

Mock Audit Report on Compliance with the DCED Standard of Results Measurement

Project: Rural Livelihoods Development Program

Program Manager	Francis Massawe
Technical Adviser	Paul Kalu
MRM-Communications Specialist	Athumani Zuberi
Consultant	Sadia Ahmed
Version	Final

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	2
Introduction.....	3
1. Overview.....	3
Compliance with the DCED Standard	4
1. Articulating the Results Chain	4
2. Defining Indicators of Change	12
3. Measuring Changes in Indicators	16
4. Estimating Attributable Changes.....	19
5. Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market.....	19
6. Tracking Project Costs	21
7. Reporting Results.....	22
8. Managing the System for Results Management	24
Recommendations.....	27
1. Suggestions for improving compliance	27
2. Other issues	28
3. Preparing for an audit.....	29

Abbreviations

ASA	Agricultural Seed Agency
BA	Business Analyst
CF	Contract Farming
DCED	Donor Committee for Enterprise Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FO	Farmer Organization
HH	Household
IG	Intervention Guide
M4P	Making Markets Work for the Poor
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRM	Monitoring and Results Measurement
MSE	Micro and Small Enterprise
PM	Programme Manager
QDS	Quality Declared Seeds
RC	Results Chain
RLDC	Rural Livelihood Development Cooperation
RLDP	Rural Livelihood Development Programme
SBA	Senior Business Analyst
SDC	Swiss Development Agency
TASUPA	Tanzania Sunflower Promoters Association
ToR	Terms of Reference

Introduction

1. Overview

Rural Livelihood Development Program (RLDP) is an initiative of the Government of Switzerland supported through the Swiss Development Agency (SDC). It aims at making market systems work better for the welfare of rural producers by addressing market constraints in six subsectors. These were sub-sectors that RLDP had worked in phase II and III, namely cotton, sunflower, dairy, rice, poultry, and rural radio. In its final phase which started in April 2012 and will end in March 2016, RLDP will address constraints in three subsectors namely cotton, sunflower, and rice, along with these subsectors RLDP will address cross sector themes namely gender and livelihood, rural advisory services, and rural women radio.

Since 2008, RLDP has applied the “making markets work for the poor (M4P)” approach, which aims at making sustainable changes in the market systems through a facilitation role at three levels of the systems: core transaction between demand and supply, supporting function and rules (business environment). In 2012, in its final phase, RLDP decided to adopt the DCED Standards for results measurement. Proper implementation of the Standard with results chains and quarterly reviews started around April 2012. Thus, the DCED Standard of results measurement has been in use within the project for a bit over a year. The system has been used mainly to monitor and steer interventions and contributed to one Annual report and one Half-yearly report for the donor. A mock audit at this point can inform RLDP on how compliant it is with the DCED Standards, within one year of its adaptation and use in the project. RLDP can identify the gaps in the system and gain suggestions on how to cover those gaps and increase its compliance with the Standard.

For this mock audit, the focus will be to understand how results measurement is done for the project overall, in three sectors and one crosscutting sector by narrowing in on how results measurement is done in one intervention in each of those selected sectors. The selected sectors and interventions selected are:



1. Sunflower sector: Quality declared seeds (QDS)
2. Poultry sector: Radio and rural poultry intervention (this will cover some aspects of media sector)
3. Rice sector: Up-scaling of rice contract farming (CF)
4. Cotton sector: Commercialization of Farm Organizations (FO)

RLDP implements its interventions thorough partners and relies heavily on partner data for results measurement. Therefore, the mock audit included discussions with partners in the sunflower sector to understand their alignment with project goals and the methodologies they employ for information gathering.

The report will start with giving details of how RLDP complies with each control point and sub-control point of the DCED as a project overall and in the selected interventions. It will then end with a set of recommendations for the project.

Compliance with the DCED Standard










Below are the details of RLDP compliance under each control point. The points mentioned under General comments applies to all interventions, specific comments for a particular intervention are mentioned under the heading of that intervention.

Two kinds of points are given below: those marked with a  indicate things that are being done right and those marked with a  indicate things that are not being done or not being done properly. It is important to note here that the ticks and crosses are not meant to imply any score and hence does not add up to an overall score for that control point. They just imply what is done well and what needs attention.

1. Articulating the Results Chain

1.1. Document on Project Results Chain (Must)

An appropriate, sufficiently detailed, and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each of the interventions.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
<p>A results chain is developed and documented for each intervention.</p>	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  RC is done for each intervention  In many cases essential activities like linking partners with suppliers, providing consultants, training materials etc. are not in the RC at all. <p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  The Sector Strategy paper mentions a forum for sharing lessons on CF, and work with 3 other millers this is not reflected in the RC. Assuming that those are to constitute a separate intervention, then this RC is fine. If not then the RC should reflect those.  Apart from MoU signing, no other activity undertaken by RLDP is reflected in the RC.  Activities related to opening accounts by farmers or giving out of post-harvest equipment are not mentioned. <p><u>Radio and poultry</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  The RC mentions farmers using chicken vaccines or feed but the Sector Strategy also mentions that vaccines are not usually available. Thus, the results claimed due to vaccination seem unlikely.  There are other interventions that are attempting to resolve the issue around vaccines. It needs to be mentioned somewhere in the IG that such interventions exist otherwise there seems to be no rationale for expecting results due to vaccination.  The involvement of actors in the sector in the radio project is not mentioned. <p><u>QDS in Sunflower</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  Done, reflects Sector Strategy paper

