

# Monitoring and Evaluation Plan



Approved by the GAFSP Steering Committee: February 2011  
Prepared by the GAFSP Coordination Unit

## Summary of Key Features of the GAFSP M&E Plan<sup>1</sup>

Key features of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of GAFSP projects include ex-ante Cost-Benefit Analysis of GAFSP projects; a baseline on which to assess progress on common indicators across all GAFSP projects, with regular reporting of progress to the Steering Committee (SC) and as input to the Mutual Accountability Framework review process of CAADP (for projects in Africa); project activities geo-referenced on a map overlaid with sub-national development indicators; an independent evaluation of implementation at project completion; and a mix of rapid and in-depth evaluation of project impacts on the overall GAFSP objective of raising rural incomes and food security.

### 1. Key Features of M&E Tools during Project Preparation Phase:

1. **Baseline data:** GAFSP will follow Supervising Entities (SEs') protocols on baseline data collection, which require that data be collected at the latest by the end of the first year of project implementation. SEs will include baseline data for all indicators (specifically including the GAFSP core indicators applicable to that project, and for indicators necessary for the impact evaluation<sup>2</sup>) in the final project document, or the progress report that covers the end of the first year.
2. **Ex-ante Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA):** CBA will be carried out and summarized in the project document available to the public, following SE protocols for all investment projects (CBAs are not required for Technical Assistance projects).

### 2. Key Features of M&E Tools during Project Implementation Phase:

1. **Core indicators:** Each GAFSP financed project will select from the menu of core indicators (see Annex 1) at least one output or intermediary outcome indicator for the results areas of focus of the GASFP project. These indicators will be included in the respective project Results Frameworks. This will allow for aggregation of results across projects.
2. **6 monthly progress reporting:** SEs will submit to the Coordination Unit (CU) (for aggregation and onward submission to the SC) their institution's standard public progress reports on project implementation, which will include an updated status on the GAFSP core indicators. In the case where the institution's reports

---

<sup>1</sup> This document benefits from inputs from Supervising Entities, consultation with some Steering Committee members, the World Bank Institute's Mapping for Results Initiative for geo-referencing, and with IFPRI, which is supporting the M&E system for CAADP.

<sup>2</sup> GAFSP core indicators are listed in Annex 1. The indicators necessary for the impact evaluation are: (1) Household income of direct beneficiaries, and (2) Proportion of target population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption, disaggregated by gender and vulnerable groups (from GAFSP Program Results Framework [Table 5]).

cannot be disclosed to the public, the SE will complete a template progress report (see Annex 3), which can be disclosed on the GAFSP website.

3. **Geo-referencing of project activities at the sub-national level:** By the end of the first year of implementation, project activities will be geo-coded onto a map overlaid with key development indicators. This geospatial information and development indicator data will be accessible through an existing established mapping platform focused on visualizing development project location data and development indicator data such as the Mapping for Results Platform, and will be embedded onto the GAFSP website.

3. Key Features of M&E Tools at Project Completion Phase:

1. **Completion reports:** SEs will submit to the CU (for aggregation and onward submission to the SC) their institution’s disclosable project completion reports. In the case where the institution’s reports cannot be disclosed to the public, the SE will complete and submit to the CU a template of a completion report (see Annex 4). The completion report will be disclosed on the GAFSP website.
2. **Independent Evaluation of implementation:** SEs will ensure that *all* GAFSP projects undergo an independent evaluation of implementation and submit to the CU (for the onward submission to the SC) their institution’s public independent evaluation reports<sup>3</sup>. In the case where the institution’s reports cannot be disclosed to the public, the SE will submit a disclosable summary of the independent evaluation which includes at minimum the overall project rating with an explanation of the scale used. The independent evaluation summary will be disclosed on the GAFSP website.
3. **Impact Evaluation (IE):** All GAFSP projects will undergo an impact evaluation (IE) upon completion of project. For a select group of projects (approximately 10-30 % of all GAFSP projects), in-depth experimental or quasi-experimental methods will be employed. For the remainder of GAFSP projects, rapid non-experimental methods will be considered sufficient (See Table A below for details on the Impact Evaluation policy for GAFSP).

**Table A: Impact Evaluation Policy for GAFSP**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Indicative Cost</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Funding</b>
<b>I. In-depth IEs</b> (experimental or quasi-experimental IE)	Approximately 10-30 % of all GAFSP projects selected according to lesson-learning priorities	\$800,000 for each IE	CU to centrally contract a specialized organization to carry out all in-depth IEs	To be funded separately by the SC

<sup>3</sup> According to SE survey results (see Table 10 in main text), current policies of AfDB, IDB, IFAD, and FAP do not require that *all* projects undergo an independent evaluation (current policies require only *some* projects to undergo an independent evaluation). In such cases, the SE would need to make arrangements for all GAFSP projects to be among the pool of selected projects for their institutions’ independent evaluation.

<b>II. Rapid IEs</b> (non-experimental IE)	All GAFSP projects (except for those that have been chosen to carry out the in-depth IEs)	\$50,000 for each IE	Each project to contract a specialized organization to carry out its rapid IE	To be funded from each GAFSP-awarded Grant amount
---	---	----------------------	---	---

#### 4. Role of SE, CU, and SC in implementing the GAFSP M&E Plan

The role of each entity is summarized below in Table B.

**Table B: Role of SE, CU, and SC in implementing the GAFSP M&E Plan**

	<b>Actions</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Supervising Entities for the Public Sector Window (ADB, AfDB, FAO, IDB, IFAD, WB, WFP)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follows its own guidelines on project M&amp;E during all phases of the project cycle</li> <li>[projects under implementation] Submits SEs' own progress report (or a disclosable version) every 6 months</li> <li>[projects under preparation] Submits a brief progress update with updated milestone dates every 6 months</li> <li>Completes geographic information form</li> <li>Submits SEs' own completion report (or a disclosable version)</li> <li>Submits SEs' own independent evaluation report (or a disclosable version)</li> <li>Submits rapid IE report (if the project is not selected for an in-depth IE)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-going</li> <li>By May 31 and Nov 30 of each year during the implementation period beginning on May 31, 2011</li> <li>By May 31 and Nov 30 of each year during the implementation period beginning on May 31, 2011</li> <li>By the end of the first year of project implementation</li> <li>When the report is ready</li> <li>When the report is ready</li> <li>When the report is ready</li> </ol>
Supervising Entity for the Private Sector Window (IFC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follows its own guidelines on project M&amp;E during all phases of the project cycle</li> <li>To develop M&amp;E Plan for the private sector window including any policy on IEs</li> <li>Submits program level annual development impact indicators based on IFC's Development Outcome Tracking System (DOTS) to CU for onward transmission to the SC</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-going</li> <li>Within 6 months of operationalization of the private sector window</li> <li>By May 31 of each year after operationalization of the private sector window</li> </ol>
Coordination Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepares template TOR for</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By Feb. 28, 2011</li> </ol>

	<p>rapid IEs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Contracts specialized organization to geo-code submitted geographic information and carry out mapping of GAFSP projects</li> <li>3. Contracts specialized organization to carry out in-depth IEs</li> <li>4. Submits GAFSP annual progress report to the SC</li> <li>5. Discloses relevant M&amp;E documents on the GAFSP website (including updating the progress of GAFSP core indicators every 6 months)</li> <li>6. Carry out other dissemination activities such as organize global and regional workshops and liaise with relevant organizations</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. By Mar. 15, 2011</li> <li>3. By June 30, 2011</li> <li>4. By July 30 of each year beginning on July 31, 2011</li> <li>5. On-going</li> <li>6. On-going</li> </ol>
Steering Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reviews annual progress report and provides overall guidance on project implementation</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On-going</li> </ol>

## The GAFSP M&E Framework<sup>4</sup>

1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has long been recognized as a vital aspect of development projects generally and of agriculture and rural development (ARD) projects in particular. This recognition has been widely held among all the key players involved in project design and implementation. For instance, the World Bank, IFAD and FAO collaborated in the 1980s to harmonize approaches to these functions (e.g., Casley and Kumar 1987). More recently, the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, FAO and the World Bank cooperated to update good practice and to elaborate a sourcebook of practical M&E indicators (GDPRD/FAO/World Bank 2008). Also, a strategy that lays out the framework for national and international statistical systems to produce and to apply agricultural and rural statistics was recently endorsed by the United Nations Statistical Commission (FAO/UNSC/World Bank 2010).
2. Such acknowledgment of importance and value does not, however, imply that practice has always matched the stated ambitions, and it must also be recognized that achievements in M&E have often proved to be disappointing (e.g., IEG 2009, p.27), and IEG continues to call for stronger compliance and performance. GAFSP intends to approach M&E with full due diligence so that all concerned parties can monitor progress effectively, use monitoring data to take appropriate managerial actions, and ultimately undertake evaluations to determine just what was achieved through the program interventions.
3. The monitoring of project performance consists of the tracking of human, physical and financial resources and the recording of how they are converted into outputs (project goods and services), and in turn, outcomes and impacts. It naturally includes financial monitoring and the analysis of financial records (e.g., Clark, Sarforius and Bamberger 2004). M&E reports should be generated regularly, and timed so as to serve as an input into the preparation of an Annual Work Plan and Budget. The allocation of budget resources for the following year, in normal circumstances, should be heavily influenced by the results and performance of the project during the current year, as recorded by the M&E system. Performance monitoring is now nearly universal in projects receiving significant external funding, and so in this regard GAFSP should not pose any novel challenges to project implementing agencies.
4. The basic rules for GAFSP agreed with the donors, recipient representatives, other potential Supervising Entities (SEs), and the World Bank Board of Executive Directors, are laid out in the GAFSP Framework Document endorsed by the World Bank Board on January 12, 2010 (see Box 1). Thus, this document, which lays out GAFSP's M&E approach, will be consistent with the rules and principles outlined in

---

<sup>4</sup> Contents of this document refer to GAFSP public sector window projects only, except for sections which explicitly refer to the private sector window or the International Finance Corporation (IFC).

the Framework Document, and describe operational details to be adopted by the GAFSP SEs as well as the Coordination Unit (CU) in carrying out M&E for GAFSP.

**Box 1: GAFSP Framework Document and M&E**

Annex 1 of the Framework Document includes the following basic information about M&E.

**GAFSP Program Goal**

The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) aims to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries through more and better public and private sector investment in the agriculture and rural sectors that is country-owned and led and through technical assistance. It does this by helping fund strategic parts of existing inclusive and peer-reviewed country-owned plans.

**Program Level Indicators**

1. Additional financing provided through GAFSP.
2. Number of people (disaggregated by gender) directly benefitting from investments to improve income and food security funded by the GAFSP.

**Component Level Indicators**

The Framework Document includes several core indicators for four out of five components of GAFSP. Furthermore the document mentions that (1) an expanded set of core indicators would be developed to capture intermediate outcomes and outputs of the different investments envisaged under the GAFSP, (2) baseline values and targets are not specified as these will depend on the specific country-level programs implemented under the GAFSP, (3) Supervising Entities are expected to commission independent evaluations of the activities they implement under GAFSP in order to facilitate lesson learning and knowledge sharing on the investment impact of agriculture and food security activities.

5. The design of GAFSP stipulates that once investment or Technical Assistance proposals are approved by the Steering Committee (SC), a SE is selected, and its internal policies, guidelines, and procedures will be used for design, appraisal, supervision, implementation and evaluation. Therefore, the M&E of GAFSP projects will follow established guidelines that already exist for the SEs. In addition, there will be limited M&E functions carried out at the GAFSP program level by the CU to be able to report aggregated results for GAFSP as a whole, as well as specific good practices that may not be required by SEs' operational policies, but will be sought to ensure a high level of accountability for GAFSP projects as requested by the donors. Specifically, these good practices refer to carrying out the following tasks:
  - 1) Project progress reports at 6 month intervals that can be disclosed via the GAFSP website
  - 2) Geo-referencing GAFSP project activity sites onto maps overlaid with development indicators
  - 3) Independent evaluation reports for all GAFSP projects that can be disclosed via the GAFSP website
  - 4) Impact Evaluation (IE) to be carried out for all GAFSP projects.

