

Auditor's Report for ALCP2


on compliance with the DCED Standard for Results Measurement

13 January 2025

1. Overview

Programme	Alliances Caucasus 2 (ALCP2)	
Audit visit dates	11-15 November 2024	
Overall final ratings ¹	MUST	586/600=98%
	RECOMMENDED	261/270=97%
Coverage	The audit covered all of the ALCP2 programme. All three outcomes were checked and a representative sample of sectors.	
	All control points were checked.	
DCED Standard	Version VIII, April 2017	

Signed:



Helen Bradbury
Team Leader, ALCP2

Date / place

January 16th 2025/Marneuli

Auditor:



Alexandra Miehlsbradt

13 January 2025 / Auckland

Date /place

¹ An overall rating of 100% implies that the project meets the compliance criteria and has a strong measurement system of acceptable quality within the boundaries of what the programme has set itself to measure, not that it is has a perfect measurement system.

Table of Contents

1. Overview	1
2. Summary of the Programme and Results Measurement System	3
3. Summary of the Audit Process.....	6
4. Summary of Findings.....	8
5. Summary of Key Areas for Improvement	16
Annexes.....	17

Acronyms

ALCP2	Alliances Caucasus 2
CHF	Swiss Francs
DCED	Donor Committee for Enterprise Development
FS&H	Food Safety and Health
GBU	Georgian Beekeepers Union
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
IA	Impact Assessment
MAP	Monitoring Action Plan (meeting)
MRM	Monitoring and Results Measurement
MSD	Market Systems Development
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise
NAIC	Net Attributable Income Change
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
USD	United States Dollar
WEE	Women's Economic Empowerment
WRU	Women's Room Union

2. Summary of the Programme and Results Measurement System

2.1 Summary of Alliances Caucasus 2²

Alliances Caucasus 2 (ALCP2) is a market systems development programme funded by a consortium of donors: the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC). The programme runs from May 2022 to April 2026 with a budget of 6 million CHF. ALCP2 targets rural producers in Georgia. Its purpose is to increase incomes and improve livelihoods through better, sustainable productivity, resilient market access, local employment opportunities and more equitable inclusion in local natural resource use.

Implemented through the lens of environmental sustainability and Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI), ALCP2 seeks to augment the lives of rural inhabitants through developing their knowledge of the value of rural resources and the potentiality of the environment in which they live. The programme aims to increase their participation in decision making concerning these resources and the availability of knowledge, inputs and skills to enable them to profit sustainably from them. ALCP 2 collaborates with all levels of the private sector, civil society and government. It works across Georgia in Kvemo Kartli, Samstkhe Javakheti, Ajara and Kakheti and includes a new focus in this phase on Western Georgia: Samegrelo, Guria, Racha and Imereti. It also promotes regional trade and initiatives in information and equitable access to decision making between Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Alliances began in pilot form in 2008 in Samstkhe Javakheti, Georgia. In 2011, the programme added a second region, Kvemo Kartli. In 2014, the Alliances Lesser Caucasus Programme (ALCP) was started, building on the pilot and expanding into Adjara. ALCP2 builds on this programme. Throughout the programme's tenure, the management team has strived to embed MSD concepts within its development: flexibility, adaptation to context, iterative results measurement, rigorous ongoing market intelligence, sensible resource use, in house capacity and commitment to inclusivity and sustainability.

2.2 Key features of the results measurement system

The ALCP2 Results Measurement system is designed for:³

- ❖ Measuring programme progress against objectives
- ❖ Usage as an internal programme management tool
- ❖ Informing interventions and learning
- ❖ Feeding into and satisfying donor reporting requirements
- ❖ Learning broad lessons from the MSD programming
- ❖ Recording, measuring and analysing system change to inform strategy and programming.

