

## 1. Overview

CAVAC Cambodia	2010-2014	
Audit visit dates	3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2013 – 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2013	
Overall final ratings <sup>1</sup>	MUST	417/430 = 97%
	RECOMMENDED	86/90 = 95%
Coverage	Active CAVAC portfolio excluding BEE and Vegetables Markets. All control points checked	
DCED Standard	Version VI, January 2013	

Signed:

CAVAC Peter Roggekamp, Team Leader

Date, Place 10/7/13 Phnom Penh.

Auditors Phitcha Wanitphon

1 July 2013, Bangkok

### Table of Contents

<b>1. Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Key Audit Findings.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Brief Review of the Programme and Measurement System .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Summary of the audit process .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. Detailed scoring of the Control Points.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6. Summary of areas with potential for improvement .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Annexes .....</b>	<b>10</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

## 2. Key Audit Findings

<b>Articulating the Results Chain</b>	
Result chains <sup>2</sup> are well articulated and guide the staff in making decisions. They are regularly reviewed including systemic changes where appropriate. The result chains are supported by adequate research and analysis. Staffs use result chains to guide their implementation. Risks of displacement are taken into account.	The reasons for changes or lack of changes of the result chains are not documented. In a few cases, there are some minor discrepancies in the explanations of result chain boxes.
<b>Defining Indicators of Change</b>	
Indicators are included and specified for each key change in the measurement plan. Indicators to assess sustainability are also included. Staffs understand and use indicators to monitor progress of implementation. Anticipated impacts are projected where appropriate and reviewed regularly.	The reasons for changes or lack of changes in the projections are not documented. In a few cases, indicators are not specific to the description in the result chain boxes. Also, the qualitative information to assess sustainability is not outlined in the plan.
<b>Measuring Changes in indicators</b>	
Monitoring plans are developed for each intervention. The plans are thorough, realistic and in accordance with good practice. Baseline information has been gathered or will be gathered at appropriate times. The qualitative information is also gathered to assess the character, depth and sustainability of changes.	
<b>Estimating Attributable Changes</b>	
The programme has a clear system to estimate attributable changes. Attribution methods chosen are appropriate and conform to good practice.	For irrigation, the attribution method chosen is not documented.
<b>Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market</b>	
Where appropriate, the results of systemic change at key levels in the result chains will be assessed by methods that conform to good practice.	The method to re-validate copying ratio and magnitude of changes is not included in the plan.
<b>Tracking Programme Costs</b>	
Costs are tracked per market.	
<b>Reporting Results</b>	
The impacts at the farmer level are not due to be assessed yet, so the programme did not report yet on aggregated impacts. Therefore, some control points (7.1 and 7.4) in this section are not yet applicable. Private sector contributions are acknowledged. The programme will be able to report results with the findings from the gender surveys. The	

<sup>2</sup> The programme uses the term “impact logic” instead of “result chains”.

result will be published.	
<b>Managing the System for Results Measurement</b>	
A clear and effective result measurement system is in place, supported by sufficient human and financial resources. The system is also integrated with the management of the programme. Staffs use the findings generated by the system in programme management and decision making.	

Cavac has a strong and institutionalised measurement system, with a particular focus on the learning elements. The learning culture has been carefully developed and nurtured so that staff can honestly accept mistakes, learn from them and improve implementation accordingly. Regression analysis and secondary research are used to estimate attributable changes in yields, in situations where control groups cannot be established.

### Final ratings

“Must” control points:

Percentage	Description	Programme Rating
91-100	Strong results measurement system	√
81-90	Reasonable results measurement system	
71-80	Moderate results measurement system	
61-70	Moderate results measurement system with notable weaknesses	
51-60	Weak results measurement system	
41-50	Weak results measurement system	
31-40	Weak results measurement system	
21-30	Weak results measurement system	
11-20	Weak results measurement system	
0-10	Weak results measurement system	

“Recommended” control points:

Percentage	Description	Programme Rating
81-100	Results measurement system with strong additional features	√
61-80	Results measurement system with some additional features	
41-60	Results measurement system with some additional features	
21-40	Results measurement system with some additional features	
0-20	Results measurement system with few additional features	

### 3. Brief Review of the Programme and Measurement System

CAVAC aims to reduce poverty by increasing farmer incomes in the rice-based farming systems of Cambodia. The Program is implemented through four components: Agribusiness Development; Water Management; Research and Extension; and Business Enabling Environment. These all work closely together with staff working across a number of components. Responsibility for the implementation of the Program is shared between the Team Leader and Cardno Emerging Markets (Australia) Pty Ltd (the Operational Contractor) under the direction of the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC).