# 1. M&E during Project Preparation

## Key M&E Tools During Project Preparation Phase:

1. **Baseline data:** GAFSP will follow Supervising Entities (SEs') protocols on baseline data collection, which require that data be collected at the latest by the end of the first year of project implementation. SEs will include baseline data for all indicators (specifically including the GAFSP core indicators applicable to that project, and for indicators necessary for the impact evaluation<sup>5</sup>) in the final project document, or the progress report that covers the end of the first year.
2. **Ex-ante Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA):** CBA will be carried out and summarized in the project document available to the public, following SE protocols for all investment projects (not required for Technical Assistance projects).

6. **Baseline data:** One of the critical early steps is establishing relevant baselines against which progress can be assessed. It is a good idea to collect baseline data *prior* to project implementation whenever possible, but no later than the end of the first year of project implementation. A careful evaluation requires a well defined and executed baseline survey that gathers information before the project starts. Evaluation design, especially regarding impact assessment, should ideally take place alongside project design and development. However, given logistical and resource constraints, initial thinking about baseline collection often occurs only after the project has begun. This is because collecting baseline data typically requires rural household surveys, which are costly and take time to conduct.
7. Other common reasons why baseline data collection receive inadequate attention, despite the obvious importance of data as necessary input into assessing any progress are as follows: (1) insufficient program planning and oversight; (2) budget constraints; (3) time constraints; (4) political constraints; (5) lack of interest by management (decision makers); (6) delay in commissioning evaluations until late in the project cycle; and (7) difficulties of identifying a comparison group or collecting information on it (for a rigorous impact evaluation).
8. The reality is that in the rush to complete project preparation against deadlines, project teams often postpone baseline collection to the first year of implementation, for some or all of the reasons stated above. However, what often happens is that once the project has launched, baseline collection is forgotten as project implementing agencies are busy getting project activities up and running. In some cases where there is phasing of project implementation, collection of quality baseline data in late-phase target areas can be postponed for good reason. But in other cases, unless there is extra scrutiny on collecting baseline data in the first year, it often gets lost in the many activities that are going on in the first year of a project's life.

---

<sup>5</sup> GAFSP core indicators are listed in Annex 1. The indicators necessary for the impact evaluation are: (1) Household income of direct beneficiaries, and (2) Proportion of target population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption, disaggregated by gender and vulnerable groups (from GAFSP Program Results Framework [Table 5]).



9. **Status of existing systems (baseline data):** In theory, all GAFSP SEs collect data during project preparation or by the end of the first year of project implementation. Also all GAFSP SEs have indicated that they are already being disclosed through publicly available documents, or can be disclosed at the project’s discretion (IFAD) (see Tables 1 and 2).

**Table 1: SE Survey<sup>6</sup>: “Are baseline data collected for all projects?”**

ADB	Baseline data on the indicators that will be monitored during the project implementation are included in Reports and Recommendations of the President (RRP – a project appraisal document) or collected during the first year of implementation.
AfDB	Baseline data is collected for indicators that have been identified for the project. This is usually done during the first year of the project, if the data is not readily available.
IDB	Baseline information on all identified indicators is required in all projects.
WB	Baseline data on results indicators that will be measured as part of project implementation are included in PADs or collected during the first year of implementation.
IFAD	Baseline data on indicators that will be measured as part of project implementation are included in our Project Design Report or is collected during the first year of implementation.
FAO	Baseline data are usually collected for FAO development projects; however, the emergency nature of some interventions may prevent substantive baseline assessment.
WFP	All food assistance operations are supported by food security analysis undertaken by the Food Security Analysis Service of WFP. Products such as Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) or Emergency Food Security Assessments (EFSAs) or Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS) provide baselines and needs estimates respectively. Most analyses are undertaken prior to designing the projects. Information is collected from both primary data sources (often collected at the household level) and secondary data sources. WFP also has a MoU with the WB living standards measurement survey (LSMS) team which now ensures that each LSMS also has WFP relevant information such as food consumption and coping strategies.

**Table 2: SE Survey: “Are these baseline data available to the public?”**

ADB	Yes. Baseline data is included in Design and Monitoring Framework of the RRP and updated in Project Information Document during project implementation, and both documents are available to the public at the ADB’s website.
AfDB	Yes. The results framework/ logframe is included as part of the PAR and the PAR is available to the public on the Bank website.
IDB	Baseline information on key indicators is required and included in every project’s Results Matrix. Results matrices are part of loan proposals which are available to the public.
WB	Yes. The baseline data for the results indicators that will be reported on as part of project implementation are included as part of the results framework in the PADs, which are available to the public, and as part of Implementation Status Reports.
IFAD	Currently, the baseline data are not being made publicly available from IFAD. Projects,

<sup>6</sup> A questionnaire was sent to the SE representatives of the Steering Committee in August 2010 asking about each SE’s existing M&E system. Replies were received from all GAFSP Supervising Entities (ADB, AfDB, FAO, IDB, IFAD, WB, and WFP).

	however, can share these if they decide to do so.
FAO	Baseline data for investment and GEF projects prepared by the FAO Investment Centre are available through the corresponding investment institution websites. For FAO managed technical cooperation and emergency projects baseline data are identified in project documents and available to internal management, donors, recipients and project partners but not generally to the public.
WFP	All finalized baseline reports are available to the public. Much of WFP food security analysis and reports are fully available on WFP's website at <a href="http://www.wfp.org/food-security/reports">http://www.wfp.org/food-security/reports</a> . Extracts of these reports are also included in WFP's project documents which are also posted for the public on WFP's external website.

10. **Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA):** An ex-ante CBA helps project preparation teams to conduct economic analysis to determine whether the project creates more net benefits to the economy than other mutually exclusive options for the use of the resources in question. The basic criterion for a project's acceptability typically involves the discounted expected present value of its benefits, net of costs. Both benefits and costs are defined as incremental compared to the situation without the project. To be acceptable on economic grounds, a project's expected present value of the project's net benefits must be significant and positive.
11. **Status of existing systems (CBA):** All GAFSP SEs already carry out ex-ante CBAs for investment projects, and report at least the summary of the analysis in publicly available documents (see Tables 3 and 4). Thus, GAFSP projects will follow existing SE protocols on CBA for all investment projects. It is understood that CBA is not required for TA projects under existing SE protocol given the difficulty in quantifying the benefits in such activities. Thus, TA projects with GAFSP financing will not be required to carry out a CBA.

**Table 3: SE Survey: “Is cost-benefit analysis of projects undertaken (e.g., expected rates of return, cost effectiveness calculations)?”**

ADB	Yes. Both EIRR and FIRR <sup>7</sup> are estimated for most agricultural project proposals, except for the projects for which a least cost analysis is more appropriate such as emergency assistance and nutrition investments. The initial estimates of EIRR and FIRR are re-calculated during the preparation of Project Completion Report.
AfDB	Yes. All investment projects include analysis of Economic and Financial rates of return.
IDB	Usually. Most agricultural projects include some economic analysis with CBA or CEA. In addition, the IDB is in the process of developing new guidelines on conducting this analysis.
WB	Yes. For most agriculture projects it takes the form of expected economic and financial rates of return. For nutrition projects it often takes the form of cost effectiveness analyses. As of July 1, 2010 the calculation of the EIRR and the FIRR has become optional. However, this will be required for GAFSP projects.
IFAD	Yes. Calculations of FIRR and EIRR with sensitivities are undertaken in all projects. In some cases a least-cost approach is followed.
FAO	Yes. For most investment and GEF projects prepared by the FAO Investment Centre. FAO technical assistance, normative and emergency projects do not usually include a cost-benefit analysis.

<sup>7</sup> FIRR = Financial Internal Rate of Return, EIRR = Economic Internal Rate of Return

WFP	WFP’s activities including capacity building, technical assistance and traditional food assistance programs (emergency, protracted relief and recovery, country program and development) do not normally include a formal cost-benefit analysis. While guidelines on cost-benefit analysis exist on Program Guidance Manual, they are not normally a requirement.
-----	---

**Table 4: SE Survey: “Is this analysis available to the public (through the web)?”**

ADB	Yes. The analysis is summarized in the RRP, which is available to the public at the ADB’s website.
AfDB	Yes. The analysis is summarized in the Project Appraisal Report (PAR) and as a detailed Annex to the PAR. The PAR is available to the Public on the Bank website.
IDB	A summary of the analysis is included in the loan proposal which is available to the public.
WB	Yes. The analysis is described in an optional Annex to the WB Project Appraisal Documents (PADs) and summarized in the main text of the PADs. The PADs are accessible to the public (including through the web).
IFAD	IFAD’s final design document is made available to the public as per its disclosure policy.
FAO	Yes, the Investment Centre cost-benefit analysis is usually included in financial institution and GEF project documents that are available on the web.
WFP	WFP’s project budgets are all available through <a href="http://www.wfp.org/operations/list?tid=All&amp;tid_1=All&amp;field_id_value=">http://www.wfp.org/operations/list?tid=All&amp;tid_1=All&amp;field_id_value=</a> which enables a cost effectiveness comparison.

## 2. M&E during Project Implementation

Key Features of M&E Tools During Project Implementation Phase:

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Core indicators:</b> Each GAFSP financed project will select from the menu of core indicators (Annex 1) at least one output or intermediary outcome indicator for the results areas of focus of the GASFP project. These indicators will be included in the respective project Results Frameworks. This will allow for aggregation of results across projects.</li> <li><b>Seminannual (6 monthly) progress reporting:</b> SEs will submit to the CU (for aggregation and onward submission to the SC) their institution’s standard public progress reports on project implementation, which will include an updated status on the GAFSP core indicators. In the case where the institution’s reports cannot be disclosed to the public, the SE will complete a template progress report (see Annex 3), which can be disclosed on the GAFSP website.</li> <li><b>Geo-referencing of project activities at the sub-national level:</b> By the end of the first year of implementation, project activities will be geo-coded onto a map overlaid with key development indicators. This geospatial information and development indicator data will be accessible through an existing established mapping platform focused on visualizing development project location data and development indicator data such as the Mapping for Results Platform, and will be embedded onto the GAFSP website.</li> </ol>
--

12. **GAFSP Results Framework:** At the program level, the CU will report on program inputs and quality for both the public and private sector windows<sup>8</sup>. For the public sector window, the indicators to be used are the aggregated GAFSP core indicators and other indicators on program inputs and quality as specified in Table 5. This information will be made available on the GAFSP website after review by the SC every 6 months (see Table 5). The information will be compiled by the CU based on project and country level information provided by the SEs. For the private sector window, annual development impact indicators for each investment will be compiled by the IFC based on its Development Outcome Tracking System (DOTS)<sup>9</sup>. This information will be compiled by the IFC, and submitted to the SC through the CU, and made available on the GAFSP website after review by the SC every 12 months. Further details on M&E for private sector window activities will be presented in an M&E Plan to be developed by the IFC.

---

<sup>8</sup> IFC will develop a separate M&E Plan for the private sector window with operational details within 6 months of operationalization of the private sector window. .

<sup>9</sup> For more information on DOTS refer to: [www.ifc.org/dots](http://www.ifc.org/dots)

Table 5: GAFSP Program Results Framework (Public Sector Window)

Outcome	Outcome Indicators	Reporting
<b>PROGRAM GOAL</b>		
Income and food security of poor people improved in selected countries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of intended and actual direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (all projects)</li> <li>2. Household income of direct beneficiaries (to be reported for all projects through an impact evaluation)</li> <li>3. Proportion of target population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption, disaggregated by gender and vulnerable groups (to be reported for all projects through an impact evaluation)</li> </ol>	<p>6 monthly, cumulative by project, against target, by SE, aggregated by the CU</p> <p>When IE reports available, by SE</p>
<b>PROJECT COMPONENTS TO ACHIEVE PROGRAM GOAL</b>		
<p>Raise agricultural productivity                      Linking Farmers to Markets                      Reducing risk and vulnerability                      Improving non-farm rural livelihoods                      Technical Assistance, institution building and capacity development</p>	<p>4. Project specific objective and component indicators (Each project will include in its project specific M&amp;E framework, one or more GAFSP core indicator selected from the list in Annex 1. These will be aggregated across projects and countries.)</p>	<p>Included in annual SE project progress reports, including baselines and targets</p> <p>6 monthly, cumulative by project, against target, by SE</p> <p>Aggregated by CU</p>
<b>PROGRAM INPUTS AND QUALITY</b>		
Existing financing gaps in ongoing bilateral; and multilateral assistance in the agriculture and rural sectors filled.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Number of countries supported</li> <li>6. Number of projects supported</li> <li>7. Amount of financing provided through GAFSP, by pillar and by window</li> </ol>	Six monthly SE update
High quality project design and	8. Number of projects rated Satisfactory by SEs in supervision	Annually by SE

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>Reporting</b>
supervision provided by SE	reports 9. Number of projects rated Satisfactory in completion reports	Published by Coordination Unit
Transparent and predictable source of agricultural financing provided.	10. Approved documents disclosed on web  11. Donor pledges and actual receipts disclosed on web  12. SEs' own planned assistance amount for GAFSP countries to agriculture and rural development (in million US\$) for current <sup>10</sup> country assistance strategy cycle 13. SEs' actual assistance amount for GAFSP countries to agriculture and rural development (in million US\$) at end of current assistance strategy cycle	Published on the GAFSP website within 1 week of Steering Committee approval  Every 6 months At time of approval of GAFSP project  At end of SEs' country assistance strategy cycle

---

<sup>10</sup> Current refers to the period when the GAFSP project was approved by the GAFSP Steering Committee.

