

# **Global Poverty Action Fund ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT 2014**

**Please read the following instructions carefully.**

This annual report template includes DFID reporting requirements for 2014. 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.

## **What has changed from last year's (2013) template?**

The template has been revised in response to feedback from grant holders reporting in 2013, the Fund Manager's experience from previous rounds, and comments from the GPAF Evaluation Manager.

The key changes are:

- The template is no longer protected to make it easier to complete.
- The guidance notes and the structure of some questions have been amended to improve clarity, particularly in relation to value for money.
- Additional questions have been introduced to enable reporting of unintended outcomes and consequences, and project efforts towards gender mainstreaming.
- The guidance and structure of 'Annex A - Outcome and Output Scoring' has been amended to ensure that the reporting is complementary to the information on progress included in the 'Reporting Logframe'. There is also new guidance on the definition of project beneficiaries for GPAF.

## **What is required?**

### **How?**

- Where relevant, refer back to your 2013 Annual (or Interim) Report feedback letter
- Use the Annual Report template (this document). Please note that in response to feedback, the template is now an unprotected WORD document. Please do not alter the structure of the template.
- Cover the period between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014
- Try to keep within the page length limits.
- Submit your Annual Report and all accompanying documentation, including separate annexes as WORD / Excel documents, rather than PDF files.
- Send all required documents by email to [gpaf@tripleline.com](mailto:gpaf@tripleline.com). Hard copies are not required.

## When?

Your report is due by **30<sup>th</sup> April 2014**

## What to send? (Use as checklist)

### **1. Narrative Report (this document)**

Mark with an "X"	Section and Title		Page limit	Notes
	1	Basic Information	2	Basic project data.
	2	Summary, Progress & Results	6	A narrative summary of progress and results.
	3	Value for Money	2	A summary of actions and achievements in relation to value for money.
	4	Sustainability	1	Progress towards ensuring sustainability
	5	Project Accountability to Stakeholders	1	Information on project mechanisms to enable beneficiary feedback.
	6	Learning	3	Lessons from project implementation for learning and dissemination to others.
	7	Responses to Due Diligence Recommendations	1	Information on actions undertaken following Due Diligence review (if not already reported).
	Annex A	Outcome and output scoring	12	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.
	Annex B	Consolidated beneficiary table	2	A summary of the number of individual project beneficiaries.
	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)

Mark with an "X"	Document	Notes
	Photograph(s)	<p>New photograph(s) which illustrates or tells a story of your project.</p> <p>Attach as a separate file(s) (i.e. do not embed into another document), preferably as a JPEG file.</p> <p><b>IMPORTANT:</b> In separate document please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* captions or explanations of the photo(s);</li> <li>* the photographer's name, if possible;</li> <li>* assurance that subjects have given their consent, both for the photograph to be taken and for its possible use in learning/publicity materials.</li> </ul>
	Reporting Logframe	<p>Most recently approved Logframe and Activity Log in Excel format, with 'Achieved' boxes completed for each indicator, and each relevant milestone.</p> <p>Please label this document: "<b>GPAF (ref. no.) Reporting Logframe (+ date prepared)</b>".</p>
	Revised Logframe	<p>To be submitted if you are proposing a revision to the logframe – see section 2.9 of the report.</p> <p>Please label this document: "<b>GPAF (ref. no.) Revised Logframe – Proposed (+ date prepared)</b>".</p>
	Revised Risk Matrix	<p>Highlights any new risks, if applicable - see section 2.10 of the report.</p>

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

Mark with an "X"	Document	Notes
	Annual Financial Report + Variance Notes	Two worksheets on Excel template showing expenditure over 2013/14, compared to budget.
	Financial Summary	Worksheet on Excel template showing a summary of expenditure over the life of your project, compared to budget.

**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 as a percentage of budget.

**Background References:**

Further Guidance documents that may help with the completion of this annual report:

**Gender and Diversity:**

- Gender guidelines prepared specifically for the GPAF: [Gender and the Global Poverty Action Fund](#)

**Value For Money:**

- [BOND VFM Guidelines](#)
- [BOND – Integrating VFM into the Programme Cycle Diagram](#)
- [DFID VFM Guidelines](#)

**Quality of Evidence:**

- [BOND Quality of Evidence Guidelines](#)
- [DFID How-To-Note – Assessing the Strength of Evidence](#)

**Any Questions?**

If you have any questions about the completion of your annual reporting requirements, please contact the Fund Manager at [gpaf@tripleline.com](mailto:gpaf@tripleline.com) or on 0208 788 4680.