CAVAC aims to address farmers' needs by addressing systemic constraints – through supporting interventions with the expectation to create sustainability and high value for money. Instead of supporting farmers directly, CAVAC supports those private and public companies and institutions that are likely to address real farmer constraints now and in the future. CAVAC thus partners with government institutions, input suppliers, traders, processors, farmer associations, research institutes/media or agro-tool producers to support them in improving their knowledge, capacity or ability to extend support to farmers. CAVAC has developed an M&E<sup>3</sup> system that is based on result chains and that uses the criteria from the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) Standard. A manual and a strategy have also been written to determine potential impact.

For implementation, CAVAC are divided into two main departments: Irrigation and Agribusiness. Each department has its own managers. The irrigation department has 4 units mainly based on the provinces they work in: Kampot, Takeo, Kampong Thom and a general unit. The agribusiness department has 4 units: information, input markets, export/vegetable and PDA/GDA support. Apart from the PDA/GDA unit, each unit has 2-5 agricultural advisors per unit working together as a team. In addition, CAVAC also has 2 dedicated M&E specialists working with the implementation team.

For each value chain, CAVAC has official value chain strategies outlining the key constraints of particular value chains and where CAVAC will focus their interventions on. In addition, for each support markets e.g. rice seeds, fertiliser, pesticide etc., there are also regularly updated support market strategies that outline the key constraints and CAVAC's focus in particular support markets which also provide the basis for intervention design. Each intervention also has an intervention plan, impact logic (result chain) and monitoring plan. All interventions will be reviewed at least semi-annually in full three-month review meetings. In the review meetings, information generated from the measurement system is analysed. Then, the lessons learned are drawn and used to improve the strategies and implementation in the next period.

There are several key issues that affect the result measurement system. The first is the practicality of using control group for estimating attributable changes in yields. CAVAC concentrate their interventions only in three target provinces and two value chains. Hence, most of the farmers in the target area are expected to be affected by CAVAC's interventions. Hence, it will be very difficult to establish the control groups in the target area since the contamination rates will be very high. In addition, comparison with other provinces will not

---

<sup>3</sup> CAVAC uses the term M&E, rather than the DCED term of results measurement, to refer to its work in this area – feeling that this emphasises the effectiveness focus.

be effective since there are differences in terms of soil type and weather condition. Hence, CAVAC has decided to use regression analysis together with secondary research to estimate attributable yields increase from the changes in practices resulting from project interventions.

Another key issue is the nature of activities under BEE. For BEE, CAVAC will mainly provide demand-led financial support to government priorities. In this case, only output monitoring is appropriate. Although CAVAC are also working on public private dialogue activities, these are still in a pilot-test stage. Hence, CAVAC does not apply the full measurement system to BEE and it was excluded from the audit. For irrigation, all interventions are very similar. So CAVAC decided to have one standard impact logic and one measurement plan that includes all schemes.

In addition, due to the production cycle, CAVAC has not been able to measure and report on impact yet. Hence, some of the use compliance criteria (for control point 5.1, 6.2, 7.1 and 7.4) cannot be assessed or can only be assessed in some markets (for control point 3.2 and 4.1). Where the compliance criteria cannot be assessed, it has been treated for the purposes of audit scoring as 'not applicable'.

## 4. Summary of the audit process

The audit scope covered the entire CAVAC active portfolio, except for two sectors. BEE was excluded for the reasons discussed above. Vegetables were also excluded, as the market is changing rapidly and so CAVAC has not been able to develop a meaningful theory of change; an audit was therefore not considered appropriate.