13. **GAFSP Core Indicators:** As it is understood that it may take many years of project operation before it is possible to report on progress made on higher-level results and their indicators, GAFSP will request SEs to report on lower-level progress indicators that can be reported on sooner and with greater frequency by all GAFSP projects: GAFSP core indicators (see Annex 1 for public sector window projects and Annex 2 for a draft for the private sector window projects). For the private sector window, development outcomes will be reported in accordance to the IFC Disclosure Policies and based on its Development Outcome Tracking System (DOTS) indicators<sup>11</sup>. For the public sector window, each individual GAFSP project will prepare its own Results Framework with its unique set of indicators. However, projects will also be required to include at least one indicator, preferably more, out of the menu of core indicators to enable some level of aggregation of results across projects at the GAFSP program level. In compiling these core indicators, the CU reviewed the IDA core sector indicators and core indicators listed in the recent publication by the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, FAO, and the World Bank (GDPRD/FAO/World Bank 2008). An earlier draft was also circulated to the SEs and their comments have also been incorporated. These indicators cover each of the five components of GAFSP<sup>12</sup> and were selected using the following principles:
- 1) The indicators are deliberately set at the output and intermediate outcome levels and have been selected in order to have parsimonious but wide applicability to GAFSP-funded interventions.
  - 2) The indicators do not provide an added burden for individual project M&E frameworks, rather provide indicators that would be included anyway, but in a form that is readily comparable across different GAFSP projects.
14. **Coordinating with country SAKSS nodes for CAADP countries:** For CAADP countries receiving funds from GAFSP, each country is strongly encouraged to coordinate from early on with the country Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (SAKSS) node, where it exists, to coordinate M&E activities as appropriate. The country SAKSSs are country owned teams comprised of local researchers that are expected to be the “knowledge brokers” for countries to carry out M&E of country investment plans.
15. **Status of existing systems (progress reporting):** All GAFSP SEs report on progress through the institutions’ standard documents at least every 6 months (see Tables 6-7). However, the main issue for GAFSP is the lack of uniformity regarding

---

<sup>11</sup> Under IFC’s current (2006) disclosure policy, IFC does not disclose project-level data due mainly to client confidentiality. The IFC does report in the aggregate on the development results achieved through IFC-supported projects. There is also an external assurance provider who reviews the data – including project level data - and provides an official assurance statement in IFC’s Annual Report. These policies will apply to GAFSP private sector window projects. Furthermore, IFC is currently reviewing its access to information policy, including whether, how, and to what extent it can make project-level data available to the public without compromising client confidentiality.

<sup>12</sup> The five components of GAFSP are: (1) Raising agricultural productivity, (2) Linking farmers to markets, (3) reducing risk and vulnerability, (4) Improving non-farm rural livelihoods, and (5) Technical assistance, institution building and capacity development.

disclosure (see Table 8). In the case where these progress reports cannot be disclosed as is, the SE will need to complete a template prepared by the CU with as much information as they can reveal. This document will then be disclosed on the GAFSP website (see Annex 3 for the template).

**Table 6: SE Survey: “What project progress reports are prepared for projects?”**

ADB	Quarterly Progress Report and Benefit Monitoring Report,
AfDB	Bi-Annual (2 per year) Supervision Reports by the Bank are prepared and recorded in SAP. In addition, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in the country prepares Quarterly Progress Reports.
IDB	Project Monitoring Reports (PMRs).
WB	Implementation Status Reports.
IFAD	At project level progress is monitored against targets. At corporate level a homogenized common format is used for all active (ongoing) projects. These are called project status reports (PSR).
FAO	This depends on the agreement with the donor concerned: in general projects produce six-monthly progress reports, focusing on progress against agreed objectives. In addition internal Quarterly Project Implementation Reports (QPIRs) are produced. These focus on the project input structure (in kind) and report on constraints and issues should schedule and deliveries deviate. Technical reports are also produced during implementation in response to specific technical issue. A sample of a technical report is provided.
WFP	WFP produced annual Standardised Project Reports (SPRs) based on a Calendar Year cycle. In addition, WFP produces additional bi-annual and quarterly reports on a grant-by-grant basis as per agreed donor reporting requirements.

**Table 7: SE Survey: “What is the reporting frequency of these reports?”**

ADB	Progress report – quarterly Benefit Monitoring Report –as agreed in Project Agreement.
AfDB	See Table 6
IDB	Every 6 months
WB	Prepared every 6 months.
IFAD	Project progress are usually semi-annual, monitored at the country management unit, PSRs are updated annually.
FAO	General progress reports (against agreed objectives) – six monthly QPIRs – (input structure) – quarterly Technical reports – no specific frequency
WFP	Every 12 months (released in Feb/March of following year)

**Table 8: SE Survey: “Are these progress reports available to the public?”**

ADB	Project Information Document, which summarizes findings of progress reports, benefit monitoring reports, and review missions, is available to the public at the ADB’s website.
AfDB	These reports are currently not available to the public but abridged supervision reports will be availed on the Bank’s website once the new supervision approach will be effective in June 2011.
IDB	PMRs are currently not available to the public but will be, in part, as of January 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2011.
WB	Part of the Implementation Status Reports is available to the public.
IFAD	Yes, they are available to the public.



FAO	No. They are usually only shared with the donor, who may ensure wider distribution
WFP	WFP SPRs are available to all governments or organisations which have donated to WFP.

16. **Geo-referencing of project activities:** Geo-referencing or mapping project activities is an innovative and effective tool to better monitor results and to increase the transparency of development programs, and is being deployed by aid organizations.<sup>13</sup> The CU will contract a specialized organization with extensive experience, e.g., the Mapping for Results Initiative, to geo-code GAFSP projects, and to display the information overlaid with relevant development indicators<sup>14</sup> in an interactive map format. This map will be embedded in the GAFSP website and be accessible through the overall mapping platform. By the end of the first year of project implementation, SEs will be requested to complete a simple form identifying the geographical location of intended project activities at the sub-national level (at least county level). The CU will pass the information to the third party vendor for processing (geo-coding). The same vendor will display the project activity in an interactive map overlaid with relevant development indicators. The map will be embedded into the country page of the GAFSP website. SEs will be required to provide updated information about the geographic location of their project at least once a year. The CU, through the specialized organization, will provide guidelines, training, and technical assistance to implement the system.

### 3. M&E at Project Completion

Key Features of M&E Tools at Project Completion Phase:

1. **Completion reports:** SEs will submit to the CU (for aggregation and onward submission to the SC) their institution's disclosable project completion reports. In the case where the institution's reports cannot be disclosed to the public, the SE will complete and submit to the CU a template of a completion report (see Annex 4). The completion report will be disclosed on the GAFSP website.
2. **Independent Evaluation of implementation:** SEs will ensure that *all* GAFSP projects undergo an independent evaluation of implementation and submit to the CU (for the onward submission to the SC) their institution's public independent evaluation reports<sup>15</sup>. In the case where the institution's reports cannot be disclosed

<sup>13</sup> Within the framework of the implementation of the new Policy on Access to Information, the World Bank in partnership with AidData has launched in October, 2010 the Mapping for Results Initiative (<http://maps.worldbank.org>) that geo-references and visualizes the geographic location of World Bank-financed projects and international aid programs at the sub-national level. Other donors (e.g., USAID, AfDB) are also piloting mapping exercises, as well as CSOs, e.g. the mapping exercises of the Kibera slum in Kenya (<http://mapkibera.org>) and the Haiti crisis map after the earthquake in January 2010 (<http://haiti.usahidi.com>).

<sup>14</sup> Development Indicators include those such as population, poverty, infant mortality, maternal health, malnutrition, and agricultural development.

<sup>15</sup> According to SE survey results (see Table 10), current policies of AfDB, IDB, IFAD, and FAP do not require that *all* projects undergo an independent evaluation (current policies require only *some* projects to

to the public, the SE will submit a disclosable summary of the independent evaluation which includes at minimum the overall project rating with an explanation of the scale used. The independent evaluation summary will be disclosed on the GAFSP website.

3. **Impact Evaluation (IE):** All GAFSP projects will undergo an impact evaluation (IE) of some form upon completion of project. For a select group of projects (approximately 10-30 % of all GAFSP projects), an in-depth experimental or quasi-experimental methods will be employed. For the remainder of GAFSP projects, rapid non-experimental methods will be considered sufficient.

17. **Completion reports:** A standard element of the project cycle is the preparation by the SEs of a completion report at project closure. SEs regard this as a crucial element that is essentially one of self-evaluation, usually conducted on a strict time scale, such as within six months of the end of disbursement of project resources. Naturally, effective reporting depends on the ready availability of project data from the respective Management Information System, including cogent project indicators that have been tracked and matched against project targets.

18. **Status of existing systems (completion reports):** All GAFSP SEs already prepare completion reports. However, not all SEs make these reports publicly available (see Table 9). Likewise in the case of the progress reports, where the completion reports cannot be disclosed as is, the SE will complete a template completion report prepared by the CU with as much information as they can reveal. These reports will be disclosed on the GAFSP website (see Annex 4 for the template).

**Table 9: SE Survey: “Are completion reports prepared for the project? Are they available to the public?”**

ADB	Project Completion Reports are prepared for all projects, and available to the public at the ADB’s website.
AfDB	The Bank’s Evaluation Department (OPEV) conducts evaluations on selected Projects and the results are available to the public.
IDB	Project Completion Reports (PCRs) are required for all IDB-financed projects but are currently not available to the public.
WB	Detailed Implementation Completion Reports (ICRs) are prepared and are available to the public.
IFAD	Yes. Project Completion Reports are prepared by Borrowers, with assistance from IFAD. These reports are available to the public.
FAO	Yes. Completion (terminal) reports are prepared for all FAO development projects. They are sent to donors and recipient governments but are not generally available to the public
WFP	Completion reports prepared only for select projects and are generally only available to donors and recipient governments.

19. **Independent evaluations:** An independent evaluation is an evaluation in which the evaluator has the primary responsibility for developing the evaluation plan,

---

undergo an independent evaluation). In such cases, the SE would need to make arrangements for all GAFSP projects to be among the pool of selected projects for their institutions’ independent evaluation.

conducting the evaluation, and disseminating the results, and describes an evaluation process that is conducted by those who are not closely associated with the intervention that is being evaluated. Accountability in self-evaluation is greatly enhanced through having in place some system for independent evaluation, where the independence is achieved by engaging evaluators who work at least at arm's length from the project implementing team.

20. **Status of existing systems (independent evaluations):** All SEs report that internal units within their institution carry out the “independent” evaluations (Table 10). These units are independent of management and report directly to the institutions’ Board of Directors, thus substantially are independent even if they are housed within the SEs. Significant differences prevail among SEs regarding independent evaluation of projects after completion and its reporting. In cases where existing guidelines do not necessarily ensure that *all* GAFSP projects would undergo independent evaluation (AfDB, IDB, IFAD, FAO), a commitment needs to be made by the SE to arrange for this to happen. In cases where existing guidelines do not ensure that *all* independent evaluations be publicly disclosed (WB (may change policy soon), IFAD), the SE will need to submit a disclosable summary of the independent evaluation which includes at minimum the overall rating with an explanation of the scale used.