	<p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬇ A very key part of the intervention is the ability of FOs to manage themselves, however this is not mentioned anywhere in the RC. ⬇ Sector Strategy paper mentions warehouse receipting, collection centers, etc. but these are not in RC.
<p>Each results chain shows all key changes arranged in logical order, demonstrating as far as possible how the selected intervention leads to achievement of development goals.</p>	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬆ RCs are all mostly logical. ⬇ None of the RCs explicitly state which activities are carried out by RLDP and which ones partners carry out. ⬇ The Activity level seems to include things done by the partner and RLDP; there is no clear distinction between one and the other. <p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬇ For some boxes, the way the arrows are placed makes it confusing to understand which box leads to which, e.g. box 12 and 15; box 25 and 24. Although color coding is used, it is necessary to select the arrows to see which box leads to which one. <p><u>Radio and poultry</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬇ Systemic change is not likely or expected for this intervention but is reflected – this is not necessary particularly as the intervention is not an M4P sector and not expected to deliver on systemic change. It is sufficient to explain this in the Intervention Status ⬆ The intervention is clear in laying out what the partners are doing ⬇ However it does not explicitly make clear what the project is doing. <p><u>QDS in Sunflower</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬆ Systemic change is not reflected in the RC because it is not clear how that will happen, there seem to be almost too many options. ⬇ However, this is an M4P intervention it is important to figure this out and reflect it. <p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬆ How systemic change will occur is not clear e.g. how will new FO learn about organic farming or how will new FO gain the management skills needed?
<p>Each results chain(s) is sufficiently detailed so that changes at all levels can be assessed quantitatively and/or qualitatively.</p>	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⬆ Changes in the boxes in of the RC are reflected as quantitative changes. ⬇ Some changes may also be assessed qualitatively but this seems to be given low priority. This is particularly important (and hence its absence is more evident) in the cotton IG where managerial skills are key to success of the intervention. ⬇ It is not always clear who is carrying out a particular activity and who is being benefitted. For example in Up-scaling Rice CF box 4 “45 bicycles are provided to lead on supporting project activities” provided by whom and to who?
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant</p>	

Most RCs are well articulated and logical. The major change needed is that the activities carried out by the project needs to be explicitly mentioned; e.g. project links processor with seed supplier, or project hires consultant to develop radio content etc. Activities done by the project should be in a separate level of its own. Boxes in RCs should reflect the realistic plan behind the intervention so reflect systemic change only where it is planned out (unlike Radio and poultry IG) and make sure to plan systemic change where it is necessary (like in the case of QDS in Sunflower IG). It might also be possible to combine some of the boxes in the RCs into one such as instead of having different boxes for farmers getting different inputs it might be possible to put that in one box and say, “farmers get inputs...”

1.2. Evidence base (Must)

Each results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
<p>The Project has documentary evidence that underlies the logic of the steps in each results chain.</p>	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⚠️ Documentary evidence is not always available for all major steps of the RC; where there is evidence used the source of it is not explicitly mentioned. Proper referencing is lacking in many cases. ⚠️ There is very little evidence anywhere of how, to what extent, and why crowding in and/or copying can happen for any of the IGs <p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✅ The Sector Strategy reflects that farmers adopt good agronomic practices after being taught about them and this leads to better yields ⚠️ What the increased yield means for income is not reflected, some calculations for income are given in the IG, but the sources for those are not clear. Evidence of profits for millers is not reflected anywhere hence it is not clear why there will be any crowding in. ✅ The <i>Strategy</i> worksheet of the IG talks about how CF will help farmers and how new seeds will be introduced ⚠️ However, the IG says little about what the benefits will be to the millers and how that will lead to a more sustainable change. <p><u>Radio and poultry</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✅ Some documentary evidence is available in the Sector Strategy mostly around how much can be made from proper rearing of chickens. ⚠️ But evidence on farmer adoption or continuation of better practices for chicken rearing is missing. <p><u>QDS in Sunflower</u></p>

	<p>↑ There is anecdotal documentary evidence of the benefits of QDS, and better productivity of QDS is mentioned in the IG (7 bags/acre against the 4 bags/acre for normal seeds). During interviews, the affordability of QDS seeds was illustrated using prices.</p> <p>↓ The Sector Strategy and IG does not have evidence of whether farmers are able to sell QDS, profitability of the business etc. There is also no documented evidence of the profitability or price convenience of QDS seeds for end user farmers.</p> <p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u></p> <p>↑ IG clearly states evidence of FO working resulting in benefits for farmers from previous RLDP work. Then the IG goes on to mention benefits to other actors.</p> <p>↓ However, the report or study where the evidence exists is not mentioned anywhere. So the source of the evidence is not clear.</p>
<p>Each results chain and/or supporting documentation outlines significant assumptions that support the logic of the results chains and mentions relevant contributions of other initiatives</p>	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <p>↓ Relevant assumptions for the RC are not documented nor are there any supporting evidence for the assumptions made.</p> <p>↑ Staff have thought about most of these assumptions, such as copying ratio will be 1 is to 3 farmers.</p> <p>↑ Staff are generally aware of other contributions by other initiatives,</p> <p>↓ But these need to be documented and mentioned possibly in quarterly reports etc.</p> <p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u></p> <p>↓ The Sector Strategy mentions other initiatives that are working in the same sector. But what those initiatives are doing and how is not clearly mentioned, it is not possible to determine if the efforts of those organizations target the same goals in the same area as RLDP.</p> <p><u>Radio and poultry</u></p> <p>↑ A few assumptions are outlined in the <i>Strategy worksheet</i> in the IG around how many will adopt the practices but the source or evidence behind the assumption is not there.</p> <p>↓ RLDP is not sure what other initiatives have similar efforts but as per the Sector Strategy and interviews with the BA, this will be followed up.</p> <p><u>QDS in Sunflower</u></p> <p>↑ Some assumptions are made in the RC, e.g., “97% QDS farmers receive supervision”.</p> <p>↓ However, these are not stated to be assumptions, and a reason is not given as to why it is 97% as opposed to any other number.</p> <p>↓ It is not clearly mentioned whether there are any other initiatives with relevant contributions working on QDS in any of the documents.</p> <p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u></p>

	<p>↑ The relevant contribution other initiatives are checked and the Sector Strategy explicitly mentions which geographical areas those initiatives are focusing on and what RLDP does to avoid overlaps.</p>
<p>The documentation explains how the changes outlined in each results chain are likely to lead to lasting impact.</p>	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <p>↑ The Sector Strategy and IGs refer to achievements in previous phases as evidence of lasting impact.</p> <p>↓ However specifically what changed for the beneficiaries and by how much is not mentioned.</p> <p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u></p> <p>↓ The Sector Strategy gives some qualitative information on why millers might be interested in the initiative and the IG gives revenue increases they might get, but not all of it is based on evidence. It is also not clear from the documentation, which parts are evidence based and which are assumptions.</p> <p><u>Radio and poultry</u></p> <p>↑ It is expected that the benefits will continue due to farmers remembering the advice of the radio project and continuing those practices. Also, RLDP is now looking at how to make the programmes more self-sustaining.</p> <p><u>QDS in Sunflower</u></p> <p>↑ There is anecdotal evidence in the IG <i>Observations Log book worksheet</i> that states improvements in the lives/living standards of farmers who had undertaken the business of selling QDS.</p> <p>↓ However, no clear evidence is given that the production and selling of QDS will continue.</p> <p>↓ Very little information is available to indicate that end-users farmers of QDS for production of sunflower will be willing and able to continue using QDS.</p> <p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u></p> <p>↑ Through interviews, it was clear that there are benefits for the farmers to continue working with their FO in the manner introduced by RLDP (cheaper services, access to inputs and training on agronomic practices, increased yield etc.).</p> <p>↓ Although it is clear that sustainability is built in, this is not documented.</p>
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Not compliant</p>	
<p>This is one area where RLDP is particularly weak. Interviews have shown that the staff are clear on which parts of their RC are based on assumptions and which are based on facts. In many cases, they can also say the sources of those facts i.e. they know where the evidence for the facts lie. However, none of the documentation is clear on which are the evidence basis for the RC nor on why certain assumptions are made. As most of the interventions that RLDP is currently focusing on are based on interventions done in previous phases it will be expected that many of the interventions are based on documentary evidence. The <i>Notes worksheet</i> in the IG is meant to keep a list of referencing for documentary evidence, this is not being done, but it must be. In cases</p>	