Defining features of the ALCP2 results measurement system are triangulation and collaboration. The programme has a 'formal' results measurement process that each intervention follows from design, through monitoring, impact assessment and reporting. This process is documented in MRM outputs that guide and inform interventions and strategy. Alongside this 'formal' results measurement process, the ALCP2 team conducts extensive monitoring of activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts as well as the evolution of the context at national, regional, local and sectoral levels, which staff members

² Adapted from the ALCP2 Annual Report July 1st 2023 to June 30th 2024

³ From the ALCP2 Results Measurement Manual, 2024

consider as part of ongoing gathering of market intelligence. The two processes – ‘formal’ results measurement and gathering market intelligence, inform each other, enabling extensive triangulation of information on results and the factors contributing to change in the sectors ALCP2 targets. The two processes also go hand in hand, promoting daily interaction between the implementation and results measurement teams. The interaction ensures that information gathering and the interpretation of findings is both informed by those most involved – the implementation team – and scrutinised by an ‘outside eye’ – the results measurement team.

The programme management, specifically the Team Leader and Deputy Team Leader, are intimately involved in both the results measurement process and the market intelligence gathering process. Their role encompasses a wide range of responsibilities from helping the sector teams frame market research and impact assessments, to guiding the interpretation of findings, using information in management, and quality control of MRM outputs.

Market intelligence and results measurement in ALCP2 start with sector market research. This research was conducted in the first six months of ALCP2 to deepen market research from the previous phase, particularly on new regions, value chains, key market actors and target groups. Guided by their knowledge of each sector, the team develops interventions with market actors. These are defined relatively broadly to address an opportunity and related constraints, usually through multiple partnerships. The team develops the following for each intervention:

- A results chain that outlines the expected causal links between the programme’s activities with partners, partner and other market actor outputs, outcomes in the market system and impacts for rural producers and inhabitants. Used as a thinking tool, the results chain goes through multiple drafts as part of intervention design.
- An intervention description summarising the intervention time frame, entry point, goals and activities.
- An investment plan with each contractual partner that describes the partner, their operating model, what they aim to achieve and what the partner and the programme will do together to enable the partner to achieve that.
- A business model showing the sustainable relationships and roles that the intervention is designed to enable.
- The intervention rationale that details the thinking behind the results chain and explains key considerations in the intervention including mitigating displacement, promoting systemic changes and addressing GESI.
- Three monitoring plans: activity monitoring, quantitative monitoring and qualitative monitoring; the plans outline indicators, sources, timelines and methods for MRM as well as targets underpinned by the market research, investment plans and other research as needed.

Monitoring starts as soon as activities start. It primarily encompasses two approaches: 1) extensive interaction with the partner market actors and gathering data from them on their operations and interactions with rural producers and other market actors, and 2) periodically gathering quantitative and qualitative information from rural producers and other market actors. These approaches are supplemented by others if needed.

The team conducts an impact assessment once sufficient impact is detected through monitoring – typically an early impact assessment to understand preliminary results and a later one to see how results are maturing. Impact assessments are tailored to the interventions and results as indicated by

monitoring. They may cover part of an intervention, a whole intervention or several interventions depending on information needs and the synergy among interventions. However, the results measurement team ensures that the impact of all interventions is assessed in a timely manner. Impact assessments build on an understanding of causality developed during monitoring by using methods to assess the attribution of observed changes to programme activities.

The implementation and results measurement teams look out for signs of system changes, such as other market actors crowding in or responding to innovations, in all monitoring and field interactions. If a sign is found, the results measurement team follows up to validate the change and assess attribution to the programme. The same approach is used for identifying unexpected results, which are validated and logged if they are positive or addressed if they are negative.

As mentioned above, this MRM process is enriched by a range of other monitoring and intelligence gathering. The team uses a wide range of approaches for gathering information, such as field visits, training assessments, monitoring relevant websites, sector social media and group chats, mini-surveys, interviews in person and by phone, extensive conversations with partners, tracking media stories and reading government and industry body publications.