Common questions and answers will be circulated as Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).

## GPAF ANNUAL NARRATIVE REPORT

### SECTION 1: BASIC INFORMATION

This information is needed to update the Fund Manager's records

<b>1.1</b>	<b>Grant Holder Organisation Name</b>	Traidcraft Exchange (TX)
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Grant Holder Organisation Address</b>	UK Address: Kingsway, Gateshead, Tyne and Wear, NE11 ONE, UK Bangladesh Address: Apt # 1-B, House # 11, Road # 13 (New), Dhanmondi, Dhaka 1209, Bangladesh
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Project partner(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List implementation partners.</li> <li>• Highlight any changes to partners.</li> <li>• For multi-country projects, please indicate which partner is in which country</li> </ul>	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
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	Sustainable livelihoods through small-scale agriculture
<b>1.5</b>	<b>GPAF Number</b>	GPAF-IMP-022: Alleviating Poverty in North-East Bangladesh
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Countries</b>	Bangladesh
<b>1.7</b>	<b>Location within countries</b>	Mymensingh and Sherpur Districts
<b>1.8</b>	<b>Project Start &amp; End Dates</b>	<b>Start:</b> (01/04/2012) <b>End:</b> (31/03/2015)
<b>1.9</b>	<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>From:</b> (01/04/2013) <b>To:</b> (31/03/2014)
<b>1.10</b>	<b>Project Year (e.g. Year 1, Year 2)</b>	Year 02
<b>1.11</b>	<b>Total project budget</b>	£ 959,003
<b>1.12</b>	<b>Total funding from DFID</b>	£ 719,252
<b>1.13</b>	<b>Financial contributions from other sources</b> 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 (efforts to raise a lot of this continues)  List all contributions £ 54596 Big Lottery £ 45000 Benfield Motors Trust £ 18000 Evan Cornish Foundation £ 3000 Isle of Man £ 13000 Other small Trusts Total Raised from external sources: <b>£ 133,596</b> Total to be covered by Traidcraft Reserves: <b>£ 107,741</b>
<b>1.14</b>	<b>Date report produced</b>	(30/04/2014)
<b>1.15</b>	<b>Name and position of person(s) who compiled this report</b>	<b>Name:</b> Mrs. Maveen Pereira <b>Position:</b> Head of South Asia Programmes <b>Name:</b> Mr. Kazi Shahed H Ferdous <b>Position:</b> Country Director, TX Bangladesh <b>Name:</b> Mr. A.B.M. Feroz Ahmed <b>Position:</b> Senior Programme Manager, TX Bangladesh
<b>1.16</b>	<b>Name, position &amp; email address for the main</b>	<b>Name:</b> Mrs. Maveen Pereira <b>Position:</b> Head of South Asia Programmes <b>Email 1:</b> <a href="mailto:maveenp@traidcraft.org.uk">maveenp@traidcraft.org.uk</a>

	<b>contact person for correspondence relating to this project</b>	<b>Email 2:</b>
<b>1.17</b>	<b>Secondary contact person (optional)</b>	<b>Name:</b> Mr. Kazi Shahed H Ferdous <b>Position:</b> Country Director, TX Bangladesh <b>Email 1:</b> <a href="mailto:shahedf@traidcraft.org.uk">shahedf@traidcraft.org.uk</a> <b>Email 2:</b>
<b>1.18</b>	<b>Acronyms</b> Please try not to use too many acronyms, and explain all that you do use e.g. <i>CHW – Community Health Worker.</i>	
	<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
	AWD	Alternative Wet and Dry Method
	BINA	Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture
	CSO	Civil Society Organization
	DEW	Development Wheel
	DAE	Department of Agriculture Extension
	DOF	Department of Fisheries
	DLS	Department of Livestock
	IPM	Integrated Pest Management
	ICM	Integrated Crop Management
	SLIPP	Sustainable Livelihood for Poor Producer (a TX project , funded by EU)
	SRDI	Soil Resource Development Institute
	TX	Traidcraft Exchange

## SECTION 2: SUMMARY, PROGRESS AND RESULTS (Aim for no more than 6 pages)

### 2.1 PROJECT SUMMARY (200 words)

In your own words please describe your project and its context.

