

Global Poverty Action Fund ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT 2013

Please read the following instructions carefully.

This annual report template includes DFID reporting requirements for 2013. It is designed to:

- ✓ provide assurance on project progress and management;
- ✓ check compliance with the terms and conditions of your grant;
- ✓ inform a wider analysis of all GPAF projects; and
- ✓ contribute to learning on emerging results.
- ✓ The revised template reflects grantholders' and Fund Manager's experience from previous rounds

What is required:

How

- Use the Annual Report template (this document)
- Cover the period between 1st April 2012 and 31st March 2013
- Keep to page length requirements
- Submit your Annual Report and all accompanying documentation including separate annexes as WORD documents, not as PDF files.
- Send it by email to gpaf@tripleline.com. Hard copies are not required.

When

Your report is due by **30th April 2013**

What to send – use as checklist:

1. Narrative Report (this document)

Check	Section and Title		Max no. of pages	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Basic Information	2	Basic project data
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Summary, Progress & Results	3	A narrative summary of progress and results
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Value for Money (including Equity)	2	A summary of actions and achievements in relation to value for money, gender and inclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Lessons	2	Lessons from project implementation for learning and dissemination to others.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Project accountability to stakeholders	1	Information on project mechanisms to enable beneficiary feedback.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Responses to Due Diligence recommendations	1	Information on actions undertaken following Due Diligence review

Check	Section and Title		Max no. of pages	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Annex A	Outcome and output scoring	8	A record of progress against the milestones and targets in your project logframe. Includes an assessment of progress against each indicator and the evidence which supports the statements of achievement.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Annex B	Consolidated beneficiary table	2	An overall summary of the number of project beneficiaries.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Annex C	Portfolio Analysis	3	Some basic information about your project to feed into an analysis of the whole portfolio of GPAF projects.

2. Project Documents (attachments)

Check	Document	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Photograph	A photograph which illustrates your project – see section 2.1 of the report.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Most recently approved Logframe and Activity Log	In word or excel format. Please label it “GPAF (ref no.) MOST RECENT LOGFRAME”.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Revised Logframe	If applicable – see section 2.6 of the report.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Revised Risk Matrix	Highlighting any new risks If applicable - see section 2.8 of the report.

3. Financial Report (attachment - use the most recent Excel template circulated with this report template)

Check	Document	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Annual financial report	Worksheet 1 of excel template showing expenditure over 2012/13
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial summary	Worksheet 2 of excel template showing a summary of expenditure over the life of your project

It is very important to note that:

- project expenditure must be reported against the **full budget agreed by Fund Manager** and not the summary budget used for expenditure claims.
- Any variances in excess of 10%, either positive or negative, (or transfers between main budget-sub-headings) must be explained.
- You should show any variances both in terms of total amount in GBP (£) and percentage of your budget.

If you have any questions about the completion of your annual reporting requirements, please contact Triple Line Consulting Ltd at gpaf@tripleline.com or on 020 8788 4680.

GPAF ANNUAL NARRATIVE REPORT

SECTION 1: BASIC INFORMATION (Max 2 pages) - to ensure GPAF database is up to date

1.1	Grantee Organisation Name	Traidcraft Exchange (TX)
1.2	Grantee Organisation Address	UK Address: Kingsway, Gateshead, Tyne and Wear, NE11 0NE, UK Bangladesh Address: Apt # 1-B, House # 11, Road # 13 (New), Dhanmondi, Dhaka 1209, Bangladesh
1.3	Project partner(s) Please list implementation partners	1. Main partner: Development Wheel (DEW), Dhaka, Bangladesh 2. Local CSO 01: Grameen Manobic Unnayan Sangstha, Mymensingh, Bangladesh 3. Local CSO 02: Rural Development Sangstha , Sherpur, Bangladesh 4. 5.
1.4	Project Title	Sustainable livelihoods through small-scale agriculture
1.5	GPAF Number	GPAF-IMP-022: Alleviating Poverty in North-East Bangladesh
1.6	Country/ies	Bangladesh
1.7	Location within country/ies	Mymensingh and Sherpur
1.8	Project Start & End Dates	Start: (01/04/2012) End: (31/03/2015)
1.9	Reporting Period	From: (01/04/2012) To: (31/03/2013)
1.10	Project Year (e.g. Year 1, Year 2)	Year 01
1.11	Total project budget	£ 965,348
1.12	Total funding from DFID	£ 724,011
1.13	Financial contributions from other sources Please state all other sources of funding and amounts in relation to this project. Sources should be listed in brackets, e.g.: £75,000 (ABC Foundation)	Total £241,337 List all contributions £ £ £
1.14	Date report produced	(30/04/2013)
1.15	Name and position of person(s) who compiled this report	Name: Mrs. Maveen Pereira Position: Head of South Asia Programmes Name: Mr. Kazi Shahed H Ferdous Position: Country Director, TX Bangladesh

		Name: Mr. A.B.M. Feroz Ahmed Position: Programme Manager, TX Bangladesh
1.16	Name and position of contact point for correspondence relating to this project	Name: Mrs. Maveen Pereira Position: Head of South Asia Programmes
1.17	Email address(es) for correspondence	Email 1: maveenp@traidcraft.org.uk Email 2: shahedf@traidcraft.org.uk
1.18	Acronyms Please list & explain all acronyms used in this annual report. <i>e.g. ABC – Afghanistan Babies Charity</i>	
Acronym	Explanation	
TX	Traidcraft Exchange	
DEW	Development Wheel	
DAE	Department of Agriculture Extension	
DOF	Department of Fisheries	
DLS	Department of Livestock	
IPM	Integrated Pest Management	
AWD	Alternative Wet and Dry Method	
CSO	Civil Society Organization	
SRDI	Soil Resource Development Institute	
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions	

SECTION 2: SUMMARY, PROGRESS AND RESULTS (max 3 pages)

2.1 PROJECT SUMMARY (200 words)

In your own words please describe your project and its context. Include direct quotations from beneficiaries that illustrate how your intervention improves their lives. Please attach an illustrative photograph.