GESI is a part of all interventions and is incorporated throughout the MRM system. All quantitative indicators with people or households as the unit of analysis are disaggregated by gender. Qualitative information related to access and, in some cases, agency for women is gathered through monitoring interviews and impact assessments with rural producers and other market actors. ALCP2 also plans to conduct special GESI studies, as they have in previous phases, to gain a deeper understanding of GESI issues at the household level, because this type of questioning involves a different approach to typical impact assessments.

The information gathered is collated and analysed on an on-going basis to inform interventions and strategies. ALCP2 has a formal 'Monitoring Action Plan' (MAP) meetings with all team members roughly every three months to discuss progress and adapt strategies. MAP meetings are complemented by frequent meetings on individual interventions or sectors to use findings to adapt, scale up or wind down interventions and inform strategy adjustments.

The results measurement team aggregates quantitative results across interventions twice per year for analysis and reporting, taking into account the overlap in those reached by multiple interventions. Reported impacts are based on impact assessments when they have been carried out. For the impacts of interventions that have not yet been assessed, the impacts are conservatively estimated based on partner market actor data, previous research and monitoring. The qualitative information from monitoring is used to deepen understanding of, and reporting on results and causality.

2.3 Evolution of the results measurement system

The Alliances Results Measurement System has been developed in accordance with the DCED Results Measurement Standard since 2011. The programme has passed audits according to the DCED Standard twice, in 2013 and 2017.⁴

⁴ The audit report from 2013 can be found [here](#) and the audit report from 2017 can be found [here](#).

3. Summary of the Audit Process

ALCP2 was audited under Version 8 of the DCED Results Measurement Standard, published in April 2017.

ALCP2 focuses on three outcomes and works in six sectors through 14 interventions (including 'cross-cutting' interventions). The sampling focused on outcomes first as ALCP2 considers these as the main way to organise interventions. These outcomes are:

1. Rural producers in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan increase profitability and sustainability thanks to access to targeted services and inputs.
2. Rural producers in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan strengthen their resilience in the market system and increase their income thanks to reliable access to diversified opportunities from sustainable MSMEs' sourcing value added rural products.
3. Rural producers benefit from equitable inclusion in sustainable local development.

The sampling also considered sectors to ensure coverage was representative. Finally, the sampling considered budget allocation and including a sufficient number of interventions for which ALCP2 has conducted a full impact assessment. To accommodate all these considerations, the sampling was fully purposive and is described below.

First, one intervention was excluded because it is a pilot and currently only has draft results measurement documentation:

Outcome 2	Silk	Increased volume and value-added silk production (<i>Pilot intervention</i>)
-----------	------	--

As there are three outcomes, all three were chosen for the sample. For each outcome, the square root of the number of interventions was taken for the sample, rounding down and with a minimum of two. This resulted in two interventions per outcome.

For Outcome 3, there are only two interventions, therefore both were chosen. For Outcome 2, one intervention had the highest budget of the portfolio by a substantial margin and was thus chosen. The second intervention chosen was the only one with an impact assessment done on activities during this phase. For Outcome 1, the intervention with a completed impact assessment was chosen. The second intervention was chosen to ensure adequate representation by sector, as the other interventions in Outcome 1 were in sectors for which there were already two interventions chosen.

The resulting sample covers all three outcomes and four out of six sectors. Three out of six interventions chosen have undergone an impact assessment. The sample is shown below:

Outcome	Sector	Intervention Name	ALCP2 Budget (USD)	Start Date	Intervention Status
Outcome 1	Honey	Strengthening the Georgian Beekeepers Union (GBU)	37,083	15/03/2023	On-going; first IA done
Outcome 1	Dairy	Access to climate smart inputs: vet input supplier ROKI Ltd	39,847	05/01/2023	On-going
Outcome 2	Pigs	Regional product production: Lori & Sashki	276,521	19/09/2023	On-going
Outcome 2	Honey	Increased volume and value-added honey production	151,461	24/07/2023	On-going; first IA done

