

Control point	How to maximize the score	What may lead to losing points?
1.1 An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each intervention (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate results chains for each intervention that commenced at least 3 months ago. • Change steps are placed in logical order: how one change leads to the next one is clear (there are no essential steps missing). • The changes in each box are clearly described to understand what it means. • Each box clearly states <u>who</u> incurs change and <u>what</u> the change is. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single results chain for multiple interventions or a sector. • Missing arrows between boxes. • Missing key steps between boxes. • More than two changes in one single change box.
1.2 Each intervention results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying at least <u>one</u> critical external assumption/risk affecting whether change in a results chain will happen. • A short explanation of how and why the intervention contributes to the sector and/or programme outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ How target beneficiaries benefit. ➢ Specific constraints addressed. ➢ Business model showing the actors involved, their incentives and likelihood of sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic external assumptions and risks have been identified but are clearly irrelevant to intervention success. • Changes in results chain appear far-fetched or vague and are not backed by sufficient evidence. • Interventions are not relevant to sector/programme strategies. • Only internal assumptions (i.e., within the results chain) stated.
1.3 Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without looking at the results chain, staff are capable of clearly explaining the most important elements of an intervention results chain. • Staff can give specific examples of how they have used results chains to monitor progress of an intervention and used it to steer intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff are unfamiliar with the results chain(s) and/or provide examples that are very vague and relate to only using results chains to track activities. • Only results measurement staff, and not implementation managers, are familiar with results chains. • Staff miss key behaviour changes in the results chain.
1.4 The intervention results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players and the programme circumstances. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A log sheet showing changes made to a results chain or different versions of results chain in archive. • Staff can give examples of things they changed and why. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes have been made to the actual implemented activities without adjusting the results chain. Or changes have been found in the higher levels of the results chain, but it has not been revised to incorporate these (within a year).
1.5 Each intervention results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis on gender. (Rec)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender specific research at the programme and/or sector level and clear explanation on how it has been used to inform the design of interventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No research is conducted either at programme, market, or intervention level to assess how programme activities interact with gender.
1.6 Each results chain is supported by research and analysis that considers the risk of displacement. (Rec)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff have assessed the likelihood of displacement at the beneficiary level, based on sector/intervention research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme only documents that the risk of displacement is 'not expected' but doesn't have any justification for why not.

WHAT WILL NOT LEAD TO POINT DEDUCTION:

- In exceptional cases, if exactly the same activities and business model are replicated in more than one intervention, programmes can choose to have the same results chain but track the progress separately for each intervention. For example, two interventions doing exactly the same activities in two different locations.
- In relation to 1.5, if the programme has no gender-related aspiration, this control point will be scored as N/A