and may or may not directly interact with the ultimate beneficiaries of the project (the most affected/most vulnerable). | Count the number of market actors who directly received program assistance (small loans/grants, training, etc.). Work with the program manager to determine who constitutes a market actor for the purposes of this indicator. | Quarterly/ Bi-annually | Project records | n/a | n/a |

| **# of key commodities (by type) in markets that show price shifts of more than the predefined trigger amount**<br>CSG.026340 | Key commodities: based on a consultative process, key commodities should be defined by the community. These will likely overlap with commodities included in a MEB. Price shift: a change in the unit price of goods/items- for this indicator, a price shift of X% in either direction (increase or decrease in price) should be tracked/counted. The % change may be based on guidelines from technical colleagues, coordination groups, etc. | Use a market monitoring survey to monitor the cost of key commodities on a regular basis (TBD based on context and expected level of fluctuation). Each week/month collect the price for a standard unit of the commodity (e.g. 1kg, 1 packet, etc.) and compare costs across time. Calculate price shifts. Count the number of key commodities with price shift of more than X% and divide by the total number of key commodities. Multiply by 100. | TBD based on context/ volatility | MarkKit/ Price monitoring tool | Weekly/Monthly | By market/good/ item (or category of goods/items) | By market place |

| **Average % change in supply of key commodities (by type) during the reporting period**<br>CSG.026341 | Key commodities: based on a consultative process, key commodities should be defined by the community. These will likely overlap with commodities included in a MEB. Supply: refers to the amount of stock vendors/shop keepers have of key commodities that can be sold/be available for consumers, usually measured in a standard way (e.g. KGs, Boxes, Packets, etc.) | Use a market monitoring survey to monitor the supply of key commodities on a regular basis (TBD based on context and expected level of fluctuation). Each week/month collect the stock availability of key commodities in a standardized sample of stores/vendors and compare over time. Take the average % change from each monitoring period to show the trends. | TBD based on context/ volatility | MarkKit/ Price monitoring tool | Weekly/Monthly | By market/good/ item (or category of goods/items) | By market place |

| **Number of key commodities that are available in the different markets**<br>Use price monitoring toolkit | Key commodities: based on a consultative process, key commodities should be defined by the community. These will likely overlap with commodities included in a MEB (where it is used) Different types of markets: source markets, central markets, local markets, etc. | Use a market monitoring survey to monitor the availability of key commodities on a regular basis (TBD based on context and expected level of fluctuation). Each week/month ask about the availability of key commodities in a standardized sample of stores/vendors and compare the number of key commodities that are in supply over time, across different market types. | TBD based on context/ volatility | MarkKit/ Price monitoring tool | Weekly/Monthly | By market/good/ item (or category of goods/items) | By market type (source, central, local) |

| **Price of key commodities in different types of markets**<br>Use price monitoring toolkit | Price: cost per unit (unit TBD locally or in line with working group/cluster agreement) Key commodities: based on a consultative process, key commodities should be defined by the community. These will likely overlap with commodities included in a MEB (where it is used) Different types of markets: source markets, central markets, local markets, etc. | Use a market monitoring survey to monitor the prices of key commodities (per standard measurement, e.g. $/kilo, $/package) on a regular basis (TBD based on context and expected level of fluctuation). Each week/month ask about the unit price of key commodities in a standardized sample of stores/vendors and compare over time, across different market types. | TBD based on context/ volatility | MarkKit/ Price monitoring tool | Weekly/Monthly | By market/good/ item (or category of goods/items) | By market type (course, central, local) |

| **Quality of key commodities in different type of markets**<br>Use price monitoring toolkit | Quality: standard of items as compared against other items in similar vendors/markets Key commodities: based on a consultative process, key commodities should be defined by the community. These will likely overlap with commodities included in a MEB. Different types of markets: source markets, central markets, local markets, etc. | Use a market monitoring survey to monitor the quality of key commodities on a regular basis (TBD based on context and expected level of fluctuation) through observation or production standards as defined by cluster/working group, Sphere, etc. Each week/month observe the quality of key commodities in a standardized sample of stores/vendors and compare over time, across different market types. | TBD based on context/ volatility | MarkKit/ Price monitoring tool | Weekly/Monthly | By market/good/ item (or category of goods/items) | By market type (course, central, local) |

---

For additional information or questions, please reach out to:

1. Marieta Fitzcharles, CVP MEAL Advisor – Marieta_Fitzcharles@wvi.org
2. Belete Temesgen, CVP Technical Director – Belete_Temesgen@wvi.org