Outcome	Sector	Intervention Name	ALCP2 Budget (USD)	Start Date	Intervention Status
Outcome 3	Cross-cutting	Access to public funds and organisational strengthening of the Women's Rooms Union	24,252	23/03/2023	On-going; first IA done
Outcome 3	Cross-cutting	Sustainable local development in Adjara region	13,431	29/03/2023	On-going

For each intervention in the sample, the auditor reviewed relevant documents including the sector market research, investment plans, results chain, measurement plan (including intervention summary, business model, rationale and monitoring plans), attribution strategy, monitoring questionnaires and transcripts, partner data, baseline data, supporting data for reporting and selected other reports and documents. When available, the auditor also reviewed the impact assessment questionnaire and impact assessment report. At the programme level, the auditor reviewed a range of documents including the programme strategic framework, logical framework, organizational structure, staff terms of reference, annual and bi-annual reports, results measurement manual, data aggregation workbook, annual targets, annual plan, learning plan, technology plan, MAP meeting minutes, systemic change log, GESI analysis, advocacy initiatives, spending projections, and various supporting documents. A full list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex 3.

During the visit to ALCP2, the auditor interviewed the programme management, results measurement manager and team, GESI team and financial manager to understand the MRM system as a whole. For each intervention, the auditor interviewed the implementation team, relevant managers and relevant results measurement staff members. A full list of interviews is provided in Annex 4.

The audit scored against all control points. However, selected compliance criteria in the Standard were not applicable and were not scored. Specifically:

- 4.2.5 Plans to collect, analyse and assess expected systemic change and effect at the beneficiary level are appropriate (considering the context and expected systemic change) and in accordance with good research practices.
- 4.2.7 Results of expected systemic change on beneficiaries are assessed using good research practices, and take attribution into account.

These compliance criteria were not applicable because it is too early for ALCP2 to design and conduct impact assessments that include assessment of the effects of systemic changes on beneficiaries. These assessments are expected to start in the next year.

4. Summary of Findings

ALCP2 scored 98% (586 out of a possible 600 points) for 'must' compliance criteria and 97% (261 out of possible 270 points) for 'recommended' compliance criteria. As noted above, some compliance criteria in the Standard are not applicable for ALCP2 and were not scored. Hence, the maximum 'recommended' scores have been adjusted to exclude the compliance criteria that were not scored.

Table 2 summarises the scores for each section of the DCED Standard. Detailed scores are outlined in **Annex 1**. Note that the numbers and percentages do not always appear to match due to rounding.

*Table 1: Scores by DCED Standard Section
(disaggregated mandatory and recommended compliance criteria)*

		Total maximum	Total actual	%
Section 1: Articulating the results chain	Must	80	78	98%
	Rec	15	15	98%
Section 2: Defining indicators and other information needs	Must	80	78	97%
	Rec	45	44	98%
Section 3: Measuring attributable change	Must	205	201	98%
	Rec	80	79	99%
Section 4: Measuring systemic change	Must	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Rec	70	70	100%
Section 5: Tracking costs and impact	Must	55	51	93%
	Rec	20	13	65%
Section 6: Reporting results and costs	Must	50	48	96%
	Rec	40	40	100%
Section 7: Managing the results measurement system	Must	130	130	100%
	Rec	N/A	N/A	N/A
Totals	Must	600	586	98%
	Recommended	270	261	97%

The following sub-sections outline the scores for each control point and summarise the findings according to the strengths and weaknesses of ALCP2 results measurement per section. More detailed findings for each outcome are outlined in **Annex 2**.

4.1 Section 1: Articulating the results chain

Table 2: Score: Articulating the results chain

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score ⁵
1.1	An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each intervention.	M	20	19
1.2	Each intervention results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis	M	15	15
1.3	Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities.	M	25	25
1.4	The intervention results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players and the programme circumstances.	M	20	19
1.5	Each intervention results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis on gender.	R	5	5
1.6	Each results chain is supported by research and analysis that considers the risk of displacement.	R	10	10