The project ensures sustainable livelihoods for poor and marginal communities, particularly women, in North-East Bangladesh through improvements to small-scale agriculture. People here rely on agriculture for their livelihoods, but they 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. Their rights are also being eroded due to lack of awareness, an inability to network, lobby and negotiate services, and worsening terms of trade. TX and DEW are building the collective power of these farmers by organizing them into groups and associations. This enables them to take collective decisions, achieve benefits of the economies of scale in their businesses, and negotiate better prices, services and resources. Through the collectives they also access agricultural and business services, achieve joint savings and benefit from investment schemes. Farmers have been supported to adapt improved cultivation practices and alternative livelihood options (e.g. rice stock business, agro-machineries, rent, etc.) so they are more resilient to shocks and stresses, especially climate fluctuations.

### 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.

We do believe that the project remains fully relevant in the context of the project area. Small farming households living in in this region of Bangladesh face a series of inter-related problems that limit their ability to generate sufficient income to support their families. This includes limited knowledge of agricultural production practices, lack of climate adaptive and environment friendly agricultural practices, and isolation from markets for their produce, which produce multiple results e.g. low yields, high costs, low prices, crop failure and distress sales. The project has been addressing these problems by supporting increased access to vital knowledge, information, skills, services, equipment and inputs from private and public service providers and local authorities. 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: The project has organised 7963 small-scale farmers (4078 men, 3885 women including 1790 ethnic) into 262 self help groups, 4 sub-district associations, 3 district associations and 1 regional association. Support continues to be provided to help them utilise their collective power to voice, negotiate and attain their rights and services from relevant stakeholders. The project facilitated training on networking, lobbying, advocacy and governance for 262 group and 77 association leaders; who then rolled it out to the 7963 group members. (ii) increasing recognition of farmers needs amongst government and private sector stakeholders: Through meetings, visits, workshops, the project has facilitated linkages between farmers and appropriate service providers. As a result they have accessed a wide range of services and improved their cultivation practices leading to reduced production costs and increased productivity. The project has assisted associations in organising 6 sub-districts and 3 district level linkage-building workshops with public and private stakeholders; (iii) improving farmers' production practices and market access: Farmers have been supported to adopt climate smart and environment friendly cultivation practices so they are more resilient to shocks and stresses. These include encouraging production diversification, eco-friendly cropping pattern, use of environmentally friendly and improved cultivation techniques, soil and water management, etc. Specific activities have been facilitated- technical training for 252 private service providers, effective service delivery training for 52 public service providers, 786 training sessions on improved cultivation technique for 262 groups, exchange visit for farmer associations, and 26 agro-fair for market access; and (iv) reducing farmers' vulnerability to environmental and financial shocks and stresses: Farmers have also been supported to access safety/mitigation measures, such as crop diversification and environment friendly cultivation practices, group savings and investment scheme, to be used as a productive joint investment and social safety net in times of crisis. Specific activities have included 158 field demonstrations, field days on improved cultivation techniques, training for 84 soil collectors, and mentoring support for 266 groups for group savings and investment scheme.

<b>2.3</b>	<b>EQUITY (GENDER &amp; DIVERSITY)</b>				
	Does this project continue to contribute to equity (i.e. equitable poverty reduction and empowerment of men, women, girl and boys and relevant marginalised groups to participate in decisions that affect them at the local and national level)? <i>(Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box)</i>				
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>To some extent:</b>

a. Please explain your response in the space below:

So far 3885 women and 1790 individuals from ethnic minorities have been organised under the project. Women are targeted as they are more disadvantaged and vulnerable due to their dependency on income from men and the patriarchal nature of society, which limits their access to education, employment, mobility and opportunities to generate their own income. Women are also targeted because of their potential to be change makers in their communities. Our experience shows that when women benefit the entire family benefits, as women prioritise household needs such as food security and children's access to education/health, above their own personal needs. The ethnic minority Garo population is highly disadvantaged as they are socially excluded (due to their apparent invisibility) and lack the means to voice their concerns and grievances. This situation is exacerbated by their small population and religious minority status (Christian).

