

Control point	How to maximize the score	What may lead to losing points?
2.1 There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each change described in the results chain(s). (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is at least one relevant indicator for each box in the results chain, with the unit of measurement made clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one indicator described when there are two different changes in one single change box. Definition of indicators is vague (e.g., 'sales change' instead of 'change in sales revenue [\$/month]').
2.2 Qualitative information on how and why changes are occurring is defined for each intervention. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators that give information on how and why/why not change is occurring for key behavioural change, for key actors in a results chain. For example, if the change is 'Farmers start applying good agricultural practices;' the 'how' indicator is 'a list or description of the good agricultural practices adopted by farmers.'; the why/why not indicator is 'reason for adopting or not adopting good agricultural practices.' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MRM manual lists generic qualitative information that needs to be collected but the programme cannot show evidence of it being collected in practice. Qualitative information not collected for a relevant actor in the results chain (e.g., intervention partner or service providers).
2.3 A small number of indicators at the impact level can be aggregated across the programme. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurement plans include common impact indicators (e.g., scale, income, jobs) that can be aggregated across the programme. If not, reasonable justification on why not. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common impact indicators only count access outreach instead of outreach who realizes a financial benefit as a result of intervention. Common indicators are defined at the programme level but not included in intervention MRM plans.
2.4 There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability indicators are defined for all key actors relevant to the intervention's success. In some cases, the indicators used to measure sustainability may be the same as indicators used to measure effectiveness or impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability indicators not identified for key actors in a results chain.
2.5 Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff are capable of clearly and easily explaining most of the key indicators, what they mean and their relevance to demonstrating progress and achievement of outcomes and impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff unclear on which indicators are key to tracking the progress of an intervention. Staff focus only on indicators for lower-level RC boxes (activities and partners) and are not familiar with indicators at higher levels.
2.6 There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of gender differentiated results. (Rec)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one indicator (quantitative or qualitative) to assess impact on gender per relevant change boxes in the results chain. Indicators for measuring changes experienced by different genders are relevant, measurable, and specific. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only gender disaggregated data is used and is not supported by additional indicators to assess qualitative change caused by the intervention (e.g., on decision making).