**Table 10: SE Survey: “Are independent evaluations undertaken by the SE or by outside individual/institutions? Are the findings available to the public?”**

ADB	ADB’s Independent Evaluation Department (IED) validates all the project completion reports, and the validation reports are available to the public at the ADB’s website. Separately, IED conducts independent evaluation of selected projects, and the evaluation reports are available to the public at the ADB’s website.
AfDB	The Bank’s Evaluation Department (OPEV) conducts evaluations on selected Projects and the results are available to the public.
IDB	The Office of Evaluation and Oversight (OVE) conducts independent evaluation of selected projects. OVE’s reports are available to the public.
WB	The Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) undertakes an evaluation of each ICR. Under IEG's new disclosure policy (to be approved by the Board), ICR reviews are expected to become public documents. Up to now they have not been. Overall project ratings are reported (rather than individual component ratings). Detailed Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPAR) is prepared for selected projects. PPARs are available to the public.
IFAD	IFAD has an Independent Office of Evaluation which directly reports to the Executive Board. While some evaluation findings are shared publicly, not all evaluation reports are presented to the Board and thus not disclosed to the public. A report – ARRI-summarizing the evaluations undertaken in a particular year is presented to the Board. The Board may decide every year to disclose it eventually for the public.
FAO	FAO has an independent FAO Office of Evaluation which carries out project evaluations for projects with a budget over 4 million USD. It also carries out country and thematic evaluations. Projects with budgets less than 4 million USD can be reviewed within the scope of country and thematic evaluations. Findings of all evaluations are generally available to the public via the FAO Evaluation website.
WFP	WFP has an Office of Evaluation which undertakes internal evaluations as well as

	<p>commissions external evaluations. Evaluation reports are submitted to the Executive Board together with a Management Response, showing action taken to date for each evaluation recommendation. Both full and summary reports are available in time for Executive Board sessions and are made public on WFP's external website after they are approved by the EB.</p>
--	--

21. **Impact Evaluation:** Impact evaluation (IE) involves an assessment of changes in outcome indicators that can be attributed to a particular intervention (e.g., Roche 1999, Baker 2000). Many different methods and approaches have been used to examine and establish a causal link between the intervention and its results (IEG 2006, Bamberger 2009, IEG 2009). The challenges to be met in such work include establishing a viable counterfactual and attributing the impact to an intervention. Measuring impacts requires that a valid counterfactual be available to compare with the group treated by the intervention. The validity of the counterfactual is related to the attribution concern. Validity entails comparability between control and treatment groups, in all relevant dimensions, to ensure that outcome changes for the treatment groups are due solely to program participation.
22. IE is the systematic identification of the effects – positive or negative, intended or not – on individual households, institutions, and the environment caused by a given development activity such as a program or project. IE helps to better understand the extent to which activities reach the poor and the magnitude of their effects on people's welfare. IEs can range from large-scale sample surveys in which project populations and control groups are compared before and after, and possibly at several points during program intervention; to small-scale rapid assessment and participatory appraisals, during which estimates of impact are obtained from combining group interviews, key informants, case studies and available secondary data.
23. It should be noted that for GAFSP, the final IE studies which capture the impact of the entire project intervention will not be ready until the completion of the first batch of projects, plus at least 6-12 months. Thus, the first IE will not likely be completed until around 2016-17. However, at the time of each survey, an associated report will be prepared, which may already capture some preliminary results on impact.

#### **Box 2: Basic Features of Impact Evaluations (IE)**

##### **Purpose:**

- Measuring outcomes and impacts of an activity and distinguishing these from the influence of other, external factors.
- Helping to clarify whether costs for an activity are justified.
- Informing decisions on whether to expand, modify, or eliminate projects, programs or policies.
- Drawing lessons for improving the design and management of future activities.
- Comparing the effectiveness of alternative interventions.
- Strengthening accountability for results.

##### **Advantages:**

- Provides estimates of the magnitude of outcomes and impacts for different demographic groups, regions or over time.
- Provides answers to some of the most central development questions – to what extent are we making a difference? What are the results on the ground? How can we do better?
- Systematic analysis and rigor can give managers and policy-makers added confidence in decision-making.

**Disadvantages:**

- Some approaches are expensive and time-consuming, although faster and more economical approaches are also used.
- Reduced utility when decision makers need information quickly.
- Difficulties in identifying an appropriate counterfactual.

**Cost:**

IEs range from \$200,000 - \$1,000,000 depending on program size, complexity and data collection. Simpler and rapid IEs can be conducted for significantly less than \$100,000 and in some cases for as little as \$10,000 - \$20,000, although surely at the cost of considerable plausibility.

**Time Required:**

IEs can take up to 2 years or more. This would be in addition to the period during execution of the project. Rapid assessment evaluations can often be conducted in less than 6 months.

Source: Clark, Sarforius, and Bamberger (2004)

24. **Status of existing systems (IEs):** Institutional arrangements to carry out IEs on an institution-wide scale are still evolving in all of the SEs (Table 11-12). To date, there is no SE that mandates IEs for all, or even for a majority, of their projects. Therefore, if GAFSP were to require all, if not many, of their projects to undergo IEs, this would entail setting up a system that does not currently exist in any of the SEs.

**Table 11: SE Survey: “Are rigorous impact evaluations undertaken for all projects?”**

ADB	No. Impact evaluations are undertaken for selected projects.
AfDB	No. Impact evaluations are undertaken for selected projects only.
IDB	Impact evaluations are undertaken for selected projects.
WB	No. Impact evaluations are undertaken for selected projects.
IFAD	Not yet this is standard practice but IFAD is starting to do impact assessments.
FAO	No. Impact evaluations are undertaken for selected projects.
WFP	No, impact evaluations are undertaken for select WFP projects but not all projects.

**Table 12: SE Survey: “Who does these evaluations?”**

ADB	Some are done by IED and Economic Research Department, and others are done by outside evaluators.
-----	---

AfDB	These are conducted by the Bank’s Evaluation Department (OPEV)
IDB	Evaluations are completed in the IADB by the operational divisions, the Strategy Development Division and the Office of Evaluation. Outside evaluators from universities, research institutes, are often hired to do all or part of the evaluations.
WB	Some are done in-house (by the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME) initiative in the Research Dept.), some by IEG, and others are done externally (e.g., IFPRI, Universities).
IFAD	These are usually contracted out to the consulting firms by IFAD-assisted projects.
FAO	Some are done in house by the FAO Office of Evaluation and others are done externally
WFP	WFP impact evaluations are undertaken by both WFP internal staff as well as external evaluators.

25. **IEs (the purist view):** Randomized evaluation designs, involving the collection of information on project and control groups at two or more points in time, provide the most rigorous statistical analysis of project impacts and the contribution of other factors, and among purists are the only designs that can properly be regarded as IEs. In much of the contemporary discussion these are referred to as “Experimental” approaches. In practice, however, it is rarely possible to use these designs, for reasons of cost, time, methodological or ethical constraints. Thus most IEs use less expensive and less rigorous evaluation designs.
26. **IEs in contemporary practice:** Among a wide continuum, three broad approaches to IE designs in development evaluation have been distinguished. The first is the “gold standard” of an experimental design mentioned in the paragraph above. The second is a quasi-experimental design in which a "non-equivalent" control group is selected to match as closely as possible the characteristics of the project population. In the third approach, which is also referred to as a non-experimental design, the project population is compared with a non-equivalent control group only *after* the project has been implemented. Each successive model sacrifices methodological rigor, in return from which there are significant reductions in cost and time requirements.

**Box 3: “Models” of IEs**

**Model 1: Experimental Design**

Subjects (households, communities etc) are randomly assigned to project and control groups. Questionnaires or other data-collection instruments (anthropometric measures, etc) are applied to both groups before and after the project intervention. Additional observations may also be made during project implementation.

**Cost:** Cost can range widely depending on the size and complexity of the program being studied. The wide range on costs is driven by project context such as the scope of the intervention and the variability of household situations, the sample sizes of household surveys that determine precision of comparisons, and the unit costs of surveying rural households in the country. Given the nature of GAFSP project design and implementation, it seems unlikely that IE of this type can be entertained. Indicatively, a cost of \$800,000 is assumed here, if this approach were to be taken.

**Duration of Study:** Typically 12-18 months

**Model 2: Quasi-experimental design**

Where randomization is not possible, a control group is selected which matches the characteristics of the project group as closely as possible. Where projects are implemented in several phases, participants selected for subsequent phases can be used as the control for the earlier phase project group.

**Cost:** Cost is similar to those for Model 1. For indicative budgeting purposes in GASFP, it is assumed that the cost for GAFSP projects of “typical” size and complexity will be of the order of \$800, 000 for a high-quality quasi-experimental design IE.

**Duration of Study:** Typically 12-18 months

**Model 3: Non-experimental design**

A non-equivalent control group is selected as for Model 2. But in non-experimental design IEs, baseline and ex-post data are collected for project beneficiaries, but data for the non-equivalent control group are only collected after the project has been implemented and completed. Multivariate analysis is often used to statistically control for differences in the attributes of the two groups.

**Cost/timing:** \$50,000 indicatively. Costs will depend on study design features such as sample size.

**Duration of Study:** 6-9 months

Source: Bamberger (2009)

27. Many so-called impact evaluations, described by some as rapid ex post evaluations (Clark, Sarforius and Bamberger 2004), only study groups affected by the project. The procedures adopted in such more informal approaches have varied greatly according to the creativity and skills of the evaluators. Participatory methods have often been used to allow groups to identify changes resulting from the project, who has benefited and who has not, and what were the project’s strengths and weaknesses. Triangulation is used where possible to compare the group information with the opinions of key informants and information available from secondary sources. Case studies on individuals or groups may be produced to provide more in-depth understanding of the processes of change. All these diverse approaches have been resorted to in order to substitute at moderate cost for the absence of the more rigorous approaches to determining plausible counterfactuals that characterize the “Models” of Box 3.
28. For the purpose of results monitoring of GAFSP projects, any IE undertaken would be of the three models mentioned in Box 3. Other informal types of IE that do not take into account the counterfactual through some form of a control group such as those mentioned in the paragraph above will not be considered to be adequate.
29. **IE Policy for GAFSP projects:** A summary of the GAFSP’s policy on IE is presented in Table 13. All GAFSP projects will undergo an impact evaluation of

some form upon completion of project. For a select group of projects (approximately 10-30 % of all GAFSP projects), an in-depth experimental or quasi-experimental methods will be employed. For the remainder of GAFSP projects, more rapid non-experimental methods will be considered sufficient. The selection of projects to undergo the in-depth impact evaluation will be decided upon discussion with the specialized organization that will carry out the work.

**Table 13: Impact Evaluation Policy for GAFSP**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Indicative Cost</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Funding</b>
<b>I. In-depth IEs</b> (experimental or quasi-experimental IE)	10-30 % of all GAFSP projects selected upon discussion with the specialized organization	\$800,000 for each IE	CU to centrally contract a specialized organization to carry out all in-depth IEs	To be funded separately by the SC
<b>II. Rapid IEs</b> (non-experimental IE)	All GAFSP projects (except for those that have been chosen to carry out the in-depth IEs)	\$50,000 for each IE	Each project to contract a specialized organization to carry out its rapid IE	To be funded from each GAFSP-awarded Grant amount

30. **Implementing arrangement of IEs:** Impact evaluations for GAFSP projects should be carried out by a recognized research entity with a track record of carrying out such studies.<sup>16</sup> For in-depth IEs (Models 1 and 2 in Box 3), the CU will contract a research entity with a solid track record in carrying out similar IEs for agricultural development projects. For rapid IEs (Model 3 in Box 3), each project will contract a research entity and manage its work. The research entity should start engaging with the project as soon as possible starting in the project preparation phase to ensure that proper baseline data are collected, and conduct periodic field visits as necessary, as well as carry out the actual IE upon completion of the project. For in-depth IEs, the CU will prepare a TOR which will cover all projects to undergo an IE. For rapid IEs, the CU will prepare a template TOR for the IE implementer. Based on this template TOR, project teams will customize it to fit their project needs.<sup>17</sup> It is

<sup>16</sup> This could include universities, research organizations such as IFPRI, the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME) of the World Bank, Brookings Institute, Center for Global Development, regional technical organizations or initiatives such as 3IE ([www.3ieimpact.org](http://www.3ieimpact.org)) etc.