b. What has the project done this year in relation to gender mainstreaming (efforts to ensure gender issues are addressed in all aspects of project management and in organisational policies and practice – including the project staffing profile)? *(Please refer to the guidance note '[Gender and the GPAF](#)')*

During group formation, we formed 126 mixed groups comprising of men, women, Garos and Bengalis to help develop an inclusive society, irrespective of gender, religion and ethnicity. 3885 women and 1790 ethnic have been trained with skills on production, effective group operation, networking, lobbying, advocacy and governance and this has enabled them to increase their income and make their voice hard. Project activities have been organised in a way that facilitates better and active involvement of women and ethnic minority. Training events for group members have been organised on the rights of women, ethnic minorities, the elderly, the young, the disabled, the extremely poor and those affected by HIV/AIDS. They have gained decision making power, not only in family matters, but also in group and at the association level, where men and women are working together. Community people now look up to them as leaders and are regarded as commendable examples. Neighbouring women are approaching them to join groups. The following table is encouraging from the perspective of women's empowerment.

Ethnicity of Groups	Total # Groups	# Groups with Woman President	# Groups with Woman Secretary	# Groups with Women President & Secretary	# Groups with Women President &/or Secretary
Bengali Groups	67	9	14	3	20
"Ethnic" (Garo) Groups	19	13	17	13	17
Mixed ethnicity Groups	40	18	29	15	32
<b>Total Groups</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>69</b>

Of the 126 mixed-gender groups: (i) almost a third have a woman president; (ii) almost half have a woman secretary; (iii) almost a quarter have both a woman president and a woman secretary, and (iv) over half have either a woman president or secretary, or both. Group performance reveals that mixed groups are better in terms of women's empowerment than women's only groups. We feel that direct engagement is needed with men in order to challenge their gender perceptions which often entail restricting what women can do.

<b>2.4</b>	<b>KEY RESULTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS</b>
Please provide a summary of the three most significant project results or achievements over the last year. This section provides you with an opportunity to tell the story of the project's successes this year. Please specify the target groups; how many citizens benefited (men/women; girls/boys); and how they have benefitted. Also make it clear where the results and achievements were made in coalition or partnership with other, non-project actors.	

1. The project assisted 7963 small-scale farmers (4078 men, 3885 women including 1790 ethnic) to establish linkage with 252 trained private service providers, 52 trained public service providers and 390 output market traders. As a result they have accessed a wide range of services. Through this support farmers have achieved economies of scale, improved climate adaptive cultivation practices and better market access that have led to reduced production costs, increased productivity & sales and in turn increased profits. Mid-term evaluation notes, "In addition to achieving a range of non-tangible benefits (cohesiveness, new skills, confidence, access to government bodies, etc.), 55% (4380) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 52% (4141) farmers have reduced 15% production costs and 60% (4778) farmers have increased 30% sales. A number of project interventions have contributed such as using less fertilizers, irrigation and pesticides, quality inputs, efficient on-farm management through improved skills on improved cultivation techniques, agro-fair". For instance, Jahida Begum from Vordi Khandakarpara in Nokla, Sherpur, has increased her profit from rice production by 423%. Following table illustrates cost of production, production, sales and profit **from one acre land**.

Description	Before soil testing and improved cultivation technique	After soil testing and improved cultivation technique
Cost of production (BDT)	30675	25377
Production (Kg)	2290	3022
Sales (BDT)	34350	44575
Profit (BDT)	3675	19198

2. The project has successfully converted a section of marginal, insecure, invisible and absolutely unorganized rural community into a visible force through 262 groups and 8 associations. Groups and associations enabled their members to have identity, utilise social capital, and voice their issues to change their lives. They were encouraged to approach different public institutions highlighting their problems, needs and demand services & resources which are the mandates for those organizations. Our mid-term evaluation reveals that 100% (262) farmer groups are working collectively and 89% (235) farmer groups taking negotiated action with local stakeholders, estimated value of the negotiated action is GBP 44,851. Examples of benefits from group membership include: The Sahapur women farmer group, Fulpur, Mymensingh has negotiated and purchased a power-tiller from the agriculture office at a discount of 30%. Previously they had to hire this machinery. Despite paying for fuel and a person to operate it, it has saved them 25% of tilling costs. They also rent it to other farmers, charging GBP 17 for 100 decimals of land. Benefits from Association membership include: 600 farmers in Mymensingh negotiated 6000 kg rice seed from Bangladesh Agriculture Development Corporation (BADC) through Mymensingh District Agro-producer's association. This assistance came on time and at an optimum price. The Nokla Agro-producers' Association, Sherpur, assisted 94 farmers to get training from local government on improved surface water irrigation management through Rubber Dam; and the Jhenaigati Agro-producers' Association, Sherpur, assisted 18 farmers to get training from DAE on minor crops (ginger, turmeric, etc.) towards seed production and storage techniques.