The audit covered representative samples of all other elements of CAVAC. Irrigation was included anyway, as it has a relatively large budget; since the interventions are very similar, 2 out of 3 provinces were reviewed to check for consistency (Takeo and Kampot provinces). In addition, the rice seed and wider market sectors were selected from the rest of the portfolio at random; for these two markets, all active interventions were reviewed, as follows:

Markets	Interventions
Irrigation	Takeo Providence: IRR 10.1: Krapum Chouk IRR 10.4: Kveng Tayi IRR 10.3: Tomnup Lork IRR 12.3: So Hang IRR 12.4: Prey Romdeng Kampot Providence: IRR 10.2: Prey Tonal IRR 10.6: Shove Andes IRR 10.7: Kook IRR 10.8: Throat IRR 12.1: Spean Touch IRR 12.2: Prey Leo
Rice Seeds	INP 10.2 Improving quality of commercial seed INP 11.2 Providing training to small seed producers

	INP 11.3 Support association to promote modern variety for wet season rice INP 12.9 Strengthen production knowledge to enhance of good quality rice seed
Wider Market	EXT 11.6 Supporting a private call centre: 8080 (Asia Master)

For all audited markets, the market strategy, intervention plans, impact logic, monitoring plan, three months review reports and other support documents were consulted. For CAVAC as a programme, the document reviewed included annual work plans, annual reports, M&E manual, farmer typology survey, job descriptions, CAVAC internal background documents for mid-term review mission and other support documents. A list of documents reviewed is included as Annex 3.

For CAVAC as a programme, interviews were held with team leaders and the general manager. For the selected interventions, interviews were held with sector managers, agricultural advisors and M&E specialist. A list of interviews conducted is included in Annex 4.

## 5. Detailed scoring of the Control Points

The program scored 417/430 points for the MUST control points and scores 86/90 for the RECOMMENDED control points. The maximum scores have been adjusted to exclude the “Not Applicable” compliance criteria. All compliance criteria were verified.

Control Point	M/R	Max. Score	Rating	Justification
<b>Section 1: Articulating the Results Chain</b>				
1.1 An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each of the interventions.	M	30	29.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All of the results chains are thorough, logical, sufficiently detailed and realistic, and linking activities to goal levels. There are only minor discrepancies in the descriptions of some of the result chain boxes.</li> </ul>
1.2 Each results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis.	M	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Result chains are supported by adequate research and analysis. All markets have strategies that outline the key constraints and intervention focus. The sustainability has been analysed for all interventions.</li> </ul>
1.3 Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities; key partners can explain the logic of interventions.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffs are familiar with the result chain and use them to guide their activities.</li> </ul>
1.4 The results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players	M	20	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The result chains have been reviewed at least twice a year in full TMR. However, the reasons for changes or lack of changes are not documented.</li> </ul>

and the programme circumstances.				
1.5 The results chain(s) include the results of broader systemic change at key levels.	REC	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The result chains include copying and crowding in where appropriate.</li> </ul>
1.6 The research and analysis underlying the results chain(s) take into account the risk of displacement.	REC	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risks of displacement have been taken into account.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2: Defining Indicators of Change</b>				
2.1 There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each key change described in the results chain(s).	M	20	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are relevant indicators for each key change.</li> <li>Some of the indicators are not specific to the changes described in the result chain boxes.</li> </ul>
2.2 The universal impact indicators are included in the relevant results chain(s).	M	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although income is not included in the individual result chain, the programme has a clear system programme-wide for calculating additional income from changes in core indicators. Employment indicators are not provided but the written justifications are valid.</li> </ul>
2.3 There are specific Indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results.	M	20	18.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All measurement plans provide sufficient quantitative sustainability indicators.</li> <li>Qualitative information on sustainability is gathered, but is not included in the plans.</li> </ul>
2.4 Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffs understand and use indicators to monitor the progress of interventions.</li> </ul>
2.5 Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators to appropriate dates.	REC	30	28.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated impacts have been projected and review regularly. However, the changes or lack of changes are not documented.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3: Measuring Changes in Indicators</b>				
3.1 Baseline information on key indicators is collected.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The baseline information is gathered.</li> </ul>
3.2 Information for each indicator is collected using methods that conform to good research practices.	M	40	39.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All interventions have documented monitoring plans to collect information at an appropriate time. However, for irrigation in the new version of monitoring plan, the method is missing.</li> <li>The information has been regularly gathered and used in regular review</li> </ul>