Strengths	Weaknesses
The interventions have results chains that illustrate how the intervention is expected to lead to development goals and are mostly logical and sufficiently detailed.	In some cases, there is a change step missing in an intervention results chain, the links shown are insufficiently clear to adequately assess causality, there are two changes in a box that are not sufficiently related and/or who is expected to do what is not clear in a box.
Staff members can identify risks from external factors that could affect the expected results from interventions, and these are usually documented in programme documents. Intervention results chains are underpinned by clear and convincing evidence that demonstrates the link between each intervention and the programme and relevant sector strategy. There is also clear and convincing evidence to support the links between changes outlined in results chains for almost all aspects of the interventions.	For some interventions, the external assumptions and risks mentioned by staff members that may affect the achievement of results are not clearly documented. In one intervention, there is limited, documented evidence to underpin the expected changes related service provision in the results chain.
Mid and senior level programme staff can describe the results chains relevant to their work and use them regularly to guide and analyse their work.	

⁵ The scores are rounded. Scores to two decimal places are provided in Annex 1.

Strengths	Weaknesses
The results chains are regularly reviewed (at least annually) and updated to reflect changes in the intervention activities or expected results.	In one intervention, several key changes to the intervention have not been adequately reflected in the results chain.
Intervention results chains are underpinned by clear and convincing evidence demonstrating that gender has been considered in intervention design.	
For almost all interventions, the risk of displacement at the beneficiary level has been considered in the design of the intervention.	In one intervention, the risk of displacement at the beneficiary level has not been sufficiently considered in the design of the intervention.

4.2 Section 2: Defining indicators of change and other information needs

Table 3: Score: defining indicators of change and other needs

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
2.1	There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each change described in the results chain(s).	M	10	10
2.2	Qualitative information on how and why changes are occurring is defined for each intervention.	M	30	28
2.3	A small number of indicators at the impact level can be aggregated across the programme.	M	20	20
2.4	There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results.	M	10	10
2.5	Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress.	M	10	10
2.6	There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of gender differentiated results.	R	10	10
2.7	Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators to appropriate dates.	R	35	34

Strengths	Weaknesses
Indicators have been defined to measure all the changes in the results chains, with almost all of them being sufficiently clear, specific and relevant.	Occasionally, the indicators for a results chain box are not sufficient to cover the changes described in the box. Selected qualitative indicators are statements of progress, rather than indicators, and a few qualitative questions are positively biased.
Documented, qualitative information needs mostly provide sufficient understanding of how and why changes are occurring and, where they do not, appropriate questions are asked in practice.	In some interventions, documented, qualitative indicators do not address why changes are happening or not happening for selected market actors.

Strengths	Weaknesses
The monitoring plans for each intervention include appropriate impact indicators (from the logframe) that are aggregated across the programme for reporting.	
There are specific, measurable and relevant quantitative and qualitative indicators to assess the sustainability of results for all interventions and almost all relevant aspects within each intervention. Where these are missing in documents, additional questions on sustainability are asked in practice.	For one intervention, documented indicators for the sustainability of behaviour improvements for one market actor are missing.
Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators for the intervention results chains.	
Specific, measurable and relevant indicators to assess changes, differentiated by gender, have been defined.	
Projections for quantitative results have been developed when appropriate and are supported by adequate research and analysis. The projections are reviewed regularly.	For some interventions, assumptions and calculations underpinning the projections are not documented; in one intervention, the unit of some projections does not match the unit of the results.

4.3 Section 3: Measuring attributable change

Table 4: Score: Measuring attributable change

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
3.1	Baseline information on all key indicators is collected.	M	60	60
3.2	Monitoring information on all key indicators is collected.	M	60	60
3.3	Impact assessment is conducted to assess attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains using methods that conform to established good practice.	M	60	57
3.4	The programme implements processes to use information from monitoring and results measurement in management of interventions and decision making.	M	25	25
3.5	The programme has a system for assessing and understanding differentiated results by gender.	R	60	59
3.6	The programme monitors to identify unintended effects.	R	20	20