where there is no documentary evidence and assumptions have to be used that should also be clearly stated along with the reasoning behind that particular assumption.

1.3. Staff Familiarity (Must)

Mid and senior level Project staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities; key partners can explain the logic of interventions.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Mid and senior level Project staff can describe the respective results chain(s) covering their work.	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ The BAs' develop IGs and themselves and are able to describe the RC as reflected in the IG. ↓ However, description of how systemic change will occur is weak mainly because it is not explained based on evidence or estimations of what kind of profits will stimulate crowding in or where those who want to crowd in will learn from.
Mid and senior level Project staff can give examples of how they will use results chain to guide their work.	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ All BAs' mention that the RCs help them see if they are on course towards achieving the targets in the RC. ↑ During quarterly reviews the IGs help BAs' report, assess what is happening in their sectors, and discuss it in more details. ↑ The BA looking after cotton sector finds the IG helps her focus and see if any changes are required to interventions, or how to deal with partners, or what to expect from partners.
Key partners can describe the logic of interventions that is reflected in results chains. (W/A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ The partners were able to explain the activities they carried out with RLDP, and what those activities would result in for their organization. In terms of how it relates to their business (Mwenge, ASA) and/or the overall industry (TASUPA, ASA) ↑ The partners were also able to explain how interventions would help achieve developmental goals of more income for farmers, or more efficient businesses and greater growth of the industry. They are also able to explain how they are capitalizing on the partnership with RLDP.
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant</p>	
<p>Systemic change and sustainability need to be better thought out and provided with stronger and clearly laid out evidence. The use of the IG by BA in assessing partners or intervention design was not mentioned much but this is also of significance.</p>	

1.4. Regular Review (Must)

The results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the Project strategy, external players, and the Project circumstances.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The Project has a clear system for reviewing the results chain(s) at least once a year.	<p>↑ IGs are reviewed and updated every quarter; this is done by the BA. The <i>Status</i> and <i>Log book</i> worksheets are also regularly updated by the BA.</p>
Use: The project has evidence to show that the results chain(s) have been reviewed at least once in the last year. It has evidence to justify changes or lack of changes made to results chain(s).	<p>↑ BAs when asked about how they review IGs mentioned updating the numbers, noting which boxes have happened and which ones have not.</p> <p>↓ The decisions made because of the reviews are not documented or mentioned as part of the IG review. It is not evident (from the paper trail) how RCs contribute to reviews other than providing numbers for assessing progress towards targets.</p>
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant</p>	
<p>From discussions, it is clear that the RLDP team sees quarterly review meetings as a point to re-visit strategy and the IG helps guide those discussions. However, the changes made to the RC or to the strategy behind the intervention also needs to be well documented, some changes may be due to how the intervention is rolling out (i.e. achievement of targets), but some may also be due to changes in market situations. Thus, changes made to strategy during reviews should be updated in the IG along with the reasons for those changes. If no changes are made then that should be mentioned too. This can be done in the <i>Intervention Status</i> worksheet.</p>	

1.5. Considering Systemic Change (Recommended)

The results chain(s) include the results of broader systemic change at key levels.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
<p>The results of expected systemic or market-wide changes are clearly included in each results chain. (W/A)</p>	<p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u> ↑ Systemic change is reflected in the RC</p> <p><u>QDS in Sunflower:</u> ↑ Systemic change is not reflected in the RC. But this is mainly because the BA is not sure how copying or crowding in of QDS will occur at this stage. ↓ It is also not clear from the RC why partners will continue to support QDS, as benefits got by the partners are not reflected in the IG ↑ Interviews with BA and partner reveals that in reality the partner gets good quality seeds at cheaper price to give their contract growers and makes a small margin on the growing of QDS.</p> <p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u> ↑ Systemic change is reflected in the RC ↓ However it becomes clearer only after the BA explained what aspects of the intervention were more susceptible to copying by other farmers or the conditions needed for crowding in.</p>
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant</p>	
<p>In situations like in the case of QDS where systemic change is not clear this should be mentioned clearly and the BA should also note down what will be done to gain more clarity. In the case of the Cotton IG, having the boxes on systemic change are ok, but the IG should reflect that crowding in and copying ratios will be different for this intervention compared to others and that the benefits that copiers get might not be the same as those directly supported.</p>	

1.6. Displacement (Recommended)

The research and analysis underlying the results chain(s) take into account the risk of displacement.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
<p>The Project can cite or produce evidence that displacement has been taken into account in the development of the results chain(s).</p>	<p>↓ Displacement has not been looked into previously. However, some new interventions will likely bring about some labor displacement in the future. ↑ There is less likely to be displacement at the support market level.</p>
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant</p>	
<p>As this is a new thing coming up having a plan to look into it will be sufficient. Further down it will be important to detail out how RLDP will try to track and measure displacement and when it will do so.</p>	

2. Defining Indicators of Change

2.1. Indicators of Key Changes (Must)

There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each change described in the results chain(s).