The project seeks to ensure sustainable livelihoods for poor and marginal communities, particularly women, in North-East Bangladesh through improvements to small-scale agriculture. It recognises that these farmers face a number of problems and challenges in their production system, which means that productivity, quality and prices are low, while costs are high. Farmers lack the volumes and capacity to bargain for better prices; face discrimination in accessing government services and face frequent threats of crop-failure, loss of livestock, accentuated by climate change. TX and DEW build the collective power of disadvantaged farmers by organizing them into groups and associations. This enables them to take collective decisions, make bulk purchases of inputs and negotiate better prices. It also helps them to access services, joint savings schemes, loans and investment. Farmers have been supported to adapt to improved cultivation practices so they are more resilient to shocks and stresses, especially climate fluctuations. For instance, Shukkuri Begum from Shapmari village in Sherpur, said "I have increased tomato productivity by more than two folds through soil testing and optimum fertilizer management. I also tested soil for chilli cultivation. Hope it will further increase my profit, if so; I will use it for house expansion." Please see Project Document-Attachment 01

2.2 RELEVANCE

Does your GPAF project remain relevant in the context where you are working? Please explain what you have done to ensure that the interventions represented in the logframe and activity log continue to respond to the needs of the target population.

Farmers in Mymensingh and Sherpur are very poor and isolated and consequently have very few livelihood options. Agriculture, which is the main source of income, is extremely vulnerable to natural disasters and climate change. Most households have small pieces of agricultural land (0 - 0.3 ha), while others have small ponds and livestock. However they are unable to use these resources effectively because they face a number of problems, which this project has been addressing. In order to achieve the aim of the project several interventions have been taken simultaneously: (i) Creating and building the collective power of small and marginal farmers: 7171 small and marginal farmers (against target scale 6000 farmers) have been organized into 240 groups. This has triggered the interest of public and private service providers to network with small farmers through these groups for wider outreach, cost effective service delivery, and repeat customers. The project facilitated effective group operation training for 480 group leaders and rolled it out to the 240 groups; (ii) Increasing recognition of farmers needs amongst government and private sector stakeholders: The project raised awareness amongst public and private sector bodies and local authorities of the problems facing small and marginal farmers through different workshop, meeting and focus group discussions. Public extension departments such as DAE, DOF and DLS conducted 240 need assessment FGDs to assess farmers need with regard to cultivation practices and identify need based solutions. Likewise, private service providers organized different meeting amongst groups on importance and benefits of soil testing and compost fertilizer; (iii) Improving farmers' production practices and market access: Linkages have been built between service providers and farmer groups through meeting, practical training session and mentoring support. For instance, public service provider-DAE and private service provider - soil collectors and compost producers have established 20 demonstration plots on improved cultivation practices and organized 20 field days to showcase the results where 2187 farmers attended;(iv) Reducing farmers' vulnerability to environmental and financial shocks and stresses: Farmers have been supported to get used to climate adaptive cultivation practices. This includes encouraging production diversification and adoption of more environmentally friendly practices (e.g. soil testing to optimize fertilizer dose, organic fertilizers to increase soil fertility, AWD method to increase water use efficiency, IPM to reduce pesticide use and thus reduce air and water pollution, etc). Farmer groups are also being supported to access safety nets, such as savings schemes and setting up a community fund to match farmers' savings, to be used as a productive joint investment and social safety net in times of crisis. 480 group leaders have been trained on group savings management.

2.3	KEY ACHIEVEMENTS Please provide a summary of your three most significant achievements over the last year. This is an opportunity to tell the story of the project's success this year. Consider the most important changes the project has brought about; how many citizens benefited (men/women; girls/boys); who they are and how they benefited.	
1. The project organized 7171 small-scale farmers (against target scale 6000) into 240 self help groups in 6 selected sub-districts under 2 districts and facilitating them to utilise their collective power to voice, negotiate and attain their rights and services from other stakeholders (public and private service providers, local authorities and other value-chain actors). This includes 3810 women and 1884 farmers from ethnic communities. Many of the members had never been in workshops or congregations where they can voice their issues in front of the civil servants, local government representatives and opinion leaders. Organization into groups, capacity building and continuing facilitation by the project team has given them confidence to deal with their own problems. They have been encouraged to approach different public institutions highlighting problems and demand services which they are meant to provide. Our annual external evaluation reveals that 75% target farmer groups are working collectively and 38% farmer groups taking negotiated action with local stakeholders.		
2. Project facilitated small-scale farmers to establish linkage with appropriate service providers (both private and public) as a result they have accessed a wide range of services. Through this support farmers have achieved economies of scale and improved cultivation practices leading to reduced production costs and increased productivity which in turn increased profit. The evaluation notes "In addition to achieving a range of non-tangible benefits (new skills, confidence, access to government bodies etc.), 50% (3586) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 40.7% (2919) farmers have reduced 15% production costs. A number of project interventions have contributed such as using less fertilizers, irrigation and pesticides through improved skills on improved cultivation technique"		
3. Though there was no specific aim set for March 31st 2013 for resilience to market and environmental shocks, significant progress has been made in this area. Two main activities implemented related to this target were: 930 farmers have tested their soil with assistance of service providers (soil collectors) and SRDI; and crop diversification has been adopted by around 600 farmers to counter market shocks. In both cases, we found noticeable progress being made as a multiplier-effect of achieving better linkage with public service providers and groups working collectively.		
2.4	PROGRESS AGAINST TIMESCALE AND BUDGETING Please read the statements below and tick 1 or more boxes as appropriate.	
a. This project is on-track against its budget, deliverables and original time-scale		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. This project is not on track against its budget, deliverables and original time-scale		<input type="checkbox"/>
c. This project is expected to be back on track in the next reporting period		<input type="checkbox"/>
d. This project is not expected to be back on track in the next reporting period		<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide a brief explanation of the reported status including a summary of key factors affecting progress and how challenges have been addressed: The project is on track against the budget, deliverables and the original timescale. There were no significant factors or challenges for affecting project progress. Political unrest in Bangladesh has remained a matter of concern. However at the moment the project districts have not been affected by it. Since the project team is based in the project area, they have continued to work effectively. But this remains an ongoing concern.		
2.5	CHANGES TO PROJECT STATUS In the last reporting period have there been any significant changes in relation to the following? Tick the boxes as appropriate.	
a. Project design		<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Partner(s)		<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Context		<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide a brief explanation of what has changed and why:		
There was no significant changes in the reporting period in relation to project design, partners and context.		
2.6	CHANGES TO LOGFRAME/BUDGET Please answer the question below. Note: All changes to logframes require approval from the Fund Manager. If you wish to change your logframe please attach a justification and a copy of your revised logframe highlighting the proposed changes.	