Strengths	Weaknesses
Plans to collect baseline information for all interventions and relevant market actors are thorough, realistic and timely. Baseline information has mostly been collected as planned.	For one intervention, the beneficiary baseline gathered during an impact assessment relied on an insufficient sample size. For another intervention, gathering baseline data on beneficiaries is overdue.
Monitoring plans specify appropriate tools and processes and take attribution into account for all parts of the results chains. Monitoring is timely, sufficiently thorough, uses good research practices including strong triangulation, and includes appropriate assessment of attribution for all relevant actors including rural producers.	For one intervention, the documentation of planned monitoring has some discrepancies in planned timing for data collection and the intervention start date.
Plans to assess impact for rural producers and other market actors are sufficiently thorough, realistic and in accordance with good research practices. The impact assessments conducted to date were timely and used good research practices. Calculations of impact were properly made based on the study data.	In the honey sector impact assessment, the beneficiary survey did not verify behaviour changes after the intervention started, reducing the rigour of the assessment of attribution. Qualitative information gathering did not sufficiently address this gap. The sample size related to one honey intervention was insufficient.
Mid and senior level staff members can describe the processes ALCP2 uses to feed the findings of MRM into decision-making and provided examples of decisions made using MRM information to inform the management of all interventions and programme strategy.	
The plans to assess and understand differentiated results by gender are relevant and appropriate. Gender differentiated results have been collected and reported.	For the honey impact assessment, the findings on net attributable income change (NAIC) for women beekeepers were based on insufficient data; additional measures were not taken during the impact assessment to verify if women's and men's earnings are different.
Monitoring includes approaches to identify significant unintended positive and negative effects. When these were found, programme staff used the information to review and adjust interventions as necessary.	

4.4 Section 4: Capturing wider changes in the system or market

Table 5: Score: capturing wider changes in the system or market

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
4.1	The programme has an overall plan for assessing systemic changes at programme level.	R	10	10
4.2	Systemic changes are assessed at market systems level and beneficiary level using appropriate methods.	R	60	60

Strengths	Weaknesses
The programme has defined an approach for assessing systemic changes among market actors and beneficiaries in its Results Measurement Manual.	
The pathway of expected systemic changes has been outlined for all interventions and there are appropriate plans in place to assess these changes. Programme staff have identified and logged systemic changes at the market actor level, which have then been verified using good research practices and attribution has been appropriately assessed.	

4.5 Section 5: Tracking costs and impact

Table 6: Score: Tracking costs and impact

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
5.1	Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	M	20	20
5.2	Programme-wide impact is clearly and appropriately aggregated.	M	35	31
5.3	Costs are allocated by major component of the programme.	R	20	13

Strengths	Weaknesses
ALCP2 has a system to track programme related expenditure annually and cumulatively. Expenditure is reported in each annual and bi-annual report.	
ALCP2 has a thorough system for aggregating its logframe impact indicators, which considers potential overlaps among interventions; the Results Measurement Coordinator can explain related calculations and assumptions. Aggregated impacts are reported annually, supported by extensive endnotes explaining data sources for each indicator. Quality control measures have detected and corrected errors.	The aggregation system often relies on manually cutting and pasting figures (rather than linking spreadsheets), which introduces potential for mistakes. The workbook sheets are not clearly organised for an outsider and not all calculations and assumptions are documented.
ALCP2 has a system to estimate expenditure per Outcome, to match its results reporting per Outcome. Reports include the ALCP2 cost contribution to each partnership which are numbered according to outcomes, and costs per service contracts some of which reference an outcome.	Expenditure is not reported per Outcome in the annual reports, because it is not required. A reader would need to aggregate figures across partnerships and service contracts to estimate the programme's external costs per outcome.