3. Crop diversification and environment friendly cultivation practices are crucial to ensure the sustainability of small-scale farmers' livelihoods. Farmers have been supported to adapt climate adaptive cultivation practices so they are more resilient to shocks and stresses, especially natural disasters and climate fluctuations. Farmers also supported to access safety/mitigation measures, such as group savings schemes, to be used as a productive joint investment and social safety net in times of crisis. This worked well when the rainfall pattern during the year was erratic and negatively impacted the crop production period and ground water levels. Farmers coped with having improved cultivation techniques and multiple crops. For instance, we trained service providers to promote efficient irrigation methods amongst farmers- such as, Alternative Wetting and Drying Irrigation (a technology for water saving in rice production), improved on-farm water management, etc. We helped farmers diversify their crops and cropping pattern- established 55 demonstrations on short duration Taman(BINA 07) - Mustard-vegetable as a result of which farmers have increased cropping intensity from 200% to 300% at the same time they reduced 30-35% irrigation water/costs. Farmer records reveal that farmers have raised GBP190,186 through their own savings (GBP 82,078) and community fund from project (GBP 108,108), investing in different small-scale farm and non-farm businesses such as fish cultivation, cattle fattening, land leasing, agro-machinery renting, rural transport, etc. Mid-term evaluation reveals that "55 farmers have adopted environment friendly cultivation practices , 41% (3240) farmers have tested their soil, 32% (2548) farmers have used IPM and ICM techniques, 25% (1991) farmers have applied improved irrigation method and 12% (956) farmers have followed eco-friendly cropping pattern.

<b>2.5</b>	<b>PROGRESS AGAINST DELIVERABLE AND TIMESCALES</b>	
	How would you describe the current status of project progress in relation to the original time-scale? ( <i>Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box</i> )	
	a. This project is <b>on track</b> against its deliverables and original timescale	<b>X</b>
	b. This project is <b>off track but expected to be back on track</b> in the next reporting period	
	c. This project is <b>off track and not expected to be back on track</b> in the next reporting period	

Please list key factors that have contributed positively to progress:

Cooperation from Beneficiary Groups: The small farmers have recognised the value of the work being done by the project and the benefits that they are reaping. As an outcome of this success other neighbouring farming households are requesting to join groups. We have exceeded our targets to the extent possible. The groups and associations are now recognised by traders and government alike and being extended cooperation as the benefits to all parties is mutual.

Programmatic Approach – utilizing learning gained from other projects: The project has been implementing as a part of a broader strategic area of TX Bangladesh focusing on small-scale agriculture. It builds-upon the foundation laid by the SLIPP and Golden Fibre. The TX and its partner DEW have significant experience and expertise of working with small farmers on sustainable agriculture practice, utilising the group formation methodology and building linkages with service providers.

Consistent Understanding: Project Management Team (PMT) and project staff have a consistent understanding of what they are trying to achieve and how they are trying to achieve it. This enables the team to all pull in the same direction.

Committed and Highly Skilled Project Team: The field staffs are all agriculturalists as are the project coordinator and supporting managers in DEW and TX, who also have strong business skills. Their specialist technical knowledge is an asset. In addition it enables them to speak the same language as the government extension officers and gain their trust in this way.

Optimizing Resources already in place: The Project facilitates linkage among farmers groups, trained business service providers (through SLIPP project) and public service providers. Public service providers have various schemes (such as subsidy, equipment, agricultural loan, etc) designed to benefit farmers but which generally don't reach the small and marginal farmers. But, APONE are now able to take advantage of these schemes.