<sup>17</sup> It is anticipated that the needs will vary considerably, so it is not easy to provide general guidance or exemplary models. Some suggestive illustrations are conveniently available on the IFPRI website, such as several evaluative surveys in Bangladesh (<http://www.ifpri.org/publication/contribution-ifpri-research-and-impact-food-education-program-bangladesh-schooling-outco> and <http://www.ifpri.org/dataset/chronic-poverty-and-long-term-impact-study-bangladesh> <http://www.ifpri.org/dataset/impact-evaluation-food-education-program-bangladesh-2000>), surveying and analyzing the nutritional impact of policies in Malawi (<http://www.ifpri.org/publication/analyzing-nutritional-impact-policies-malawi>), and baseline survey and initial results for the World Bank’s Uganda NAADS project (<http://www.ifpri.org/publication/assessing-impact-national-agricultural-advisory-services-naads-uganda-rural-livelihoods>).



expected that the TORs for both types of IE will include priority for sub-contracting or partnering with local research organizations.

31. **Funding of IEs:** For in-depth IEs, the SC will make available a separate budget to cover for these studies based on an indicative cost of \$800,000 per study. For rapid IEs, the indicative cost of \$50,000 is expected to be budgeted within the GAFSP-awarded grant amount that is executed by the Government.
32. **Role of CU in IEs:** The CU will hire a senior IE specialist to be housed in the CU with extensive experience in carrying out and managing IEs to oversee the work of the research entity contracted to carry out the in-depth IE, as well as to support and advise project teams in carrying out their rapid IEs.

#### 4. M&E Reporting and Dissemination Structure

33. The reporting and dissemination structure is presented in Table 14.

**Table 14: Role of SE, CU, and SC in implementing the GAFSP M&E Plan**

	<b>Actions</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Supervising Entities for the Public Sector Window (ADB, AfDB, FAO, IDB, IFAD, WB, WFP)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Follows its own guidelines on project M&amp;E during all phases of the project cycle</li> <li>2. [projects under implementation] Submits SEs' own progress report (or a disclosable version) every 6 months</li> <li>3. [projects under preparation] Submits a brief progress update with updated milestone dates every 6 months</li> <li>4. Completes geographic information form</li> <li>5. Submits SEs' own completion report (or a disclosable version)</li> <li>6. Submits SEs' own independent evaluation report (or a disclosable version)</li> <li>7. Submits rapid IE report (if the project is not selected for an in-depth IE)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On-going</li> <li>2. By May 31 and Nov 30 of each year during the implementation period beginning on May 31, 2011</li> <li>3. By May 31 and Nov 30 of each year during the implementation period beginning on May 31, 2011</li> <li>4. By the end of the first year of project implementation</li> <li>5. When the report is ready</li> <li>6. When the report is ready</li> <li>7. When the report is ready</li> </ol>
Supervising Entity for the Private Sector Window (IFC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Follows its own guidelines on project M&amp;E during all phases of the project cycle</li> <li>2. To develop M&amp;E Plan for the Private Sector Window</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On-going</li> <li>4. Within 6 months of operationalization of the private sector window</li> <li>2. By May 31 of each year</li> </ol>

	including any policy on IEs 3. Submits annual development impact indicators based on IFC's Development Outcome Tracking System (DOTS) to CU for onward transmission to the SC	after operationalization of the private sector window
Coordination Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prepares template TOR for rapid IEs</li> <li>2. Contracts specialized organization to geo-code submitted geographic information and carry out mapping of GAFSP projects</li> <li>3. Contracts specialized organization to carry out in-depth IEs</li> <li>4. Submits GAFSP annual progress report to the SC</li> <li>5. Discloses relevant M&amp;E documents on the GAFSP website (including updating the progress of GAFSP core indicators every 6 months)</li> <li>6. Carry out other dissemination activities such as organize global and regional workshops and liaise with relevant organizations</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By Feb. 28, 2011</li> <li>2. By Mar. 15, 2011</li> <li>3. By June 30, 2011</li> <li>4. By July 30 of each year beginning on July 31, 2011</li> <li>5. On-going</li> <li>6. On-going</li> </ol>
Steering Committee	2. Reviews annual progress report and provides overall guidance on project implementation	2. On-going

34. **Role of SEs:** During project preparation, the SE will carry out due-diligence appraisal according to its own guidelines including the establishing of a baseline by the end of the first year of implementation and an ex-ante CBA. It will also support the government in designing an appropriate M&E structure to report on results for the project. Additionally, to satisfy GAFSP requirements, SEs will: (1) submit progress on the GAFSP Results Framework (Table 5) as requested by the CU, (2) ensure that at least one core indicator is included in the project Results Framework per GAFSP Component (see Annex 1), (3) complete basic geographic information forms to enable geo-coding of project activity sites, and (4) arrange for the rapid IE (Model 3 in Box 3) to be carried out (if the project is not selected for an in-depth IE). Also, in cases where required GAFSP documents cannot be disclosed, SEs will complete templates prepared by the CU with as much disclosable information as possible.

35. **Reporting Structure:** SEs will submit to the SC, through the CU, progress reports for each project under preparation and implementation every 6 months (by May 31 and November 30 beginning May 31, 2011). For projects still under preparation, the SE will submit to the SC a brief progress update note prior to SC meetings, which includes updated milestone dates and a brief description of progress also beginning May 31, 2011. Project teams are requested to carry out supervision missions shortly before these dates so the latest progress can be reported in the progress reports. Upon completion of the project, the SEs will submit a completion report to the CU, as well as an independent evaluation carried out by the SE's independent evaluation unit.
36. **Role of CU:** The CU will send timely reminders to the SEs on any documents that will be due. It will also develop a results page in the GAFSP website to report on progress made program-wide as well as at the project level, minimally every six months. At the program level, it will report on the progress of the GAFSP Results Framework (Table 5) as well aggregated progress on the core indicators (see Annex 1), which will be reported by the SEs through the progress reports. This will be provided to the SC as an annual progress report every year by July 31 beginning July 31, 2011. At the project level, the CU will maintain a page for each project on the website, and upload to the website any disclosable documents provided by the SEs, embed a project activity map, create a link to the project website, media material, and any other pertinent information/material provided by the SE.<sup>18</sup> The work of the CU will require timely provision of project data by all SEs to the CU. The CU will also contract and supervise the work of specialized organizations, namely to carry out in-depth IEs, and the mapping platform.
37. The CU will also prepare one-page results sheets and other opportune dissemination materials, liaise with the M&E office of relevant organizations such as the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge System (ReSAKSS), which is in charge of the review of M&E for CAADP country investment plans, organize and participate in global and regional workshops as needed, and aim to incorporate other best practice M&E tools. In particular, as stated in the GAFSP Framework Document<sup>19</sup>, the SC may decide to commission an annual workshop organized by the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD) to communicate progress towards results, knowledge, and lessons learnt in GAFSP projects. The workshop will include representatives from stakeholder groups involved in GAFSP, including recipient countries and regional organizations, Supervising Entities and CSOs. For CAADP countries, GAFSP will provide input into CAADP's Mutual Accountability Framework as requested by the ReSAKSS. These efforts will be led by a senior M&E specialist to be hired and housed in the CU.

---

<sup>18</sup> Pages have already been created and are publicly accessible for the eight countries awarded funds in 2010.

<sup>19</sup> Para. 80, Pg. 36

38. **Private Sector Window:** IFC is the SE for the private sector window. Given the difference in the level of disclosability of data between the public and private sector windows, the IFC will develop a separate M&E plan applicable for the private sector window in consultation with the donors of the private sector window. The CU will coordinate with IFC during the drafting of the plan to ensure that a proper reporting structure is established between the IFC and the CU. IFC's plan is expected to be developed within 6 months of operationalization of the private sector window. Currently it is expected that the IFC will submit to the CU input of progress on the Private Sector Window for the GAFSP annual progress report by May 31 of each year after operationalization of the private sector window.
39. **Role of the SC:** The SC will review progress made at the program level and in the individual countries either virtually or at SC meetings. Once the SC has reviewed the progress, the documentation will be disclosed on the GAFSP website.

**List of Annexes:**

- Annex 1: GAFSP Core Indicators for the public sector window
- Annex 2: Draft GAFSP Core Indicators for the private sector window
- Annex 3: Template for Project Progress Report
- Annex 4: Template for Project Completion Report

## References

- ADB (2002). Handbook for Integrating Risk Analysis in the Economic Analysis of Projects, Asian Development Bank, Manila.  
[http://www.adb.org/documents/handbooks/integrating\\_risk\\_analysis/risk\\_analysis.pdf](http://www.adb.org/documents/handbooks/integrating_risk_analysis/risk_analysis.pdf)
- Baker, J. (2000). *Evaluating the Poverty Impact of Projects: A Handbook for Practitioners*. The World Bank, Washington, D. C.  
<http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/library/impact.htm>
- Bamberger, M. (2006) *Conducting Quality Impact Evaluations under Budget, Time and Data Constraints*. IEG: World Bank, Washington D.C.  
<http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/>
- Bamberger, M. (2009), Institutionalizing Impact Evaluation Within the Framework of a Monitoring and Evaluation System, IEG, World Bank, Washington, DC.  
[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/4585672-1251461875432/inst\\_ie\\_framework\\_me.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/4585672-1251461875432/inst_ie_framework_me.pdf)
- Belli, P., Anderson, J.R., Barnum, H.N., Dixon, J.A. and Tan J.-P. (2001). *Economic Analysis of Investment Operations: Analytical Tools and Practical Applications*, WBI Development Studies, World Bank, Washington, DC.  
[http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2006/01/27/000160016\\_20060127112546/Rendered/PDF/298210REPLACEMENT.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2006/01/27/000160016_20060127112546/Rendered/PDF/298210REPLACEMENT.pdf)
- Casley, D.J. and Kumar, K (1987), *Project Monitoring and Evaluation in Agriculture*, World Bank, Washington, DC.  
[http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000178830\\_98101911003577](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000178830_98101911003577)
- FAO/UNSC/World Bank (2010), Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics, World Bank Report Number 56719-GLB.  
[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/AgStatistics10\\_web.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/AgStatistics10_web.pdf)
- Fort, L., Martinez, B.L., Mukhopadhyay, M. (2001), *Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development: A Tool Kit*. Poverty Reduction and Economic Management, World Bank, Washington, DC, revised and updated in 2005.  
<http://search.worldbank.org/all?qterm=Fort%202005%20gender%20toolkit>
- GDPRD/FAO/World Bank (2008), *Tracking Results in Agriculture and Rural Development in Less-than-ideal Conditions: A Sourcebook of Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation*. Global Donor Platform for Rural Development, Bonn, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, World Bank, Washington, DC.

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0380e/i0380e00.htm>

- Clark, M. Sarforius, R. and Bamberger, M. (2004), *Monitoring and Evaluation Tools, Methods and Approaches*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn booklet, IEG, World Bank, Washington, DC, In English and six other languages

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTOED/EXTEVACAPDEV/0,,contentMDK:22293257~menuPK:4585754~pagePK:64829573~piPK:64829550~theSitePK:4585673,00.html>

- IEG (2006), *Impact Evaluation: The Experience of The Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank*, IEG, World Bank, Washington, DC (prepared by Howard White)

<http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/>

- IEG (2009), *Annual Review of Development Effectiveness 2009 Achieving Sustainable Development*. World Bank Washington, DC.

<http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/>

- IEG (2010), *Cost-Benefit Analysis in World Bank Projects*. IEG, World Bank, Washington, DC

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTOED/Resources/cba\\_full\\_eval.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTOED/Resources/cba_full_eval.pdf)

- Kelly, V. and Donovan, C. (2008), *Agricultural Statistics in Sub-Saharan Africa: Differences in Institutional Arrangements and their Impacts on Agricultural Statistics Systems: A Synthesis of Four Country Case Studies*. International Development Working Paper 95, MSU, East Lansing

[www.aec.msu.edu/fs2/papers/idwp95.pdf](http://www.aec.msu.edu/fs2/papers/idwp95.pdf)

Note especially the Donovan Appendix 3 Agricultural Statistics in Mozambique: Institutional Organization and Performance, and Appendix 4 Agricultural Statistics in Rwanda: Key Aspects of Institutional Organization and Performance.