	Do you need to make changes to your most recently approved logframe? (tick as appropriate) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
	If you answered 'yes' have you attached a justification and a copy of your logframe highlighting the proposed changes? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			
2.7	RISK MANAGEMENT & MITIGATION Risk management matrix: Please use the table below to describe the risks you faced in the reporting period and how you dealt with them.			
	Which risks materialized during the year? Describe briefly.	Was the risk anticipated? Answer either: Yes, No, to some extent	What action did you take to address the risk? Briefly explain.	Was this action sufficient? Answer either: Yes; No; to some extent
	1. Political unrest across the country	To some extent	Travelled on weekends-Friday and Saturday when no strikes are called; rescheduled events with different stakeholders on strike free days and weekends.	Yes
	2. Staff turnover	To some extent	Re-recruited quickly to reduce loss of momentum. Regular training of staff to increase morale.	Yes
	3.			
	4.			
	5.			
2.8	Are you expecting significant new risk(s) in the next reporting period that would affect project performance or completion? If yes, tick the box and list the new anticipated risks in the table below. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Anticipated risks and mitigating actions. Complete the table if relevant. Focus on higher level risks such as a deterioration in operating environment (maximum of 4 risks).			
	Anticipated risks	Intended mitigating actions	Risk rating: <i>Your assessment of risk probability & impact</i>	
	1. Political unrest may continue and get worse in forthcoming months	We are in the process of developing a comprehensive contingency plan to cope with the situation that will include rescheduling of outdoor events, reshuffling of working days, change in working hours and always keep an alternative plan handy.	Probability: high; Impact: medium	
	2.			
	3.			
	4.			
2.9	If you anticipate new risks please submit a revised risk matrix.			
	Revised risk matrix attached highlighting new anticipated risks (tick box)			
				Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SECTION 3: VALUE FOR MONEY (including equity) (Max 2 pages)

For guidance and resources on VfM please see: Value for Money: What it means for NGOs; and Integrating Value for Money into the Programme Cycle available on this website:

<http://www.bond.org.uk/pages/value-for-money-resources.html>

3.1	Equity: Does this project continue to contribute to equity (i.e. equitable poverty reduction and empowerment of men, women, girls and boys and relevant marginalized groups to participate in decisions that affect them at the local and/or national level?)		
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	To some extent <input type="checkbox"/>
	Please explain your response and provide examples as evidence of achievements		

We have placed great emphasis on reaching a broad spectrum of people with our work, especially those who are vulnerable and/or disadvantaged. Accordingly, the project has been promoting inclusiveness and equal opportunity. During group formation the inclusion of women and farmers from garo communities was emphasized. 3810 women farmers and 1884 garo farmers have been organised under the project. Also, we have formed 111 mixed groups (out of 240) comprising of men, women, Garos and Bengalis to help develop an inclusive society, irrespective of gender, religion and ethnicity. At the same time, specific training modules and group constitutions/bylaws are educating group members on the rights of women, the garo, the elderly, the young, the disabled and the extremely poor.

3.2	Effectiveness: Is the project achieving the intended results?		
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	To some extent <input type="checkbox"/>
	Please explain your response and provide examples as evidence of achievements:		

Partnership: The partnership with DEW and Local CSOs are working well in establishing control over the groups and maintaining relationship with local stakeholders such as local administration, local government, civil society, etc. Local CSOs have been integrating groups into their regular programmes-education, micro-credit, renewable energy, etc, which shows they are taking ownership of the project and indicates well for the group's sustainability.

Self Help group model: The annual evaluation, conducted by an external firm, reveals that the approach to form self help farmer groups is effective since the private and public services are now directed through these groups. The groups are giving, both the public sector and the private sector, an instrument to increase outreach to their services and products. The 'self help groups' are thus at the heart of service delivery, advocacy (lobbying, negotiation), and business development. For instance, Shapmari farmers' group, Sherpur sadar, were awarded a sprayer machine from DAE through effective networking and negotiation.

3.3	Economy: What has the project management done this year to buy and employ inputs at an optimum value-for-money price?
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Provide examples in bullet points:
So far £238,952 has been spent in Year 01 on the project covering 7171 farmer households (about 35,855 people in total). Hence the cost per participant is approximately £33.32.