4.6 Section 6: Reporting costs and results

Table 7: Score: Reporting costs and results

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
6.1	The programme produces a report at least annually which describes results to date.	M	50	48
6.2	Results of gender impact are reported.	R	10	10
6.3	Results of systemic change are reported.	R	20	20
6.4	Results are published.	R	10	10

Strengths	Weaknesses
ALCP2 produces a report bi-annually that provides thorough information on progress and achievements, and explains how, why and for whom changes are occurring. The reports consistently explain the contributions of other programmes/organisations that work with or finance ALCP2 partners.	In the context of 47 reported quantitative indicators in the 2023-24 annual report, there are three for which the figures presented do not align well with the indicator – two at the output level and one at the outcome level.
The bi-annual reports disaggregate results by gender when the unit of analysis is people or households and also include qualitative descriptions of results in relation to women's economic empowerment (WEE) and gender equality.	
The bi-annual reports describe quantitative and qualitative evidence of systemic changes at the market actor level. Qualitative examples of the impacts of systemic change on beneficiaries are cited; quantitative data will be added once measured.	
All ALCP2 annual and bi-annual reports are publicly available in the programme's extensive online library.	

4.7 Section 7: Managing the system for results measurement

Table 8: Score: Managing the system for results measurement

No.	Control points	Must/ Recommended	Std max. score	Actual score
7.1	The programme has a clear system for using information from the results measurement system in management and decision-making.	M	30	30
7.2	The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.	M	50	50
7.3	The system is well managed and integrated with programme management.	M	50	50

Strengths	Weaknesses
An appropriate and practical system for regularly using information on results to inform management decision making at all levels of the programme is outlined in the Results Measurement Manual. The 'formal' MRM system is complemented by extensive, additional information gathering on results and changes in the context that enrich the programme team's understanding and management.	
There are sufficient financial resources and human resources, with appropriate skills, to manage and implement all aspects of the ALCP2 MRM system. There is an extensive orientation process for new staff members on MRM. All staff members have access to a detailed Results Measurement Manual with templates, and working relationships allow staff members to ask the results measurement team questions as needed.	
There are reviews of all MRM activities and outputs built into the ALCP2 system. The programme also follows Mercy Corps' guidelines of rechecking 5% of MRM figures annually. Results measurement staff members can provide examples of detecting and correcting data errors. Roles and responsibilities in MRM are outlined clearly and in detail in all relevant staff members' terms of reference and also in the Results Measurement Manual.	

5. Summary of Key Areas for Improvement

Outlined below are the key areas for improvement based on the audit:

Articulating Results Chains

- Thoroughly check all results chains to ensure sufficient change steps are included, links are clear, boxes do not contain unrelated changes and who is expected to do what is clear, particularly after revisions are made.
- Document external assumptions and risks to individual interventions.
- Ensure all aspects of results chains are supported by documented evidence.
- Ensure that the risks of displacement at the beneficiary level are sufficiently considered for all interventions.

Defining Indicators of Change and Other Information Needs

- Thoroughly check all indicators to ensure they cover the changes described in the relevant box and are formulated as neutral indicators.
- Ensure that qualitative indicators address why changes are happening or not happening for all relevant market actors.
- Ensure that documented indicators cover the sustainability of behaviour improvements for all relevant market actors.
- Document all assumptions and calculations underpinning projections and ensure the units of projections and results match.

Measuring Attributable Changes

- Ensure that beneficiary baseline data is gathered in a timely manner, referencing the monitoring plan when appropriate.
- Thoroughly check monitoring plans for discrepancies in terms of timing and frequency of measurement activities.
- When conducting impact assessments, verify beneficiary behaviour changes related to the interventions being assessed. Ensure a sufficient sample size to analyse findings related to all the objectives of the assessment, including analysis of gender-related objectives when applicable; when this is not possible, fill any gaps with additional quantitative or qualitative information gathering.

Tracking Costs and Impacts

- Develop clearly organised and linked spreadsheets for aggregation to reduce the potential for mistakes and facilitate cross-checks. Document all calculations and assumptions.
- Report expenditure per Outcome.

Reporting Costs and Results

- Ensure all reported figures adequately align with the indicators to which they correspond.

Annexes

1. Overall and Outcome specific ratings
2. Outcome specific findings
3. List of documents reviewed
4. List of interviews conducted