- Legovini, A. (2010), *Development Impact Evaluation Initiative: A World Bank-Wide Strategic Approach to Enhance Developmental Effectiveness*. Paper prepared for CODE, June. Click on “Read more” at:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTDEVIMPEVAINI/0,,contentMDK:22728189~menuPK:3998294~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:3998212,00.html>

- Mackay, K.R. (2007), *How to Build M&E Systems to Support Better Government*. IEG, World Bank, Washington, DC

Available in several languages at:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTOED/EXTEVACAPDEV/0,,menuPK:4585748~pagePK:64829575~piPK:64829612~theSitePK:4585673,00.html>

- Ravallion, M. (1999) “The Mystery of the Vanishing Benefits: Ms. Speedy Analyst’s Introduction to Evaluation” Working Paper Series 2153, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

[http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDS\\_IBank\\_Servlet?pcont=details&menuPK=64154159&searchMenuPK=64154240&theSitePK=501889&siteName=IMAGEBANK&eid=000094946\\_99082005390028](http://imagebank.worldbank.org/servlet/WDS_IBank_Servlet?pcont=details&menuPK=64154159&searchMenuPK=64154240&theSitePK=501889&siteName=IMAGEBANK&eid=000094946_99082005390028)

- Roche, C. (1999) *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change*. Oxfam, Oxford.
- World Bank (2000). Ex Ante Economic Analysis in AKIS Projects. Methods and Guidelines for Good Practice. Agricultural Knowledge & Information Systems (AKIS) Good Practice Note. Washington, DC.  
[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/825826-1111129171182/20431827/Exante\\_Analysis.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/825826-1111129171182/20431827/Exante_Analysis.pdf)
- World Bank (2005), *Community Driven Development and Social Capital: Designing a Baseline Survey in the Philippines*. Report No. 32405-PH, SDV, World Bank Washington, DC.  
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/EASTASIAPACIFIC/EXT/EXTEAPREGTOPSOCDEV/0,,contentMDK:20589113~pagePK:34004173~piPK:34003707~theSitePK:502940,00.html>
- World Bank (2005), DIME Development Impact Evaluation Initiative. Processed, DEC, World Bank, Washington DC.

## **Annex 1: GAFSP Core Indicators for the public sector window: A menu of progress indicators common to all projects**

The GAFSP Framework Document stipulates that the selected Supervising Entities (SEs) will prepare and supervise projects using their own policies, guidelines, and procedures. This clearly applies to aspects of M&E as well. Each GAFSP project will therefore include a detailed M&E framework with appropriate objectives, components, monitorable indicators and targets, and report on them following each SE's institutional requirements.

At the same time, there is strong demand from GAFSP stakeholders to demonstrate accountability and progress, which coincides with the clear interest of SEs in being able to demonstrate the usefulness of their contributions. To respond to this demand, there is a need for the program as a whole to report progress aggregated across all projects and countries in a timely manner.

As it is understood that it may take many years of project operation before it is possible to report on progress made on higher-level results and their indicators, this section presents a menu of core lower-level progress indicators that can be reported on sooner and with greater frequency by all GAFSP projects. These indicators cover each of the five components of GAFSP and were selected using the following principles:

- The indicators are deliberately set at the output and intermediate outcome levels and have been selected in order to have parsimonious but wide applicability to GAFSP-funded interventions.
- The indicators do not provide an added burden for individual project M&E frameworks, rather provide indicators that would be included anyway, but in a form that is readily comparable across different GAFSP projects.

Supervising Entity (SE) project task teams are requested to incorporate all (and at least one) relevant GAFSP core indicator(s), from the menu provided for each component, into their own project-specific results frameworks. Thus, each component of the GAFSP financed project should have at least one of the GAFSP core indicators.

Where relevant, core indicators will always be disaggregated by gender or any other vulnerable target group (such as indigenous groups, infants, pregnant women.)

SEs are expected to set targets for each indicator and report progress on each indicator at six monthly intervals, when appropriate, as part of their project supervision reports.

The Coordination Unit will aggregate these results and prepare annual progress reports for the Steering Committee by July 31. Thus, the first annual progress report is expected by July 31, 2011. To this end, it would be helpful to have supervision missions by the respective SEs carried out shortly before this date so that the latest progress updates could be fed into the report. Following consideration by the Steering Committee, progress made on the core indicators will be disclosed on the GAFSP website in a suitable format.



## MENU OF GAFSP CORE PROJECT PROGRESS INDICATORS

Results Area	Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)	Reporting Frequency	GAFSP Funded Interventions
<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVES</b>			
<b>Component 1: Raise agricultural productivity</b>			
Higher yielding technologies adopted Technology generated	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of collaborative research or extension sub-projects implemented</li> <li>2. Number of client days of training to raise agricultural productivity provided to scientists, extension agents, agro-dealers, farmers, community members etc (disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>3. Number of client days of extension services provided to farmers, community members etc (disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>4. Number of farmers who have adopted the technology being promoted</li> <li>5. Number of additional hectares which have adopted the technology being promoted</li> </ol>	Every 6 months where appropriate, cumulative by project, against target, by SE	<p><i>Farmer advice and information.</i></p> <p><i>Access to improved seeds and inputs.</i></p> <p><i>Veterinary services and improved breeds.</i></p> <p><i>Adoption of improved technology including aquaculture and land management practices.</i></p> <p><i>Technology development and adaptation.</i></p> <p><i>Institutional development</i></p> <p><i>Linkages with farmers and advisory services.</i></p>

Results Area	Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)	Reporting Frequency	GAFSP Funded Interventions
Water resources managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Area with new irrigation and drainage services (ha)</li> <li>7. Area with improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services (ha)</li> <li>8. Number of water users provided with new/improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services (disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>9. Number of operational water user associations</li> </ul>		<p><i>Expand and rehabilitate irrigated areas.</i></p> <p><i>Improve river basin management.</i></p> <p><i>Improve water use in rainfed systems</i></p>
Land security strengthened	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Number of target population with use or ownership rights recorded (disaggregated by gender) in a manner recognized by national or customary law</li> <li>11. Percent of target land area with use or ownership rights recorded in a manner recognized by national or customary law</li> </ul>		<p><i>Land policy and legal reforms.</i></p> <p><i>Increase security of existing customary or informal land tenure.</i></p> <p><i>Preventing and reducing land conflicts.</i></p> <p><i>Improving land use planning.</i></p>
<b>Component 2: Linking Farmers to Markets</b>			

Results Area	Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)	Reporting Frequency	GAFSP Funded Interventions
Transfer and transaction costs reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. Km of roads constructed (disaggregated by all-weather or seasonal)</li> <li>13. Km of roads rehabilitated (disaggregated by all-weather or seasonal)</li> <li>14. Number of targeted clients who are members of an association including producer association, cooperative, water user association etc (disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>15. Number of rural markets/market centers constructed</li> </ul>	Every 6 months where appropriate, cumulative by project, against target, by SE	<p><i>Construction, upgrade and rehabilitation of rural infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Improve collection and dissemination of market information</i></p> <p><i>Improve systems for grades and standards and their application.</i></p> <p><i>Strengthen producer organizations.</i></p> <p><i>Improve skills and access through outgrower schemes and contract farming.</i></p> <p><i>Improve regional integration of agricultural markets.</i></p>
Value addition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16. Volume of farm produce under improved post-harvest management</li> <li>17. Number of private or public-private agro-processing and quality control facilities installed</li> <li>18. Number of client days of training on better post-harvest storage, transportation, and/or</li> </ul>		<p><i>Improving post-harvest management.</i></p> <p><i>Food safety and quality management.</i></p>

<b>Results Area</b>	<b>Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)</b>	<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	<b>GAFSP Funded Interventions</b>
	management practices provided (disaggregated by gender)		
Mobilization of rural finance supported	19. Outstanding rural microfinance loan portfolio (amount US\$) 20. Outstanding rural SME loan portfolio (amount US\$) 21. Number of active microfinance loan accounts of holders domiciled in rural areas,(disaggregated by gender of holder) 22. Number of active loan accounts of rural SMEs 23. ‘At risk’ proportion of microfinance loan portfolio 24. ‘At risk’ proportion of rural SME portfolio		- improving farmer and marketing agent access to finance and financial intermediaries.
Private enterprises directly financed (private sector window)	See Annex 2 for GAFSP Core Indicators for the private sector window		
<b>Component 3: Reducing risk and vulnerability</b>			

<b>Results Area</b>	<b>Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)</b>	<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	<b>GAFSP Funded Interventions</b>
Price and weather risk managed	<p>25. Volume of food for which price risk has been managed using market based tools</p> <p>26. Value of food for which price risk has been managed using market based tools</p> <p>27. Number of systems introduced or restored to improve food security monitoring and early warning for weather-related risks</p> <p>28. Number and frequency of food security and crop assessment surveys conducted</p> <p>29. Volume of production covered by risk mitigation programs directed towards vulnerable groups.</p>	Every 6 months where appropriate, cumulative by project, against target, by SE	<p><i>Manage food price volatility at the country-level.</i></p> <p><i>Early warning and weather risk management for food crop production.</i></p>
Food-related social protection strengthened	<p>30. Number of households benefiting from cash transfer programs (head of household disaggregated by gender and vulnerable groups)</p> <p>31. Number of households receiving</p>		<p><i>Transfer programs.</i></p> <p><i>Insurance schemes.</i></p> <p><i>Institutional capacity strengthening.</i></p>

<b>Results Area</b>	<b>Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)</b>	<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	<b>GAFSP Funded Interventions</b>
	food based transfers (disaggregated by gender and vulnerable groups)		
Nutrition of vulnerable groups improved	<p>32. % increase in production of fortified foods including complementary foods and special nutritional products.</p> <p>33. Number of people receiving improved nutrition services (e.g., Ready to Use Therapeutic Food (RUTFs), Vitamin A, micronutrients, bio-fortified foods), disaggregated by gender, age, vulnerable groups</p>		<p><i>Production of nutritious foods.</i></p> <p><i>Women empowerment programs.</i></p> <p><i>Essential vitamins and minerals.</i></p>
<b>Component 4: Improving non-farm rural livelihoods</b>			
<p>Investment climate improved</p> <p>Non-farm rural entrepreneurship promoted</p>	<p>34. Number of client days of non-farm related vocational training provided (disaggregated by gender)</p> <p>35. Percentage of targeted clients satisfied with provided vocational training</p>	<p>Every 6 months where appropriate, cumulative by project, against target, by SE</p>	<p><i>Improve the rural investment climate.</i></p> <p><i>Expand rural infrastructure (see also indicators 11-12)</i></p> <p><i>Community-driven</i></p> <p><i>Upgrade skills</i></p>

Results Area	Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)	Reporting Frequency	GAFSP Funded Interventions
	(Disaggregated by gender)		<i>Improve access to finance (see indicators 17-22)</i>
<b>Component 5: Technical Assistance, institution building and capacity development</b>			
Capacity-building for sector strategy, investments and implementation provided	<p>36. Number of policies, strategies, frameworks or investment plans adopted</p> <p>37. Public expenditure review results published</p> <p>38. Number of trained additional civil servants dedicated to sectoral planning and strategy</p> <p>39. Number and percentage of community based organizations which reflect community interests and needs, that actively participate in national or provincial level technical and policy bodies or project implementation related to food security or agriculture programs</p> <p>40. Number of additional community based organizations' staff trained in institutional</p>	Every 6 months where appropriate, cumulative by project, against target, by SE	<p><i>Development of agriculture and food security policies, strategies, frameworks, and investment plans.</i></p> <p><i>Support the design and implementation of a consultative/participatory process including civil society to update and/or formulate sector strategy and policy</i></p> <p><i>Improving public expenditure management</i></p> <p><i>Institutional reform and implementation capacity</i></p> <p><i>Strengthening donor coordination.</i></p>

<b>Results Area</b>	<b>Menu of Common Project Level Progress Indicators (Output and Intermediate Outcomes)</b>	<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	<b>GAFSP Funded Interventions</b>
	strengthening/sectoral planning and strategy		
Enhancing design, monitoring and evaluation	41. Number of participants in M&E workshops, training events, seminars, conferences etc (disaggregated by gender and affiliation)		<i>Expanding technical expertise Strengthening agriculture and food security data and results monitoring.</i>
Knowledge development and dissemination	42. Number and cost of analytical reports published		<i>Carry out high-impact analytical work</i>
Private sector advisory and related services investments (private sector window)	See Annex 2 for GAFSP Core Indicators for the private sector window		



## **Definition of Core Indicators (to be completed)**

### **1. Number of collaborative research or extension sub-projects implemented**

This indicator measures the number of collaborative research or extension sub-projects under implementation or completed. These data aggregated across projects and over time will show the growth in collaboration between the public sector/government-driven research and extension systems, with the private sector and other non-governmental providers of extension services and of agricultural research.