3.4	Efficiency: How do you ensure resources are used efficiently to optimise the results achieved compared to the required level of inputs (include reference to use of relevant benchmarks at the output level and the project's approach to working with others)?
------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Provide examples in bullet points:

In addition to achieving a range of non-tangible benefits (new skills, confidence, access to government bodies etc.), 50% (3586) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 40.7% (2919) farmers have reduced 15% production costs. A number of project interventions have contributed such as using less fertilizers, irrigation and pesticides through improved skills on improved cultivation technique.

Working with small-scale farmers to motivate them and help them see that change is possible, has been an uphill task and has required a range of activities including need assessment, training workshop, awareness raising, practical demonstration, influence government for resources, etc.

We have exceeded our planned year 1 targets in most areas such as:

- 50% (3586) farmers have increased 30% productivity (Target: 10% (600) farmers)
- 40.7% (2919) farmers have reduced 15% production costs (Target: 10% (600) farmers)
- 56.4% (4044) farmers have increased 30% sales (Target: 10% (600) farmers)
- 40.7% (2919) farmers have increased 143% profit from one rice and one vegetable harvest. (baseline: £69, current: £168)
- 75% (5378) farmers have satisfied with services received (Target: 10% (600) farmers)

3.5 Are there multiplier effects from this project?: e.g. potential for leveraging additional funds; longer term or larger scale implementation; or replication of approaches and results? Where additional project funds have already been secured, how have they been used to enhance delivery?

Yes

No

To some extent

Please explain your response and provide examples as evidence of achievements:

Although there are a number of NGOs working in project areas their work is not focussed on supporting small-scale agriculture. DEW and TX have been consulting these organisations in regular basis. All organisations stressed the need for activities to help improve returns from agricultural operations and diversify income sources. The organisations stated a commitment to support and collaborate where possible. Accordingly, we have started collaboration with these organizations. For instance, World Vision has conducted a collaborative event with our project and provided veterinary medicine support to 180 cattle farmers worth £780.

TX awarded a four years project on small scale agriculture in the same areas from Big Lottery Fund. The project has been reaching 6000 small and marginal farmers. This will multiply the effects through wider outreach. For instance, farmers association will be strengthened, service providers will be attracted, etc

If applicable, how has leveraged funds this affected the delivery of activities?

3.6 Sustainability: What have you done to ensure the sustainability of the project results?

The project has been promoting self help group approach and organized 7171 farmers into 240 groups. The approach is cost-effective and sustainable as it enables service providers to reach large numbers of farmers, and empowers farmers to maximise production capacity, negotiate lower input costs, access services and lobby for getting policy benefits. This approach has been successfully implemented in several TX projects.

Training the Trainer approach is very effective and has a multiplier effect to the transfer of knowledge and skills to large numbers effectively and leaves behind a skilled resource that can help continue replication. The project has promoted this approach in capacity building activities for farmers groups. For instance, the project facilitated effective group operation training for 480 group leaders and rolled it out to 7171 group farmers

The project has facilitated linkage building amongst farmers groups and service providers. Public service providers have the mandate to render services to the producers free of cost. However they could not perform their duties as expected due to many valid reasons such as shortage of man power and their inability to reach out producers individually. This problem has been solved. Now they don't have to deliver services individually but to a group. External evaluation reveals that groups have strong relationship with the public service providers and they got various benefits like agricultural advice, government subsidized livestock medicine and assistance with soil testing, etc.

The project has engaged local CSOs and built their confidence and capacity to continue working effectively with farmer groups and other related stakeholders. This will help ensure that outcomes and outputs made by the project continue and multiply after the project comes to an end.

SECTION 4: LESSONS (max 2 pages)

Please note you do not have to provide lessons under each area. Try to draw lessons on how you achieved results that might be useful for other GPAF projects. Try to avoid presenting obvious lessons (e.g. “the participation of women in project activities is key to their empowerment”).

4.1 Innovation: Describe any project innovations which have the potential for scaling-up or replication by your own or other organisations.

Cluster based group approach allows a large outreach in a relatively short time with limited resources - it is cost effective. The project has selected cluster based farmers and formed 240 groups. This makes the beneficiaries ideal for many other organizations and projects. Thus we saw various organizations and projects reaching out to our staff and groups with direct offers of assistance. The advantage is clear as it provides additional scope for poverty reduction to project beneficiaries with no extra financial requirements. A prime example can be seen with tribal groups in Jhinaigati, sherpur. Among tribal female groups, livestock management is a major source of income. Thus, World Vision reached out to these women along with the government Livestock department to give them free deworming tablets (from World vision), vitamins and pregnancy medicine (from government). Ms. Nasreen reveals the medicines will lead to healthier cows which can get additional £ 20. Similarly, In Haluaghat, an all female group has been contacted by the Department for Agricultural Expansion (DAE) under their “Food Security Project”. Under the project, the beneficiaries were connected with a fashion house for which they sew sequins.

4.2 Equity and gender: What are the key lessons learned from the project's approach to reducing inequalities between men women, girls and boys or other relevant aspects of diversity, particularly in relation to participation and empowerment in decision-making?

It is important and effective to work with mixed farmer groups to reduce inequalities amongst men women, ethnic and other aspects of diversity, while supporting women and minority with inputs to strengthen their voices. We have formed 111 mixed groups (out of 240) comprising of men, women, Garos and Bengalis which is helping to strengthen social harmony and develop an inclusive society, irrespective of gender, religion, culture and ethnicity. Our field team is working very closely with the community leaders and relevant people and ensure that project activities are sensitive to the local culture and diversity.