				<p>process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The data collection to date conforms to good practice.</li> </ul>
3.3 Qualitative information on changes at various levels of the results chain is gathered.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualitative information has been regularly gathered.</li> </ul>
3.4 Reported changes in indicators that are extrapolated from pilot figure are regularly verified.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable</li> </ul>
<b>Section 4: Estimating Attributable Changes</b>				
4.1 Attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains are estimated using methods that conform to established good practice.	M	40	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme has a clear and documented system to estimate attributable changes.</li> <li>The methods chosen are appropriate and conform to good practices. However, for irrigation, the attribution method chosen is not documented.</li> <li>For irrigation, the planned calculation for changes in cultivated areas mistakenly include pre-scheme EWP and DSP areas of some farmers who have already access to the main rivers. These pre-scheme areas should not be claimed as impacts since they are already cultivated before the construction of the scheme.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 5: Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market</b>				
5.1 The results of systemic change at key levels in the results chain(s) are assessed.	REC	20	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate, the results of systemic change at key levels in the result chains will be assessed by methods that conform to good practices.</li> <li>The plans and method to re-confirm the copying ratio and magnitude of changes is not documented in monitoring plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 6: Tracking Programme Costs</b>				
6.1 Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The accounting system in place to tracks the in-country costs annually and cumulatively.</li> </ul>
6.2 Costs are allocated by major component of the programme.	REC	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The accounting system is capable of allocating costs by market.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 7: Reporting Results</b>				
7.1 The programme produces a report at least annually which clearly and thoroughly describes results	M	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports to date only discussed results at the support market level.</li> <li>Due to long cycle time, the impacts are not due to be assessed. Hence, the</li> </ul>



to date.				progress reports did not include the programme wide impacts yet.
7.2 Contributions of other publicly funded programmes and private contributions are acknowledged.	M	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The private contributions are acknowledged.</li> <li>There is no other publicly funded project working to address the same issues.</li> </ul>
7.3 Reported changes in key indicators are disaggregated by gender.	M	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results at support market level, e.g. number of providers trained, are disaggregated by gender.</li> <li>The impact at the farmer level will be reported together with the findings from the gender survey which will cover, for example, how decisions are made in farming households.</li> </ul>
7.4 Results of systemic change and/or other indirect effects are reported.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to the long cycle time, no systemic change has been observed yet.</li> </ul>
7.6 Results are published.	REC	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The progress reports are published on the website.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 8: Managing the System for Results Measurement</b>				
8.1 The programme has a clear system for results measurement through which findings are used in programme management and decision-making.	M	40	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme has a clear and effective system for using the information generated from the result measurement system in management decision-making.</li> <li>Staffs have access to a written manual.</li> <li>Staffs regularly use the information generated from the system in management and decision-making.</li> </ul>
8.2 The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.	M	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are sufficient human and financial resources.</li> <li>Tasks and responsibilities for measuring changes are appropriate and clearly documented.</li> <li>Staff can accurately describe their tasks and responsibility in result measurement.</li> </ul>
8.4 The system is integrated with the management of the programme.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The system is institutionalised.</li> <li>Staffs consider result measurement tasks as part of their job.</li> </ul>

## 6. Summary of areas with potential for improvement

### *Articulating the Results Chain*

Descriptions in some results chain boxes need clarification of the causal relationship anticipated. When results chains are changed, the reasons for change (if any) should be documented.

### *Defining Indicators of Change*

Indicators should specifically match with the descriptions in the result chain boxes. Documented plans should consistently include qualitative assessment of sustainability. When projections are changed, the reasons for change should be recorded.

### *Measuring Changes in Indicators*

Details of the data collection methods need to be added back into the irrigation monitoring plan.

### *Estimating Attributable Changes*

For irrigation, revise the planned calculation for changes in cultivated areas to exclude existing pre-scheme WSP and/or DSP. Consistently document chosen attribution methods.

### *Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market*

When applicable e.g. for interventions in rice seed markets, document the method used to re-validate the copying ratio and results for farmers indirectly impacted.

## Annexes

1. Overall and market specific ratings (spread sheet)
2. Market specific findings
3. List of documents reviewed
4. List of interviews conducted