Guidance on “collaborative sub-projects”: Individual projects on research or extension, funded by matching grants, research grant scheme or other contractual arrangements as part of project activities.

Guidance on “under implementation”: A collaborative sub-project for which a contractual arrangement has been established.

Data requirements: Number of collaborative sub-projects under implementation, number of collaborative sub-projects completed.

### **2. Number of client days of training provided to raise agricultural productivity (disaggregated by gender)**

Guidance on “clients”: Includes scientists, extension agents, agro-dealers, farmers, community members, business owners, etc, to be defined by the project.

Guidance on “trained”: Any training organized or provided by the project (formal or informal training degree and non-degree courses, vocational, on the job training, field demonstrations, etc), completed by a client.

Data requirements: Male clients who completed training multiplied by the duration of training expressed in days; female clients who completed training multiplied by the duration of training expressed in days.

### **3. Number of client days of extension services provided to farmers, community members etc (disaggregated by gender)**

**TO BE DEFINED**

### **4. Number of farmers who have adopted the technology being promoted**

**TO BE DEFINED**

### **5. Number of additional hectares which have adopted the technology being promoted**

**TO BE DEFINED**

## **6. Area with new irrigation and drainage services**

Guidance on “new irrigation and drainage services”: This refers to the provision of irrigation and drainage services in an area that has not had these services before. The area is not necessarily newly cropped or newly productive land, but is newly provided with irrigation and drainage services, and may have been rainfed land before.

## **7. Area with new improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services**

Guidance on “improved irrigation and drainage services”: This refers to the upgrading, and/or modernization of irrigation and drainage services in an area with existing irrigation and drainage services.

## **8. Number of water users provided with new/improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services (disaggregated by gender)**

This indicator measures the number of water users, disaggregated by women and men, who are provided with irrigation and drainage services under the project.

Guidance on “water users”: This refers to the recipients of irrigation and drainage services, i.e. the owners or, in case the land is leased, the lessees of the land provided with irrigation and drainage services. Female and male recipients are to be reported on separately.

Guidance on “irrigation and drainage services”: This refers to the better delivery of water to, and drain water from, arable land, including better timing, quantity, quality, and cost-effectiveness for the water users.

Guidance on “new irrigation and drainage services”: This refers to the provision of irrigation and drainage services in an area that has not had these services before. The area is not necessarily newly cropped or newly productive land, but is newly provided with irrigation and drainage services, and may have been rainfed land before.

Guidance on “improved/rehabilitated irrigation and drainage services”: This refers to the upgrading, and/or modernization of irrigation and drainage services in an area with existing irrigation and drainage services.

## **9. Number of operational water user associations**

**TO BE DEFINED**

## **10. Number of target population with use or ownership rights recorded (disaggregated by gender) in a manner recognized by national or customary law**

**TO BE DEFINED**

## **11. Percent of target land area with use or ownership rights recorded in a manner recognized by national or customary law**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**12. Km of roads constructed (disaggregated by all-weather or seasonal)**

This indicator measures the number of kilometers of all roads available to motorized traffic constructed under the project.

Need to add Guidance on “all-weather” and “seasonal”

**13. Km of roads rehabilitated (disaggregated by all-weather or seasonal)**

This indicator measures the number of kilometers of all roads reopened to motorized traffic, rehabilitated, or upgraded under the project.

Need to add Guidance on “all-weather” and “seasonal”

**14. Number of targeted clients who are members of an association including producer association, cooperative, water user association, etc (disaggregated by gender)**

This indicator measures the share of clients (may include men and women farmers or businesses) who have become members of a relevant association as a result of project activities.

Guidance on “association”: Includes producer association, cooperative, water user association, business associations, etc, which either existed in the project area before the project started, or were created under the project.

Guidance on “members”: A client who is formally registered as a member of an association.

Data requirements: Number of targeted male clients; number of targeted female clients, number of targeted businesses; number of targeted males who are members of an association; number of targeted females who are members of an association; number of targeted businesses who are members of an association

**15. Number of rural markets/market centers constructed**

TO BE DEFINED

**16. Volume of produce under improved post-harvest management**

This includes practices such as (i) improved storage, (ii) warranty contracts, (iii) investments to comply with SPS and other food safety standards, and (iv) others.

**17. Number of private or public-private agro-processing facilities installed**

TO BE DEFINED

**18. Number of client days of training on better post-harvest storage, transportation, and/or management practices provided (disaggregated by gender)**

Guidance on “clients”: Includes farmers, fishers, agro-foresters etc.

Guidance on “trained”: Any training organized or provided by the project (formal or informal training degree and non-degree courses, vocational, on the job training, field demonstrations, etc), completed by a client.

Data requirements: Male clients who completed training multiplied by the duration of training expressed in days; female clients who completed training multiplied by the duration of training expressed in days.

#### **19. Outstanding rural microfinance loan portfolio (amount US\$)**

This indicator measures the total outstanding (i.e., not yet repaid or written off) amount of the micro-finance loan portfolio for all Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs) and Community Managed Loan Funds (CMLF) promoters receiving project support. The entire portfolio of holders registered in rural areas of the institution should be reported as of a reasonably recent date, not just the project-financed portion.

#### **20. Outstanding rural SME loan portfolio (amount US\$)**

This indicator measures the outstanding (i.e., not yet repaid or written off) amount of the SME loan portfolio for all Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs) and Community Managed Loan Funds (CMLF) promoters receiving project support. The entire portfolio of the institution should be reported as of a reasonably recent date, not just the project financed portion.

#### **21. Number of active microfinance loan accounts of holders domiciled in rural areas (disaggregated by gender of holder)**

This indicator measures the total number of active microfinance loan accounts for all institutions supported by the project. This should not be the cumulative number of loans over the life of the project. The entire microfinance portfolio of the Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs) and Community Managed Loan Funds (CMLF) should be reported, not just the project financed portion. If number of loan accounts is not available, the number of borrowers should be used as a proxy.

#### **22. Number of active loan accounts of rural SMEs**

This indicator measures the total number of active SME loan accounts for all institutions supported by the project. This should not be the cumulative number of loans over the life of the project. The entire SME portfolio of the Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs) and Community Managed Loan Funds (CMLF) should be reported, not just the project financed portion. If number of loan accounts is not available, the number of borrowers should be used as a proxy.

#### **23. ‘At-risk’ proportion of microfinance loan portfolio**

**TO BE DEFINED**

#### **24. ‘At-risk’ proportion of rural SMEs**

**TO BE DEFINED**

#### **25. Volume of food for which price risk has been managed using market based tools**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**26. Value of food for which price risk has been managed using market based tools**

**TO BE DEFINED**

27. Number of systems introduced or restored to improve food security monitoring and early warning for weather-related risks

**TO BE DEFINED**

**28. Number and frequency of food security and crop assessment surveys conducted**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**29. Volume of production covered by risk mitigation programs directed towards vulnerable groups.**

This indicator measures the existence of insurance and other market based programs targeted towards vulnerable groups

Guidance on “vulnerable groups”: Includes but not limited to women, smallholder farmers, ethnic minorities, and other marginalized producer groups.

Data requirements: Amount (in dollar value) of insurance and other market based programs

**30. Number of households benefiting from cash transfer programs**

The indicator evaluates the total number of households that benefitted from cash transfer interventions in a particular area through a GAFSP-financed project.

Guidance on “vulnerable groups”: Vulnerable groups include women headed households, smallholder farmers, ethnic minorities, and other marginalized producer groups.

**31. Number of households receiving food-based transfers (disaggregated by gender, vulnerable groups)**

The indicator measures the total number of people that received food based transfers in a particular area through a GAFSP-financed project.

Guidance on “vulnerable groups”: Vulnerable groups include households with pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants and young children as well as people living with HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.

**32. % increase in production of fortified foods including complementary foods and special nutritional products**

The indicator measures the increase in capacity to produce fortified foods - including complementary foods and specific nutritional products- in countries supported through GAFSP - financed projects.

Guidance on “fortified foods”: this refers to food that is fortified or enriched with micronutrients (i.e. vitamins and minerals) to improve the nutritional quality of food and provide public health benefits.

Guidance on “complementary feeding”: this refers to food that is used for complementary feeding (i.e. the process of initiating and continuing feeding food other than breast milk when breast milk alone is no longer sufficient to meet the nutritional requirement of infants).

Guidance on “special nutritional products”: this refers to foods that are developed for specific nutritional purposes, such as preventing malnutrition and promoting growth. These includes ready to use food (for supplementary of therapeutic feeding); complementary food supplements; and micronutrient powder.

### **33. Number of people receiving improved nutrition services (e.g., Ready to Use Therapeutic Food [RUTFs], Vitamin A, micronutrients, bio-fortified foods), disaggregated by gender, age, vulnerable groups**

This indicator measures the increase in the number of people with access to a basic package of nutrition services through a GAFSP-financed project. The contents of the basic package are defined by countries, and are therefore not identical. The indicator is calculated from the increase in the number of people with access to a defined basic package of nutrition services as a result of project investment.

Guidance on “Ready to Use Therapeutic Food (RUTFs)”: This is an energy-dense mineral/vitamin-enriched food, specifically designed to treat severe acute malnutrition. It is equivalent in formulation to Formula 100 (F100), which is recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO) for the treatment of malnutrition (WHO, 1999/a). RUTF is usually oil-based and contains little available water, which means that it is microbiologically safe, will keep for several months in simple packaging and can be made easily using low-tech production methods. As it is eaten uncooked, it is ideal for delivering many micronutrients that might otherwise be broken down by heat. RUTFs permit community-based therapeutic care (CTC) – with treatment at home and in the community – rather than costly and more problematic clinical care. A successful example of RUTFs is the Plumpy’Nut®.

Guidance on “Biofortification”: This method improves the micronutrient density of staple food crops. The process contributes to reducing the high prevalence of specific nutritional deficiencies, especially of iron, zinc and vitamin A that commonly occur in low income populations. Biofortification differs from ordinary fortification because it focuses on making plant foods more nutritious as the plants are growing, rather than having nutrients added to the foods when they are being processed. Examples foods that have been bio-fortified foods are sweet potatoes and corn.

Guidance on “Micronutrients”: These are essential nutrients only needed by the human body in small quantities for it to function normally. Categories of essential nutrients include vitamins, dietary minerals, essential fatty acids, phytochemicals and essential amino-acids.

Guidance on “vulnerable groups”: Vulnerable groups include pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants and young children as well as people living with HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.

### **34. Number of client days of non-farm related vocational training provided (disaggregated by gender)**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**35. Percentage of targeted clients satisfied with non-farm related vocational training provided (disaggregated by gender)**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**36. Number of policies, strategies, frameworks or investment plans adopted**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**37. Number of public expenditure reviews published**

**TO BE DEFINED**

**38. Number of trained additional civil servants dedicated to sectoral planning and strategy**

Guidance on “trained”: Satisfies the minimum academic and professional qualification necessary to carry out the activity.

**39. Number and percentage of community based organizations which reflect community interests and needs, that actively participate in national or provincial level technical and policy bodies or project implementation related to food security or agriculture programs**

This indicator measures the inclusion of civil society organizations in the processes and outputs of working groups and other technical and policy groups.