4.3 Capacity building: How have you been building the capacity of civil society, such as local partners and community groups, to address poverty and/or to negotiate and claim their rights? what approaches have been most successful? Provide an example.

Capacity building has been the central feature of this project through training, workshops, agricultural demonstration sites and field days designed to build farmers’ capacity to ensure improved production practices, increased production levels and increase in resilience to impacts of climate change. We have found a direct correlation between the capacity of the groups and access to services and resources. 'Training the Trainer' approach has been very effective and cost efficient especially for the farmer groups where increase outreach and enable a multiplier effect for the transfer of knowledge and skills to large numbers effectively. This also leaves behind a skilled resource that can help continue replication. The project has promoted this approach in capacity building activities for farmers groups. For instance, The project facilitated effective group operation training for 480 group leaders and rolled it out to 7171 group farmers. Post training mentoring and follow-up support is also very effective in terms of gradual but practical improvements of know-how and skills.

4.4 Monitoring & Evaluation: What tools and methods have been most useful and practical in measuring and demonstrating evidence of project achievements?

<p>We have developed a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework along with different tools to measure and demonstrate evidence of project achievements. Agricultural seasons, productions and market dynamics have been considered during tools development. For example, we have developed producer record tool to keep record on cost of production, productivity, sales, profit, etc by taking into account the crop seasons, fisheries production cycles and livestock varieties, etc. Also, we have developed a mathematical model which is very useful to get a better understanding of costs, income and profits. Case studies and anecdotes of individuals and their households, as well as of groups have also helped to understand the changes that are occurring as a result of project interventions.</p>	
4.5	<p>Approaches to Empowerment and Advocacy: a) What lessons have you identified in relation to factors that enhance approaches to empowerment or advocacy processes? b) What lessons have you identified in addressing resistance against the empowerment of marginalized groups?</p>
<p>The project facilitated linkages amongst existing farmers associations formed under our previous project and the 240 groups formed under this project. The association leaders shared their learning and experience on collective initiatives amongst group members. We found that through this linkage building local communities have been empowered to use their collective power to negotiate access to services, rights and pro-poor policies. Capacity building and collective empowerment processes in turn facilitate effective advocacy with private and public sector institutions to ensure access to rights and services on an ongoing basis. The external evaluation reveals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkage built with public institutions like Government Agriculture office supports advocacy skills of groups so they can be aware of and avail of government services and benefits like fertilizer subsidies. • Linkage with private institutions like input sellers, built bargaining power of groups so they can use the combined buying capacity to influence wholesaler rates and ensure best quality of inputs. <p>For instance, Mr. Akhter, from Sherpur sadar, reflected the group's concerns with overpriced adulterated vegetable seeds. During cucumber harvest this season, Mr. Akhter went to buy seeds at the local vendor and found it overpriced at BDT 120 per packet. However, he used the name of his group and warned to let all 30 members of his group know and avoid his shop. They reached an understanding for which only his group members now buy the seeds at the normal price of BDT 112.</p>	
4.6	<p>Other lessons learned: Please include any other lessons learned that you think may be useful for other partners, grant holders or DFID</p>
<p>Not applicable.</p>	
4.7	<p>Applied learning: How have you used learning to improve project delivery?</p>
<p>Project staff have been building and maintaining regular contact with stakeholders and share project leanings and experiences and incorporate their suggestions as and when necessary. We have conducted an annual evaluation of the project through an external consulting firm. The findings, lessons and recommendations will be disseminated amongst relevant stakeholders.</p>	

<p>SECTION 5: PROJECT ACCOUNTABILITY TO STAKEHOLDERS (max 1 page)</p> <p>DFID is particularly interested in project mechanisms to enable beneficiaries to provide feedback to project managers. The questions below aim to enhance understanding of the use of beneficiary feedback mechanisms within the GPAF portfolio.</p>	
5.1	<p>It is understood that the majority of GPAF projects collect feedback from beneficiaries. What questions does your project seek to answer in collecting this type of data?</p>
<p>The project collects feedback from beneficiaries to answer the following questions (list up to 4 examples):</p> <p>a) Did you get any service from the project stakeholders such as service providers, local CSOs, project staffs, etc?</p> <p>b) Have you been benefitted somehow from these services? If yes, what?</p> <p>c) Are you satisfied with the services? If not, why?</p> <p>d) Do you have any feedback / suggestion/learning that you want to share with the project?</p>	

5.2	How often do you collect and analyse beneficiary feedback data?	
	When a complaint is made by beneficiaries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Once a year	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Mid-term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Final evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (explain in brief): We have developed a beneficiary feedback tool under monitoring and evaluation framework and collecting their feedback quarterly.		
5.3	Provide a brief example(s) of how beneficiary feedback has influenced project decisions on implementation.	
One of the feedbacks from the beneficiaries was that retailers selling adulterated fertilizer which affect their productivity and production cost negatively. To address this problem, we have facilitated a meeting between Agriculture officer and group members. Agriculture officer has shown some ways to detect adulterated fertilizers which the farmers use to gain bargaining power with retailers. For instance, Mr. Munir Hossain has learnt how to detect adulterated Potassium. This learning was shared among multiple groups in our FGDs, regular meetings, using this, farmers like Munir Hossain has benefitted with better quality fertilizer and stronger bargaining power.		
5.4	After their views are analysed, what feedback if any does the project provide to beneficiaries and how?	
Periodic FGDs are held by field teams to share learning of the project and seek feedback. The associations also are an important means of giving and receiving feedback. Project staff suggest group members to invite government extension officers in group meeting on regular basis so that they can share their problems for immediate solution.		