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Quantitative and/or qualitative indicators are defined for each change in the results chain(s).	<p>General comments</p> <p>↑ There is usually only one quantitative indicator defined for each change in the RCs</p> <p>↓ There are almost no qualitative indicator mentioned in any of the RCs</p> <p>Commercialization of cotton FO</p> <p>↓ There are no indicators given for the boxes in the RC relating to copying and crowding in.</p>
The indicators are relevant to the associated changes in the results chain(s).	<p>General comments:</p> <p>↑ In most cases the indicators in the measurement plan are measurable and can measure the change in the relevant RC box</p> <p>↓ They are however not always adequate and in many cases additional indicators both qualitative and quantitative would help measure the box better.</p> <p>Up-scaling rice CF:</p> <p>↓ It was difficult to judge if the indicators were relevant to the boxes, as the indicators were not written corresponding to the right boxes.</p> <p>Radio and poultry:</p> <p>↓ The indicator for box 11 “number of calls and SMS received,” is not relevant for the box it is tagged to and cannot assess if</p>
Evidence of validation is provided for proxy indicators if used. (W/A)	N/A
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant</p>	
<p>There can be and in many cases should be more than one indicator per box in the RC. The indicators should be checked to see if it can assess the box, it is related to. There should also be more qualitative indicators used that can add more clarity to the results measured and feedback into strategy, such as indicators that measure adoption rate of farmers.</p>	

2.2. Universal Impact Indicators (Must)

The universal impact indicators are included in each relevant results chain(s).

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Each results chain includes the universal impact indicators at the relevant level wherever possible, or written justification is provided for each such indicator if not included.	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ Income and scale is always reflected in all IGs ↓ Jobs is not reflected in any IG and no written justification is available for not including jobs ↑ The RLDP team has reviewed the potential number of paid labor jobs that are created in agriculture due to its interventions and has found that to be an insignificant number ↓ Jobs are however likely created at other levels of the RC (e.g. at processor level) but these are not being counted.
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
For full compliance, the MRM team should document the assumptions and calculations that led to the conclusion that an insignificant number of jobs is created in agriculture. The assumptions will later have to be verified; how and when that will be done should also be written in the document. In addition to that, the RLDP team should keep track of jobs created at MSE levels or in the associations it works with (e.g. TASUPA, etc.) ¹ .	

2.3. Assessing the likelihood of lasting impact (Must)

There are specific Indicators that enable the measuring of sustainability of change.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Specific indicators (qualitative and/or quantitative) are defined that enable assessment of sustainability of results in the results chains.	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↓ There are no qualitative indicators for assessing sustainability of results. ↑ In most cases, sustainability is assumed if the intervention creates benefits for the partners and the end beneficiaries. <p>Up-scaling rice CF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ Although not tagged to the right box the income increase of end-beneficiaries and the revenue that millers will earn from CF are measured to assess sustainability <p>Radio and poultry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ Increased HH income from poultry is measured <p>QDS in Sunflower</p>

¹The Project Document for this phase also mentions: “There is little transformation and processing done within the value chains RLDP is addressing; hence, employment creation will be measured in terms of laborers hired by the producers/MSEs and the employees hired by partner enterprises (processors/millers)”

	<p>⬇ The question in the measurement plan asks about profit and sales of QDS farmers however, the indicator only measures sales.</p> <p><u>Commercialization of cotton FO</u></p> <p>⬆ Increased household income is measured as an indicator of sustainability</p>
The indicators are relevant and appropriate to assessing the sustainability of results at key levels of the results chains.	<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <p>⬇ The indicators given in the IG are a start at measuring sustainability. But these indicators are not adequate. There needs to be some qualitative indicators.</p> <p><u>Up-scaling rice CF:</u></p> <p>⬇ The indicators are not adequate to assess sustainability, there needs to be qualitative indicators, and in case of millers profits rather than revenue to assess benefits got by them from CF</p> <p><u>QDS in Sunflower</u></p> <p>⬇ Profit of the buyers of QDS are not mentioned</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
Some quantitative indicators of sustainability are there but these are not adequate, in some cases they do not go far enough (e.g. measuring revenues rather than profits), or they do not measure sustainability indicator for all actors involved in the chain which is very essential for the benefits to be sustainable. Also important will be to find qualitative indicators of sustainability which may include specific indicators, quotes or anecdotes.	

2.4. Staff Understanding (Must)

Mid and senior level Project staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate Project progress.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Mid and senior level Project staff can describe the indicators covering their work.	⬆ Staff were able to accurately describe the indicators related to their work and the importance of the indicators to the success of the intervention.
Mid and senior level Project staff can give examples of how they will use changes in indicators to affect their strategy and implementation decisions.	<p>Different staff considered different interventions important for assessing strategy</p> <p>⬆ BAs mentioned “increased income and yield of farmers”, explaining that this shows if the intervention is achieving impact</p> <p>⬆ SBA mentioned “number of farmers reached by the partners”, as this shows if the partner is able to carry out the activities</p> <p>⬆ PM mentioned “overall number of farmers reached in a region or through an intervention” shows if there is potential for further scale up in those areas or through those interventions.</p>

Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant

2.5. Projections (Recommended)

Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators to appropriate dates.²

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
There are clear projections for key quantitative indicators to specific dates during or beyond the intervention. Projections are expressed as a change in indicator value due to the Project by a specific date.	<p>General comments:</p> <p>The projections given for key quantitative indicators are targets rather than projections.</p> <p>↑ Achievement of the targets are updated every quarter and recorded in the <i>Measurement worksheet</i> of the IG</p> <p>↓ However the targets or projections have not been reviewed downwards based on field happenings</p>
The projections are supported by documented research, analysis, and clear calculations, with sources of information and assumptions explicitly outlined.	<p>General comments:</p> <p>↑ The targets on outreach are set based on partner suggestions, experience with previous interventions and on project targets</p> <p>↓ However the process of arriving at outreach targets are not documented</p> <p>↑ Projections on income, costs, yields etc. is based on secondary information and experience of the previous phases.</p> <p>↓ However, the sources of the above information is not mentioned.</p>
Wherever possible, there are projections for the universal impact indicators (or other common impact indicators) to either the end of Project or to two years after the end of interventions.	<p>General comments:</p> <p>↑ Universal impact indicators (scale and income) are projected up to 2 years after the start of the intervention in the <i>Overview worksheet</i>.</p> <p>↓ Jobs are not projected or reflected in the IG</p> <p>Poultry and Radio</p> <p>↓ The projections for scale given in the <i>Overview worksheet</i> does not reflect number of farmers adopting good poultry rearing practices but rather the number of farmers reached with the information. This should not be the case; scale should be those that are actually realize a benefit from the intervention.</p>

² This Control Point is particularly important for initiatives aiming for market-wide impacts, since their impacts in the short term may be lower than those for initiatives that are giving away large subsidies.

Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant

An audit will check if the targets are set based on evidence so it will be useful to record the assumptions that lead to targets. For all other calculations, the sources of information, assumptions, and reasoning behind the assumptions should be recorded clearly, possibly in the *Support calculations worksheet*. The MRM team should also make sure to check these calculations and the projections for consistency and to ensure that proper referencing and recording is done.

3. Measuring Changes in Indicators

3.1. Baseline Information (Must)

Baseline information on all key indicators is collected.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
A documented plan is in place to gather baseline information,	<ul style="list-style-type: none">↑ Baseline information for all markets has just been collected via a large household survey which gives information on the land holdings, poverty status and use of agricultural inputs in farm households↑ For some interventions (e.g. Strengthening Access to improved seeds in rice), ASA collects baseline information before carrying out the intervention collecting information on yields etc.↑ Information on yields is also collected from secondary information.↓ The plan(s) for collecting baseline information is not documented↑ Baseline information on incomes from particular crops (namely rice, sunflower, cotton) comes mainly from reports of the previous phases.

Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant

How baseline information is collected should be written down, explaining which information will come from which study or which source (if secondary sources or previous phase reports are used). Baseline information should also include information on sources of inputs, trainings, access to buyers etc.

3.2. Good Research Practices (Must)

Information for each indicator is collected using methods that conform to good research practices.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
A documented plan is in place to collect information for each indicator at appropriate times.	<p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">↑ The measurement plan in IGs does mention who will be collecting which data at which point in time.

	<p>↓ But all measurement plans have too many methods of data collection and not all of them are used. What is actually used at a point is usually decided at that point.</p>
<p>The plan is thorough, realistic and in accordance to good research practice. It shows for each indicator what information will be collected, when and how the information will be collected and how each indicator will be calculated or described.</p>	<p>↑ In reality information at activity levels are collected by partners and these are verified through random field visits by the BA.</p> <p>↑ Collecting information on intervention impacts will be done through intervention surveys, which gather information that is more detailed on practice changes, yields, costs etc.</p> <p>↑ Such studies are usually outsourced and the quality control is done by MRM through development of a detailed ToR, development, review of tools, supervising pre-testing, random visits during actual fieldwork etc.</p> <p>↑ Although the studies are generally small in scale, the findings are usually found to be consistent across the sample.</p>
<p>Use: The project can demonstrate that it used the plan to collect information.</p>	<p>↑ Measurement plans have only partially been put into use so far, mainly because some of the measurement dates are not current yet. The parts that have been put into use conform to the measurement plan (partner reports, field verification reports).</p>
<p>Use: The project can demonstrate that information collection conformed to established good practices (in terms of research design, timing, sampling, quality control, etc.)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant</p>	
<p>For full compliance here data collection should be more carefully planned and thought out, so measurement plans should instead of listing a large number of methods decide on one or more methods that will be used to gather data. More effort should be put into triangulating data from various sources and mentioning that clearly in reports. The BA should also check how the partner is actually collecting farm level information to judge if more needs to be done to support or triangulate the data collected. Data collection methods should always follow good practices and if RLDP finds it necessary to deviate from good practices it should then state clearly why that happened and how that affects the data.</p>	

3.3. Qualitative Information (Must)

Qualitative information on changes at various levels of the results chain is gathered.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Assessment of changes includes qualitative information gathering.	<p>↓ No qualitative indicators are mentioned in the measurement plans in the IG, which makes it seem like a low priority for RLDP</p> <p>↑ However, the questionnaires used for intervention studies generally have a good number of questions relating to qualitative information.</p>
Qualitative information gathering enables an appropriate assessment of why changes are or are not taking place and the character, depth, and sustainability of changes at various levels of the results chain.	<p>↑ The qualitative information collected through the questionnaires can provide greater understanding of what changes are happening and why.</p> <p>↓ However, that information does not seem to be reflected in reports or used for enriching interventions much. For example: the team is not clear which practices are most readily adopted by farmers under CF, or in the case of Radio and poultry intervention which were the aspects that most listeners wanted information on (which would have provided evidence for boxes 12, 13 and 14).</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
For full compliance here, qualitative indicators should form part of the measurement plan. Qualitative information collected in should then be analysed, used for explaining changes occurring in the sectors and to strategize.	

3.4. Verification of Extrapolated Figures (Recommended)

Reported changes in indicators that are extrapolated from pilot figures are regularly verified.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
When changes in indicators are calculated for large numbers of enterprises using data from small samples or a pilot phase, a method for regularly validating the extrapolation is in place.	<p>Most of the interventions are scale ups of what was carried out in the previous phases.</p> <p>↑ The changes in indicators will need to be verified through separate studies, as this is a separate phase.</p> <p>↓ There are no clear plans on how to handle extrapolation of results based on a small sample or on a pilot</p>
Use: The method for validating the extrapolation is in regular use.	N/A
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially Compliant	
As per interviews where extrapolation is done the team will also try to validate those findings later. However, it is necessary to document how this will be done. It can be through a few small case studies that check if the findings are still valid or if the assumptions are still valid.	

4. Estimating Attributable Changes

4.1. System for Measuring Attributable Change (Must)

Attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains are estimated using methods that conform to established good practice.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The Project has a documented plan for assessing and estimating the attribution of observed changes to Project activities for each of the key indicators in the results chain.	<p>↑ The <i>Measurement Plan</i> for each intervention includes a means of how certain changes at higher levels will be attributed. The method of attribution given in all <i>Measurement Plan</i> are FGDs.</p> <p>↓ However, the actual method used might vary.</p>
The methods chosen to assess and estimate attribution link back to the results chains, are appropriate to the Project context, and conform to established good practices.	<p>↑ From interviews, attribution is also assessed by proving that no other initiatives are likely to have caused those changes, by ascertaining the source of information/learning/inputs during surveys, comparing target group, and non-beneficiaries.</p> <p>↑ The team needs to decide on which methods will be used, it does not always need to be FGDs</p>
Use: The project has used the plan to estimate attributable change in indicators.	N/A.
Use: The project can demonstrate and staff can explain the methods used to assess and estimate attribution and how the methods conform to established good practices	<p>↑ The BAs are clear on what is attribution and what they can do assess it, for example they are aware of what other projects are doing that are similar in their markets and how that might affect their attribution</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
As of yet none of the methods of attribution have been used as it is too early for that however at the audit it will be necessary to have FGD questions, and responses analysed in reports show that attribution methods have been used and can assess attribution. It is not necessary to use all the methods, but selecting the right mix of methods for the interventions is necessary.	

5. Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market

5.1. The results of systemic change (Recommended)

The results of systemic change at key levels in the results chain(s) are assessed.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The Project has a documented plan for assessing and estimating the results of systemic change outlined in the results chains.	<p>⬇ It was not possible to assess this point using any of the four interventions chosen for this audit³.</p> <p>For this point the intervention on “Promotion of improved seed use through demo plots by ASA and Mount Meru”, is used.</p> <p>⬆ Quantitative indicators will be used to assess numbers copying, crowding in and the benefits got by those who copy or the farmers reached by the companies that crowd in.</p> <p>⬆ The <i>Measurement plan</i> also specifies what will be measured, how it will be measured and when.</p>
The methods chosen to assess systemic change link back to the results chains, are appropriate to the Project context, take attribution into account and conform to good research practices	<p>⬆ The <i>Measurement plan</i> mentions that attribution will be checked by looking at possibilities of other initiatives being the reason for changes.</p> <p>⬆ The methods suggested are appropriate and can measure systemic change.</p> <p>⬇ However qualitative measures of what was replicated, why those aspects etc. are not measured</p>
Use: The project has used the plan to assess and estimate the extent of systemic change.	N/A
Use: The project can demonstrate and staff can explain the methods used to assess systemic change and how the methods conform to established good practices.	<p>⬆ All staff are clear on what they consider systemic change for their interventions: it is crowding in and copying. They can explain how or why that might happen.</p> <p>⬇ Staff are not always clear on how to assess systemic change</p> <p>⬆ However, in most cases attribution of any changes will be through elimination of other initiatives that may have caused systemic change and through confirming a link between those copying or crowding in and the project or its partners.</p>
Use: Figures are supported by clear calculations; any assumptions are outlined.	<p>⬇ Figures quoted around systemic change are based on unwritten assumptions or are guesstimates.</p>

³ The up-scaling rice CF IG did not have indicators tagged to the right boxes, and there were no indicators given for systemic change in the cotton commercialization of FO IG. The other two IG on QDS and radio and poultry did not have boxes on systemic change as they did not cater to systemic change.

Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant
There needs to be a clear plan of how systemic change will be assessed. The plans should also be realistic, thus where surveys are feasible they should be used, where it is in-depth interviews, or meeting minutes, those methods should be used. All IGs should be carefully checked to see if systemic change has been thought of, included, and will be followed up and measured.

6. Tracking Project Costs

6.1. Tracking Costs (Must)

Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
A clear, accounting system is in place to track costs and produce annual and cumulative totals of all Project-related costs spent in country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ There is an accounting system in place that keeps track of all costs in country including costs in-country costs that are actually expensed at headquarters level. ↑ All costs can be summed up both annually and cumulatively. Costs of M&E are included as in-country costs. ↑ There were no separate design costs for this phase as it was based on conclusions of the previous phase.
Use: The project has annual and cumulative totals of all project-related costs spent in country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ Total annual and cumulative costs are reflected in the project annual and half yearly reports.
Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant	
An auditor might want to check if costs in the accounting system match the costs quoted in reports to donor.	

6.2. Allocating Costs (Recommended)

Costs are allocated by major component of the Project. (Applicable only to Projects with more than one main intervention)

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The accounting system enables management to estimate and produce totals on costs spent on each major component of the Project for which impact is estimated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↑ RLDP has different sectors and costs are allocated to each sector. Currently the costs for a sector reflects direct costs for that sector i.e. cost sharing with partners, events, costs of travel etc. of the BA.

Use: The project has annual and cumulative estimates of costs for each component for which impact is estimated.	↑ Costs are presented annually and cumulatively and presented against annual and cumulative project budgets.
Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant	
The DCED itself does not say which costs should be allocated per component (per sector in case of RLDP). RLDP has to make a decision on what to allocate for each sector and apply that method consistently when reporting annual and cumulative expenditures per sector. This is feasible under the current system.	

7. Reporting Results

7.1. Annual Results *Estimates* (Must)

The Project produces a report at least annually which clearly and thoroughly describes results to date.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The Project has a documented system for estimating Project-wide impacts for universal impact indicators (and/or other high level common indicators) at least annually.	↑ There is an <i>unwritten</i> plan for estimating project wide estimates of impact for both the universal impact indicators (except jobs) and other log frame indicators. This is done mainly by the MRM team compiling from various reports prepared by the BA
Use: The project has an annual report with clear estimates of project wide impacts for universal impact indicators (and/or other high level common indicators). The report outlines the context and any qualitative information needed to understand the numbers produced.	<p>↑ The Annual and Half-yearly reports do contain estimates of the achievements against all Log Frame indicators.</p> <p>↓ The reports have quantitative information on impact but very little qualitative information is reflected. However, this is mainly because the structure set out in the SDC guidelines for partner reporting requires very concise reporting on achievements and does not allow much detail in qualitative and contextual reporting.</p> <p>↑ RLDP also produced a “Highlights of 2012” report for public dissemination that summarizes achievements of the year and it has some qualitative information but again this is very little.</p>
Use: The project can clearly explain how the estimates were derived and show supporting calculations. These calculations takes overlap into account. (W/A)	<p>↑ MRM staff were able to explain how aggregation of results is done but were not very clear on how overlaps were handled.</p> <p>↓ Overlap between different sectors is taken into account but overlaps within a sector not so clearly (e.g. overlap of QDS purchasing farmers and contract farmers of sunflower).</p> <p>↓ There may be some overlaps between indirect beneficiaries and those reached through interventions that are done on radio. The team is a bit unsure on how to handle this, as of now indirect has not been reported.</p>

Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant

The process for aggregating project wide impact should be documented; this documentation should include a way to handle overlaps. It is important that a clear and reasonable manner is developed and then used consistently. The team should look for scope to add more to its reporting by giving some contextual background and qualitative information in its reporting, this can be done in partly in the *Introduction* section and partly in *Chapter 2* of the Annual and Half-yearly reports. However, if it is not very feasible to do so in the Annual and Half-yearly reports then this can be done in the Highlights for 20XX reports.