Guidance on “reflect community interests and needs”: Associations and organizations comprised of targeted beneficiaries, including, where appropriate, women and smallholder farmers.

Guidance on “actively participate”: Includes invitations, attendance, and concrete inputs to (via voting rights, publication/report authorship) meetings of ministries and groups working on food security and agriculture issues. This must apply to both existing groups as well as those newly created by GAFSP funds or to achieve GAFSP program goals.

Data requirements: Number of national technical agriculture and food security bodies; number of regional technical and food security bodies; number of civil servant attendees; number of CSO attendees.

**40. Number of additional community based organizations’ staff trained in institutional strengthening/sectoral planning and strategy**

Guidance on “trained in”: Includes but not limited to classes, workshops, and seminars in the topics of institutional strengthening/sectoral planning, strategy, and analytical review of public sector performance designed to support GAFSP-funded activities.

Data requirements: Number of learning/training opportunities; number of CSO staff participating in these opportunities; total number of people participating in these opportunities; total number of participating organizations (governmental and civil society).

**41. Number of participants in M&E workshops, training events, seminars, conferences etc. (disaggregated by gender and affiliation)**

Guidance on “affiliation”: Affiliation includes public sector (central, local), private business, and civil society organizations (local, international).

**TO BE DEFINED**

**42. Number and cost of analytical reports published**

**TO BE DEFINED**



Annex 2: Draft GAFSP Core Indicators for the private sector window (To be finalized in the GAFSP private sector window M&E Plan)

**1. Investment Indicators**

<b>Results Area</b>	<b>Primary Indicators (applies to all projects)</b>	<b>Secondary Indicators (applies to projects on a case-by-case depending on the nature of the project)</b>
<b>Financial Performance</b>	<p>[Real sector projects]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Financial Rate of Return (FRR) or Return on Investment Capital (ROIC)</li> <li>2. Project implemented in time and within cost (Y/N)</li> <li>3. Volume of product produced or processed</li> </ol> <p>-----</p> <p>[Financial markets projects]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Return on Equity (ROE) (Financial institution) or Net Internal Rate of Return (IRR) (Fund)</li> <li>2. Portfolio quality (Non Performing Loans %)</li> <li>3. Targeted portfolio growth per year</li> </ol>	
<b>Economic Performance</b>	<p>[Real sector projects]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economic Rate of Return (ERR) or Economic Return on Invested Capital (EROIC)</li> <li>2. Taxes paid (US\$)</li> <li>3. Employment (#)</li> <li>4. Female employment (#)</li> <li>5. Farms reached (#)</li> <li>6. Farmers reached (#)</li> </ol> <p>-----</p>	<p>[Real sector projects]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of farmers who have adopted the technology being promoted</li> <li>2. Number of hectares on adopted technology has been promoted</li> <li>3. Area with new or improved irrigation and drainage services (ha)</li> <li>4. Length (km) of roads constructed or rehabilitated</li> <li>5. Volume of farm produce under improved post-harvest management (MT)</li> </ol>

	<p>[Financial markets projects]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economic Return on Equity (EROE)</li> <li>2. Number of enterprises financed</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Volume of food for which price risk has been managed using market based tools (MT)</li> <li>7. Volume of nutritionally enhanced foods (MT) -----</li> </ol> <p>[Financial markets projects]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of employees of enterprises financed</li> <li>2. Number of female employees of enterprises financed</li> </ol>
<b>Environmental and Social Performance</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. E&amp;S integrated management systems (Y/N)</li> <li>2. Certification to food quality and safety and/or sustainability standards (Y/N)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Energy consumption per unit of product or per \$ of product value</li> <li>2. Water consumption per unit of product or per \$ of product value</li> <li>3. CO2 Equivalent emissions (MT)</li> <li>4. GHG Emissions avoided (MT CO<sup>2</sup> equivalent)</li> <li>5. Water saved (m<sup>3</sup>)</li> </ol>
<b>Private Sector Performance</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MSMEs reached (#)</li> <li>2. Financial transparency improvements (Y/N)</li> <li>3. Corporate governance improvements (Y/N)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purchase and sales from MSMEs (US\$)</li> </ol>

## 2. Advisory Service Indicators

<b>Output</b>	<b>Outcomes &amp; Impacts</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of workshops, training events, seminars, conferences, etc. (# events)</li> <li>2. Number of participants in workshops, training events, seminars, conferences, etc. (# events)</li> <li>3. Number of women participants in workshops, training events, seminars, conferences, etc. (# women)</li> <li>4. Number of participants providing feedback on satisfaction # (people)</li> <li>5. Number of participants reporting satisfied or very satisfied</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of entities that implemented recommended changes (# MSMEs/farmers)</li> <li>2. Number of entities reporting improved performance (e.g., improvements in productivity, operations, loan terms, valuations) (# MSMEs/farmers)</li> <li>3. Number of individuals achieving appropriate certification standards with support from project-trained people and/or institutions (# people disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>4. Number of entities obtaining certification due to</li> </ol>

<p>with workshops, training, seminars, conferences, etc. (# people)</p>	<p>Advisory Services (# MSMEs/farmers)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. MSMEs Reached (# MSMEs)</li> <li>6. MSME Revenues (US\$)</li> <li>7. Farmers Reached (# farmers)</li> <li>8. Farmer Revenues (US\$)</li> <li>9. Number of people receiving access to improved services (# people)</li> <li>10. GHG emissions avoided (metric tons/year) directly</li> <li>11. Water use avoided (millions of liters/year)</li> <li>12. Hectares of sustainably managed land (Ha)</li> </ol>
---	--

Definition of indicators to be completed



### Annex 3: Template for Six Monthly Project Progress Report

**GAFSP Project Six Monthly Progress Report**  
**COUNTY AND PROJECT NAME**

---

SE Name:	County:	Project Name:	Seq. No:
----------	---------	---------------	----------

---

**KEY DATES**

Project Approval Date:	Original Closing Date	Planned Mid Term Review:	Date of this Progress Report:
------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------

---

Effectiveness Date:	Revised Closing Date:	Revised Mid Term Review:
---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

---

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE (PDO)**

PDO from appraisal document:

Has the PDO been changed since approval? (YES/NO)

If yes new PDO:

---

**COMPONENTS:**

Component name	Component Cost
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
<i>etc</i>	

---

**OVERALL RATINGS<sup>20</sup>**

	Current rating	Previous rating
Progress towards achieving PDO		
Overall implementation		

<sup>20</sup> The ratings are: “S” = satisfactory; “U” = unsatisfactory

progress		
----------	--	--

---

**IMPEMENTAION STATUS OVERVIEW:**

*text*

---

**RESULTS**

(a) Core GAFSP Indicators	Baseline	Current	End Target
(b) Project Specific Indicators (top five)	Baseline	Current	End Target

---

**DISBURSEMENTS (in Millions)**

Currency	Original amount	Disbursed	% Disbursed

---

**KEY DECISIONS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION**

*text*

---

**RESTRUCTURING HISTORY**

## Annex 4: Template for Project Completion Report

### GAFSP PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

*Country and Project Name*

#### I. DATA SHEET

##### Section A: BASIC INFORMATION

Project Name:

Approval Date:

Effectiveness date:

Restructured date: *If applicable*

Completion date:

Implementing Agencies: *Enter formal name(s) of main entities/organizations responsible for implementation*

Co-financiers and Other External Partners: *Enter formal name(s) of any co-financiers and other partner organizations contributing to the operation.*

##### Section B: RATINGS SUMMARY

Outcome: *Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (or six point scale?)*

##### Section C: KEY RESULTS FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS

*The indicators and target values in this Section should be the same as the appraisal document.*

	Baseline	Actual Achieved	Original Target	Formally Revised Target	Comments (inc reasons for revised targets if any)
<b>KEY PDO Indicators</b>					
<b>KEY Component Indicators</b>					
<b>GAFSP Core Indicators</b>					

#### II. MAIN DOCUMENT

**SECTION 1: PROJECT/PROGRAM CONTEXT, DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES, AND DESIGN**

*This section is descriptive only, comprising factual statements or references to other documents*

Context at Appraisal

*Briefly summarize the country, macroeconomic and/or sector background of relevance to the operation's objectives and design.*

Original Project Development Objectives (PDO)

*Enter the original objective statement(s) and key associated performance indicators exactly as set out in the appraisal document. Briefly describe the changes and benefits that the operation was expected to achieve.*

Formally Revised Project Development Objectives (PDO)

*If applicable only -- explain how the change affected the originally expected outcome targets. Briefly describe the changes and reasons for the changes*

Main Beneficiaries

*Describe the "the primary target group" (people and organizations) as identified in the appraisal document and captured in the PDO as well as any other significant individuals and organizations ("secondary beneficiaries") expected to benefit directly from project activities. The section should establish clearly the causal link between project investments and the benefits expected to flow to the beneficiaries, including identifying any associated investments from other sources which are a necessary co-contributor to those benefits.*

Original Components

*List and summarize the project components as originally planned in the appraisal document. Indicate the causal linkages between component activities/outputs and the PDO outcomes to be achieved.*

Revised Components

*If applicable*

**SECTION 2: KEY FACTORS AFFECTING IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES**

*This section provides analysis of the key factors and events throughout the operational cycle which accounted for the operation's achievements and any shortcomings.*

Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry

*Summarize key factors during the preparation stage or issues related to quality at entry that affected implementation and outcomes, including: Soundness; Assessment of the project design; Adequacy of government's commitment, stakeholder involvement, and/or participatory processes; Assessment of risks*

Implementation

*Describe the factors that contributed to successful implementation or gave rise to problems*

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation, and Utilization

*This section should include separate assessments of (a) M&E design (b) M&E implementation (c) M&E utilization and strengthening of the existing M&E systems and capacity.*

Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance



*Summarize key safeguard and fiduciary issues in the operation, compliance with policy and procedural requirements, and any problems that arose and their resolution, as applicable.*

#### Post-completion Operation/Next Phase

*This section addresses transition arrangement to post-completion operation of investments financed by the present operation, operation and maintenance arrangements, and means of sustaining reforms and institutional capacity. It also briefly outlines the next phase/follow-on operation, if any.*

### **SECTION 3: ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES**

*This section assesses and rates the outcomes of the operation, especially achievements against the PDOs.*

#### Relevance of Objectives, Design, and Implementation

*Relevance refers to the extent to which an operation's objectives, design, or implementation are consistent with the country's current development priorities*

#### Achievement of Project/Program Development Objectives

*Describe the extent to which the operation achieved its development objectives and achievement of key associated outcome targets*

#### Efficiency

*Efficiency in the Outcome rating for operations asks whether the costs involved in achieving project objectives were reasonable in comparison with both the benefits and with recognized norms ("value for money"). The analysis should discuss both the traditional measures of efficiency (as applicable and practical)—e.g., net present value, economic rate of return, cost effectiveness, unit rate norms, service standards, least cost analysis and comparisons, and financial rate of return—and aspects of design and implementation that either contributed to or reduced efficiency*

#### Justification of Overall Outcome Rating

*Rate the overall Outcome of the operation and justify the rating*

#### Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts (if any)

*(a) Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social Development*

*(b) Institutional Change/Strengthening*

*(c) Other Unintended Outcomes and Impacts*

### **SECTION 4: LESSONS LEARNED**

*Drawing on the descriptions and analysis in earlier sections of the operation's design, implementation, and outcome, this section should present briefly the most **significant positive and negative lessons** learned from the operation's experience. A **Note of Cancelled Operation** should indicate lessons and implications to the future operations in the sector/country, or to any Bank operations or engagements in general.*

## **III ANNEXES**

#### Project Cost by Component

*List the component(s), and enter the estimated total project costs at appraisal and the actual total costs (or the latest estimates) by component in US million dollars (including*

*all sources of funds). Enter the amount of Physical and Price Contingencies (for appraisal estimate), Project Preparation Facility, and/or Front-end fee, as applicable. Calculate and enter the totals and percentages.*

**Financing**

Enter all sources of funds for the project/program, including from the government or from beneficiaries.

**Outputs by Component**

*Output targets should be assessed against those set out in the appraisal document*

**Economic and Financial Analysis**

This Annex provides the details of the economic and financial analysis reported in *Section on Efficiency*, including on cost effectiveness measures or other indicators of efficiency.