SECTION 6: RESPONSES TO DUE DILIGENCE RECOMMENDATIONS (max 1 page)

Please provide an update on any actions taken in response to the Due Diligence Assessment of your organisation by KPMG (this does not relate to those recommendations included as specific terms and conditions in section 4 of your Grant Arrangement).

Partner Funding: to date we have raised £ xxxxxx of £ 240,162 towards the project

Partnered Project Contract: the contract has been signed.

Baseline data: the Baseline work was completed and logframe revised based on advice from the Triple Line team

Staffing: the recruitment of the team has been completed. Two members of the field team that resigned during the year have been replaced.

KPI Reporting: this is being tracked by the senior management team on a quarterly basis.

Foreign Exchange Policy: is now in place.

Project Status Reporting: this is in place for all projects. Senior management reviews these each quarter.

M & E Officer: the Head of Programme Funding and Evaluation has 35 percent of her time towards developing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation systems across Traidcraft.

Monitoring & Evaluation: the Head of Programme Funding and Evaluation is working with programme teams to develop and implementing M & E systems to reflect the strategic targets of the organisation.

Data Quality: We have put in place procedures for sign off of monitoring reports by the person named in the contract as the key named contact for the project. Members of the Senior Management Team (Head of Fundraising & Evaluation, Head of South Asia Programmes and Head of Africa Programmes) will also be part of key monitoring and evaluation activities on projects - baseline, midterm, final evaluations.

ANNEX A: OUTCOME AND OUTPUT SCORING (maximum of 6 pages)

PLEASE READ THE INSTRUCTIONS ON THIS PAGE CAREFULLY AND COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS

ANNEX A asks you to score performance against your Outcome and Outputs (Purpose and Outputs), making a judgement on the actual achievement of expected results in the reporting year. Use the five-point scoring system to rate your achievement of results. Your milestones should guide your judgement of how you rate your score.

- Under outcomes and outputs, list all indicators from your most recently approved logframe.
- Clearly state the achievement against the indicator in the reporting year focusing on results. Do not simply describe activities.
- Back up statements of progress/achievements with references to evidence that can be checked if necessary.

ANNEX A also asks you to provide disaggregated beneficiary data against outcomes and outputs. Note that ANNEX B now asks you to record total consolidated beneficiary numbers without double counting.

Score	Description of Score
A++	Output/outcome substantially exceeded expectation
A+	Output/outcome moderately exceeded expectation
A	Output/outcome met expectation
B	Output/outcome moderately did not meet expectation
C	Output/outcome substantially did not meet expectation

Annex A Outcome and Output Scoring (max 8 pages)

Retain in portrait format

0.1	Outcome: write in full your project outcome(s) in the box below						
Reduced poverty and more sustainable livelihoods for poor and marginal communities in Mymensingh and Sherpur through sustainable agricultural practices.							
0.2	Outcome Score: Please provide an overall outcome score (C – A++)						
A+							
0.3	Write in full each outcome indicator, the milestone, and state progress. Explain any over or under achievement.						
Indicator 1: Farmers that see a 50% increase in disposable income (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity); Milestone 1: 10% (600 of 6000 farmers); Achieved 40,7 percent (2919 of 7171 farmers) Indicator 2: Farmers who perceive an improvement in their well-being (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity); Milestone: 10% (600 of 6000 farmers); Achieved: not measured in annual assessment, but Survey planned at midterm in year 2.							
0.4	Disaggregate the number of citizens benefitting from this outcome; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years. (Please delete the example in the first row)						
	Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Change/Improvement
	1372	1547	0	0	2919	Farmers benefited on Indicator 1.	reduced cost of production; increased productivity and increased sales.
0.5	State the evidence base that supports the progress described: where relevant include details of the representativeness of surveys, and details of timing, place and methodology (focus groups, participatory rural appraisal etc.)						
An annual assessment has been conducted using external consultants who looked at Producer Records and conducted focus groups discussions with 180 producer groups.							

1.1	Output 1 Write in full
Target farmers are working collectively and collaboratively	
1.2	Output 1 score (C – A++)
A+	
1.3	Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state progress.

Indicator 01: Farmer groups taking collective actions
 Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 20% (48 of 240 groups) ; Achieved:75% (180 of 240 groups)
 Indicator 02: Farmer groups that negotiate with local stakeholders for improved resources and services
 Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 20% (48 of 240 groups) ; Achieved:38% (91 of 240 groups)
 Indicator 03: Farmers that perceive benefits from membership of local groups (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)
 Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 40% (2400 of 6000 farmers) ; Achieved:75% (5378 of 7171 farmers)

1.4 Disaggregate the number of citizens benefitting from this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Nature of engagement
2528	1850	0	0	5378	Farmers have take collective actions	Collective action has led to tangible results
1278	1441	0	0	2719	Negotiated action by groups	Groups had to negotiate for resources.
2528	1850	0	0	5378	benefits from group membership	Farmers achieved benefits as members of groups

1.5 State the evidence base that supports the progress described: where relevant include details of the representativeness of surveys, and details of timing, place and methodology (focus groups, participatory rural appraisal etc.)

The annual evaluation included FGDs with farmers and project staff which revealed generally high level of cohesion and confidence within groups. There is a clear understanding of what farmers want to do as a group. Multiple examples of groups already taking collaborative actions without project assistance demonstrates performance moderately exceeding expectation.

1.6 Impact weighting (%)
 Please insert the **impact weighting** for this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions since your last Annual Report. If the rating has changed, please provide an explanation.

40%

1.7 Value of inputs for this Output
 Please insert the estimated value of total inputs (in £s) allocated for the delivery of this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions. If the value of inputs, or the DFID proportion of inputs has changed, please provide an explanation.