7.2. Contributions acknowledged (Must)

Contributions of other publicly funded Projects and private contributions are acknowledged.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
Where the reported changes will be due in part to the work of other publicly-funded Projects and private contributions, they are acknowledged in the report above.	↑ Collaborations with other publicly funded projects are acknowledged in the report.
Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant	

7.3. Gender Disaggregated Data (Must)

Reported changes in key indicators are disaggregated by gender.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
All reported changes, and particularly in impact indicators, are disaggregated by women and men. Where figures are not disaggregated, justification is provided as to why this was not possible or appropriate.	↑ All reporting disaggregates the number of poor men and women that are involved/benefitted. ↓ In a few cases disaggregation is not feasible (e.g. in case of outreach due to radio) and in those cases it is not done. This is however not documented.
Conclusion & Recommendations: Fully compliant	

7.4. “Indirect” Results Reported (Recommended)

Results of systemic change and/or other indirect effects are reported.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The results of systemic changes and other indirect effects are reported. When these or other indirect effects are quantified, the figures are divided as ‘direct’ and ‘indirect.’	<p>↑ The Annual, Half-yearly, and Highlights of 2012 reports all mention direct results of the project. The Highlights of 2012 report mentions that the results quoted are direct.</p> <p>↓ Indirect effects are estimated in the IGs but are not used in reports</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
For full compliance, the direct, indirect, and total results should be included in the above report(s). The calculations used to derive those aggregate numbers should be clearly done with any assumptions or methods used to handle overlaps etc. clearly outlined.	

7.5. Publishing Results (Recommended)

Results are published.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
A document with the results and costs described in Sections 7.1-7.4 is made publicly available. The auditor may choose to ‘sign off’ on this report.	<p>↑ The project has developed the Highlights for 2012 report for public dissemination that reports the direct results achieved in the 2012</p> <p>↓ The report does include costs but this is only the costs expensed for the interventions, and not all sector costs or project wide costs.</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
The development of this report is a good initiative and very useful for publishing results. For full compliance here, RLDP should: include all costs expensed directly for the sector (annual and cumulative), mention all in-country costs, and increase the amount of qualitative and contextual information in the report.	

8. Managing the System for Results Management

8.1. Results Used for Management (Must)

The Project has a clear system for results measurement through which findings are used in Project management and decision-making.

Compliance Criteria	Findings/remarks
The Project has a documented plan in place to show how information from results measurement system will flow into management decision making.	<p>⬇ There is no documented plan in place showing how information from results measurement system flows into management decision making</p> <p>⬆ However, the project has quarterly reviews done where each intervention is discussed based on the IG. All important information (field observations, intervention progress, etc.) are also stored in the IG</p>
The plan is realistic and ensures that results information is regularly and effectively integrated into management decision making.	<p>⬆ The results measurement system allows the Project Manager to review progress of the project against the resources used.</p> <p>⬆ In the cotton sector the results measurement system helped the BA and SBA in understanding which region to focus on based on the results that were being got and the decision was made to focus more in the eastern region.</p> <p>⬆ The quarterly reviews have also been useful in motivating the BAs to plan better and to share their challenges with their colleagues.</p>
All Project staff have access to written guidance (e.g. a manual or staff guide) on how to implement all elements of results measurement (each of the sections above).	<p>⬇ There is no written guidance on results measurement, staff have mostly all seen the DCED guidance.</p>
Use: Managers can explain to what extent underlying assumptions in the results chain(s) are proving to be valid, and can cite decisions they have made based on the information provided by the results measurement system.	<p>⬆ For example: BAs were told at the beginning of this phase to assessing which partners were likely to scale up after the previous phase. This helped the project decide which partners to continue working with.</p> <p>⬇ However, this has mostly not happened as most underlying assumptions are not documented hence the validation of those assumptions and making decisions based on those has not happened.</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
For full compliance, RLDP should document the results measurement system explaining what happens when, what are the expected outcomes. Decisions taken during reviews should be documented along with the reasons behind the decisions to make it clear that the reviews also use information gathered as part of the results measurement system. Assumptions should be identified first and when possible validated.	

8.2. Human and Financial Resources (Must)

The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.

Compliance Criteria	Rating
The program can show that sufficient human and financial resources are available and have been allocated to manage and implement the results measurement system.	<p>↑ About 6% of the annual project budget is allocated for results measurement activities⁴.</p> <p>↑ Currently the budget given is deemed sufficient to carry out regular results measurement activities. Regular monitoring done by the BA is not part of this budget but is part of the sector budget.</p> <p>↓ However as the overall project budget is decreasing over the years, the RLDP team is concerned about not having sufficient funds for results measurement in its final years</p>
Tasks and responsibilities in relation to results measurement are appropriate and documented.	<p>↑ Job descriptions of the BA and SBA mention their results measurement roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>↓ There is no document clearly outlining roles and responsibilities of each staff around results measurement.</p>
Staff are able to accurately describe their tasks and responsibilities in results measurement.	<p>↑ All staff were able to describe their results measurement roles and responsibilities and the descriptions were consistent.</p> <p>↑ BAs and SBA has mentioned that there is a lot that needs to be done to ensure that sufficient information is available for the results measurement system.</p> <p>↑ Staff said that they have so far had the time to carry out those activities.</p>
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
The roles and responsibilities of each staff member about results measurement should be clearly documented. Current resource allocation to results measurement has been sufficient; however, there are concerns that it might not remain so and more resources will be required particularly in the final years of the project. This should be looked into.	

8.3. System for Results Measurement (Must)

The system is institutionalised.

Compliance Criteria	Rating
Evidence exists of the results measurement system having been institutionalized, for example in the form of inclusion in Project	<p>↑ Job descriptions mention results measurement as part of the responsibilities of the BA, SBA and of course the MRM team.</p> <p>↑ Staff performance review do not have a specific MRM focus but it is clearly expected of them to regularly monitor their interventions, BAs even have to develop a budget for monitoring in their sector.</p>

⁴ In year 3 when RLDP is expected to carry out another Household survey the results measurement budget is 10%

management documents, job descriptions, staff performance reviews, regular meetings etc.	⬇ Documentation supporting the institutionalization of the results measurement system is poor. There are no manuals or guidance on results measurement, there is no documentation of quarterly review meetings etc.
All Project staff can provide examples of results measurement activities that they have undertaken in the last month.	⬆ Examples of results measurement activities that staff have recently carried out include updating of IGs, monitoring visit to the field to see what implementation has been done, writing of reports
Conclusion & Recommendations: Partially compliant	
As at now, there is no written documentation that supports institutionalization of the system within the project. This can be done by outlining roles and responsibilities of staff regarding results measurement, and by recording the decisions taken during review meetings, relating those to field findings etc.	