£ 265,479

2.1 Output 2 Write in full

Government and private sector stakeholders recognise the needs of target farmers and reflect these in the implementation of policies and practices and the allocation of resources

2.2 Output 2 score (C – A++)

A+

2.3 Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state progress.

Indicator 01: Improvements in policies, practices or resources negotiated by the district or regional associations
 Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 0 ; Achieved: 0
 Indicator 02: Public & private service providers trained to provide more appropriate & affordable services to target farmers
 Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 204 ; Achieved: 204
 Indicator 03: Farmers that perceive benefits from district/regional association membership (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)
 Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 0 ; Achieved: 0194

2.4 Disaggregate the number of citizens benefitting from this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Nature of engagement
194	10	0	0	204	Service Providers linked with farmers	Service Provision for farmers

2.5 State the evidence base that supports the progress described: where relevant include details of the representativeness of surveys, and details of timing, place and methodology (focus groups, participatory rural appraisal etc.)

FGDs show that each group has very strong relationship with atleast one government agricultural officer. Additional partnership developed with other projects for added benefits which exceeded expectations. Benefits yet to received in measurable form.

2.6 Impact weighting (%)
 Please insert the **impact weighting** for this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions since your last Annual Report. If the rating has changed, please provide an explanation.

15%

2.7 Value of inputs for this Output
 Please insert the estimated value of total inputs (in £s) allocated for the delivery of this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions. If the value of inputs, or the DFID proportion of inputs has changed, please provide an explanation.

£ 129 903

3.1 Output 3 Write in full

Target farmers have improved their production practices (increased quality and yields, reduced costs etc.) and increased market access

3.2 Output 3 score (C – A++)

A++						
3.3	Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state progress.					
Indicator 01: Farmers who see a 15% decrease in production costs (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity); Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 10% (600 of 6000 farmers) ; Achieved:40.7% (2919 Of 7171 farmers)						
Indicator 02: Farmers who see a 30% increase in productivity (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity); Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 10% (600 of 6000 farmers); Achieved: 50% (3586 of 7171 farmers)						
Indicator 03: Farmers who see a 30% increase in sales (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity): Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): (600 of 6000 farmers ; Achieved: 56.4% (4044 of 7171 farmers)						
3.4	Disaggregate the number of citizens benefitting from this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.					
	Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Nature of engagement
	1372	1547	0	0	2919	Farmers see decrease in production costs Cost of production reduced through a variety of means
	1685	1901	0	0	4044	Farmers see increase in productivity Farmers trained to increase productivity
	1901	2143	0	0	4044	Farmers see an increase in sales Farmers supported to increase sales.
3.5	State the evidence base that supports the progress described: where relevant include details of the representativeness of surveys, and details of timing, place and methodology (focus groups, participatory rural appraisal etc.)					
180 producer records along with Focus Group Discussion reveals the results. Linkage with government extension bodies and existing trained private service providers has benefited farmers to get information and knowledge on improved cultivation techniques which accelerated the results.						
3.6	Impact weighting (%) <i>Please insert the impact weighting for this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions since your last Annual Report. If the rating has changed, please provide an explanation.</i>					
30%						
3.7	Value of inputs for this Output <i>Please insert the estimated value of total inputs (in £s) allocated for the delivery of this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions. If the value of inputs, or the DFID proportion of inputs has changed, please provide an explanation.</i>					
£ 254,659						

4.1	Output 4 Write in full
------------	-------------------------------

Target farmers are less vulnerable to shocks and stresses, especially natural disasters and climate fluctuations						
4.2	Output 4 score (C – A++)					
A+						
4.3	Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state progress.					
Indicator 01: Farmers that diversify production and/or adopt more environment friendly cultivation practices (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity): Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 0 (0 of 6000 farmers) ; Achieved: 13% (930 of 7171 farmers)						
Indicator 02: Farmers that report an increase in soil fertility (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity): Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 0% (0 of 6000 farmers); Achieved: 13% (930 of 7171 farmers)						
Indicator 03: Farmers covered by safety measures (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity): Milestone 1 (March 31st 2013): 0% (0 of 6000 farmers ; Achieved: 0% (0 of 7171 farmers)						
4.4	Disaggregate the number of citizens benefitting from this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.					
Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Nature of engagement
437	493	0	0	930	Diversification of production	improved mix of crops suggested and supported
437	493	0	0	930	Better soil health	Soil Testing and advice on inputs
4.5	State the evidence base that supports the progress described: where relevant include details of the representativeness of surveys, and details of timing, place and methodology (focus groups, participatory rural appraisal etc.)					
Soil Health Card provided by SRDI indicates that 930 farmers have tested their soil to manage soil fertility and adopt environmentally cultivation practices. At the same time, producer record shows that 143 farmers have used compost fertilizer to improve soil fertility.						
4.6	Impact weighting (%) <i>Please insert the impact weighting for this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions since your last Annual Report. If the rating has changed, please provide an explanation.</i>					
15%						
4.7	Value of inputs for this Output <i>Please insert the estimated value of total inputs (in £s) allocated for the delivery of this Output (from your logframe) and note any revisions. If the value of inputs, or the DFID proportion of inputs has changed, please provide an explanation.</i>					
£ 315,307						

ANNEX B: CONSOLIDATED BENEFICIARY TABLE: (max 2 pages)

To be completed by all projects

You will need to use the figures in Annex A to arrive at a consolidated figure of total individual beneficiaries reached by the project as a whole.

If you reach the same beneficiaries in more than one output **ensure you do not double count them** when calculating the consolidated total.