Recommendations

1. Suggestions for improving compliance

RLDP has quite quickly adopted the DCED Standards and tried to put it into use for mostly tracking progress and steering the project. Thus, it has been able to develop the RCs with measurement plans and intervention strategies all with an eye to having a system that can be used immediately for management of the project. So far, this has been done well; the BAs have internalized the system and own their IGs. What is now required is to fill in a few gaps that will make the system more robust and will build the paper trail that can support the claims of the project. As the recommendations given for each sub-control point above shows, the main weaknesses in the system comes from insufficient documentation and from unclear measurement plans at the higher levels of the RC.

Thus the suggestions for improving compliance are:

- The BAs should carefully reference their IG and their Sector Strategy making it clear where they have got different figures from.
- Figures or estimates that are not based on evidence but are assumptions should be labelled assumptions, and the reasoning behind those assumptions should be clearly laid out. Sometimes the reasoning behind an assumption may be a previous experience (e.g. from a previous contract farming intervention we have seen a 90% adoption of GAP). Or it may be from a set of quick checks in the field made by the BA such as by asking a group of farmers how many of them have had someone copy a GAP from them. These will make the assumptions made more realistic and closer to what is likely to happen later. These little verifications of assumptions can be recorded in the IG under *Observations logbook* or in *Status update sheet*.
- Clear documentation should be made of the decisions made during quarterly review and the reasons behind those decisions. This can be recorded in the IG *Status update worksheet*.

- *Measurement plans* should be more carefully made with both quantitative and qualitative indicator. The major guiding principle for indicators given for a box is that they should together be able to **adequately measure the change in a particular box** and **attribute the change to activities**.
- The MRM team should carefully review all IGs right after a quarterly review to see that all worksheets of the IG are properly filled up with the correct information, referencing, and updates. The quality control for the results measurement system lies with the MRM team and the IG is the most important monitoring tool for an intervention.
- The MRM team should develop a short guidance note that explains how monitoring and results measurement is being done in the project. This does not need to explain how to draw RC, but it should outline what are the different ways that data is collected by the project, the different kinds of reports it generates, what those reports contain, and what they feed into. It should explain the quarterly reviews what is discussed and how important points to cover for the review. It should explain how RLDP aggregates for annual and half-yearly reports including how technicalities such as overlaps will be handled. Then it should outline the broad roles and responsibilities regarding monitoring and results measurement that all positions in the project has.

2. Other issues

A few other issues that were also discussed during the audit process are:

Contract Farming:

This is one of RLDP's oldest running intervention, it is also the intervention that currently generates the most numbers. However, CF interventions still base a lot of their projections and targeting on assumptions, particularly around copying, crowding in and sustainability. When discussing what might trigger copying and/or crowding in a myriad of scenarios are given but it is not clear which ones are the most important ones. Given RLDP's experience and success in CF this is quite surprising. Therefore it is recommended that a case on CF should be developed. The case should not be one that only establishes the benefits of CF for poor farmers, as that would vary from sector to sector, and will still need to be measured carefully with current interventions.

The case should rather focus on the aspects of sustainability and systemic change that CF has brought about in the sectors RLDP has worked in. The case can outline what has made an organization continue working through CF even after RLDP has withdrawn support, what has made another organization drop CF and what made another organization scale up. It should explore the modifications made to the CF model introduced by RLDP by the organizations it has worked with. The reasons behind copying at farmer level should also be explored.

A case of this kind that establishes how systemic change and sustainability occurs through CF at both the level of the farmer and the contractor can serve as the evidence base of copying, crowding in and sustainability for all of RLDPs contract farming interventions. It can also help guide RLDP in selecting future partners and re-designing interventions so that copying, crowding-in and sustainability is made more likely. The data for such a case can be collected by RLDP staff if necessary but case study methodology, analysis and writing should preferably be done by someone external to the project to get an objective and outsiders view.

Working in advocacy:

As part of its strategy in different sectors RLDP carries out various tasks that are advocacy related. Mostly these are carried out via associations in that sector and take up a good bit of resources in terms of staff time and costs. However, no IG or RC is developed for these as it seemed difficult to draw the effect of these changes down to impact at farm level. For example: what effect would a reduction in tax for sunflower oil processing equipment have on the incomes of farmers in the central corridor? Not only is this difficult to say, any claims made would be extremely difficult to show and attribute. In some cases the change may mean processors have a better idea of how to certify their products, which may not have an effect on farm level incomes.

However, RLDP has a clear strategy on how to work on advocacy in the different sectors and spends a good bit of resources (time and money) on these. Thus there is no reason these initiatives should not be classified as an intervention (right now they are almost classified as ad hoc activities). To accurately capture the impact of these, and give them the importance they deserve, the suggestion is that these too should be called interventions and they should have their own IG. However, to avoid the hassle of claiming farm level income increases for these interventions, it should be sufficient to claim that any changes due to these advocacy interventions will contribute to changes in farm level incomes being measured in other interventions. Thus no farm level outreach or income should be claimed for those interventions, just the systemic change brought about due to policy changes or capacity development of associations will be measured.

3. Preparing for an audit

Finally, the points below are what RLDP can do to prepare for an audit.

- RLDP will soon be carrying out a few small impact assessments of the interventions it carried out in the 2012-13 farming season. These studies will likely be completed by March 2014. The project should use this opportunity to gather as much information as possible to fill up its evidence base. This can range from understanding farmer behavior in terms of adopting new practices, their adoption rates, changes in yields and incomes due to the changes they make, to understanding how copying from farmer to farmer takes place. In short the assessments should cover any gaps in information that RLDP currently has and also validate any assumptions RLDP has made in developing the current IGs
- Using the information collected the next set of IGs should be developed for the new interventions that will be launched for the 2013-14 farming season. This new set of IGs will also take in all the recommendations set out above and thus be more based on evidence and more compliant.
- Various reports should also be updated with the information collected from these studies.
- Then the new IG, updated Sector Strategy, and study reports should be reviewed to assess compliance with the DCED Standards. This can be done by an external person or by the MRM team – if it is the MRM team, then they should take care to be very critical and objective as an auditor will be even more so.
- Any gaps in compliance found after the above assessment should be immediately addressed.
- Then the project should go for a full audit. This should preferably be done before the Household survey scheduled for year 3 (2015) is carried out. This will allow the project to understand how robust its measurement process is before it launches a major study of this kind. If the measurement system is found

to be quite robust, then RLDP can go ahead with a household survey that can cap off all other achievements of the project. If there are gaps in information found during the audit in the measurement system then RLDP can make adjustments to its household survey to cover those gaps in information and so make up for the things that may have slipped through during regular monitoring.