		Gender and Age Dissaggregation			
	OVERALL TOTAL	Adult Male (18 years +)	Adult Female (18 years +)	Child Male (under 18 years)	Child Female (under 18 years)
Consolidated total number of beneficiaries reached since project began	5378	2528	2850	0	0
Consolidated total number of beneficiaries reached this reporting year	5378	2528	2850	0	0
Provide a clear description of your beneficiaries in the box below (e.g., people living with HIV/AIDS; disabled children; soapstone workers; child labourers).					
Description: The number in the above table denotes the number of beneficiaries who have benefited from the project. However a total of 7171 individuals are now members of groups. Of these, the number of women is 3810; the number of men is 3361; and the number of beneficiaries who are from the Garo Community: 1884					
How many of these beneficiaries were unintended and how did they become beneficiaries?					
Description: Our target was 6000 small-scale farmers but we have reach 7171 due to local community demand.					
How many of these beneficiaries received benefits that they could not have received from other (non-GPAF funded) providers e.g. state, other NGOs and private sector?					
Description: According to the baseline survey, no farmers had received benefits from others. However, approximately 2 percent of farmers could have received benefits from the State since government officers especially extension service providers exist in the project area.					
Indicate or estimate the percentage or number of disabled beneficiaries reached in the box below (e.g., people living with HIV/AIDS; disable children).					
Description:					
How has the collection of disaggregated data improved project approaches to reducing gender inequalities in participation and empowerment in decision making. Please provide an example in the box below.					
Description:					

The means of organising women in particular needed to be different - where meetings are organised at times when it is convenient for women. Training techniques for women also needs to be adjusted to address the fact that many women are illiterate or semi literate. The project team has been particularly conscious in taking it at their pace. Where there are groups with both men and women, this has been a challenge and more mentoring support needs to be given to the women members so that they are not left behind or to ensure that it is not just men who take the decisions. Hence we are working with a mix of men and women in the field team.

If the project is unable to specify who all beneficiaries are please explain.	Not Applicable
If the project faces challenges in providing exact beneficiary numbers, please explain.	Not Applicable
If the project is unable to <i>disaggregate beneficiaries</i> by gender or age, please explain.	Not Applicable

ANNEX C: PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS (maximum of 3 pages)

To be completed for all projects

DFID aims to capture and compare performance and results across the whole GPAF portfolio based on the information provided in the Annual Reports.

Please Answer each of the following questions.

1. Which of the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) is your project contributing to directly? <i>You may choose up to 3.</i>	Please indicate: 1 = Primary MDG 2 = Secondary MDG 3 = Tertiary MDG	Please indicate the relative level of contribution to the selected MDGs as a percentage
MDG 1: Eradicate Extreme Hunger and Poverty	1	40%
MDG 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education		%
MDG 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women	2	35%
MDG 4: Reduce Child Mortality		%
MDG 5: Improve Maternal Health		%
MDG 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases		%
MDG 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability	3	25%
MDG 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development		%

2. What is the main methodological approach being used by the project to bring about the changes envisaged? Please select up to three factors and prioritise them as 1, 2 and 3 (with 1 being of highest significance).	
(a) Rights awareness e.g. making 'rights holders' more aware of their rights so that they can claim rights from 'duty bearers'	3
(b) Advocacy e.g. advocating publicly for changes in policy and/or practice on specific targeted issues	
(c) Modelling e.g. demonstrating best practice / approaches / behaviours which can be adopted or relicated by others to bring wider improvements in policy or practice	2
(d) Policy engagement e.g. building relationships with decision-makers behind the scenes, pragmatic collaboration on policy development to achieve incremental improvements	
(e) Service provision in collaboration with government e.g. working with government to enhance the services already provided	1
(f) Service provision in parallel to government e.g. providing an alternative service	
(g) Monitoring of government policy e.g. monitoring budget-making or enforcement of rights	
If you are using other methodological approaches please note in the box below.	

3. Whose **capacity** (in the main) is being built through the project? Select a maximum of 3.

(a) End-beneficiaries (poor and vulnerable groups)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Local leaders / change agents	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Local Community-Based Organisations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Civil Society Organisations / Networks	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Local government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) National government	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Local implementing partner(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) Trade unions	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) Private sector organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>
(j) Other (Please name below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Environmental Impact and Climate Change Mitigation	
7.1 How would you describe the project's environmental impact? 1. Positive, 2. Neutral, 3. Insignificant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>
Provide a brief justification for choice of ranking	
Project has facilitated different activities on environment-friendly cultivation practices among farmers such as soil testing & use of compost fertilisers to save soil ecology, Alternative Wet and Dry irrigation method to save water, Integrated Pest Management method to reduce air and water pollution. Groups are also being encouraged to saving and set up a Community Fund to be used in times of natural and other disasters leading to crop failure. All of these actions are having positive impact on the environment.	
7.2 Describe actions the project took to reduce negative environmental impact (use bullet points)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has facilitated soil testing services among farmers to reduce use of chemical fertiliser doses and improve soil fertility. • The project has facilitated demonstration among farmers on compost fertilisers to improve soil fertility and water holding capacity of the soil which reduces irrigation requirements i.e. less stress on ground water. • Actions include promoting the Wet and Dry Method of Irrigation to reduce water consumption. • Training and advice is also being provided to improve the mix of crops and means of livelihood to support adaptation to climate change situation. 	
7.3 Describe any activities taken by the project to build climate change resilience (use bullet points)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has facilitated field demonstration and organised field days for farmers on climate resilience agricultural practices as given above. • We have also facilitated linkages between farmer groups and government extension boeids to get climate resilience technology based on research and innovation by government research organisations. 	