List key challenges and how they have been addressed:

<p>The key challenge has been the violent political unrest in the last year. We have however been supported by having the project teams based in the project area so that activities were not disrupted. We also developed a comprehensive contingency plan to cope with the situation that include rescheduling of outdoor events, reshuffling of working days, change in working hours and always keep an alternative plan handy. However, the political situation in Bangladesh remains an ongoing concern.</p>				
<p>If the project is considered to be 'off track' please explain what measures are being taken to get the project back 'on track':</p>				
<p>Not applicable.</p>				
<p><b>2.6</b></p>	<p><b>CHANGES TO PROJECT STATUS</b> In the last reporting period have there been any significant changes in relation to the following? Tick the boxes as appropriate. (Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box)</p>			
	a. Project design			
	b. Partner(s)			
	c. Context			
	d. Availability of match-funding (where relevant)			
<p>Provide a brief explanation of what has changed and why:</p>				
<p>There was no significant change in the reporting period in relation to project design, partners and context.</p>				
<p><b>2.7</b></p>	<p><b>UNINTENDED (POSITIVE) OUTCOMES</b> Are there any unintended outcomes that have been observed as a result of your project implementation during this reporting period? Please list below. If these require a revision to the project logframe, please incorporate into your response to question 2.9.</p>			
	<p>DEW, TX and our local CSOs have benefited from networking with different NGOs and agricultural research institutions working in the project area and inviting them in different activities for possible collaboration and support to help improve returns from agriculture, inputs/equipment support to diversify income sources, etc. As a result farmers have seen other benefits: For instance, World Vision has conducted a collaborative event with our project and provided veterinary medicine support to 210 cattle farmers worth GBP795, distributed 55 pigs and 5 cattle amongst 60 farmers worth GBP 2784 as alternative livelihood option, and installed two deep-set hand tube-wells worth GBP487 to solve drinking water problem. BINA has provided 124 kg rice seed and 24 kg mustard seed worth GBP 75 to establish 45 demonstrations on eco-friendly cropping pattern and crop diversification. Likewise, International Fertilizer Development Corporation (IFDC) has provided training in collaboration with DAE to 452 farmers on fertilizer management. We will continue consultation with similar NGOs and other relevant organizations to acquire resources and services.</p>			
<p><b>2.8</b></p>	<p><b>UNINTENDED (NEGATIVE) CONSEQUENCES</b> Has the project implementation led to any unintended negative effects during this reporting period? Please list and explain below. If these are considered to have a negative effect on the outcome of the project, do they require a revision of the project risk matrix? If so, please incorporate into your response to question 2.11.</p>			
	<p>There was no unexpected negative outcome.</p>			
<p><b>2.9</b></p>	<p><b>CHANGES TO THE PROJECT LOGFRAME</b> 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. (Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box)</p>			
	<p><b>Do you need to make changes to your most recently approved logframe?</b></p>			
		Yes	No	X
	<p><b>If you answered 'yes', have you attached a justification and a copy of your logframe highlighting the proposed changes?</b> Please label this document: "GPAF (ref. no.) Revised Logframe – Prepared (+ date prepared)"</p>			

		<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
	<b>On the basis of your project implementation experience during this reporting period, do you consider there to be any key aspects of your project which are not sufficiently captured in your project logframe (such as hard-to-measure qualitative results)?</b>				
	If yes, please use the space below to explain.				
		<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	<b>X</b>
Not applicable.					
<b>2.10</b>	<b>RISK MANAGEMENT &amp; MITIGATION</b>				
	Risk management matrix: Please use the table below to describe the risks you faced in the reporting period and how you dealt with them.				
<b>Which risks materialized during the year?</b> Describe briefly.	<b>Was the risk anticipated?</b> Yes / No / To some extent	<b>What action did you take to address the risk?</b> Briefly explain.		<b>Was this action sufficient?</b> Yes / No / To some extent	
1. Political unrest across the country	Yes	Travelled on weekends-Friday and Saturday when no strikes are called; use manual/local transports to move around within project areas; rescheduled events with stakeholders on strike free days and weekends		Yes	
2.					
<b>2.11</b>	<b>Are you expecting significant new risk(s) in the next reporting period that would affect project performance or completion?</b> If yes, tick the box and list the new anticipated risks in the table below.				
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	
	<b>Anticipated risks and mitigating actions.</b> Complete the table if relevant. Focus on higher level risks such as deterioration in the operating environment (maximum of 4 risks).				
<b>Anticipated risks</b>		<b>Intended mitigating actions</b>		<b>Risk rating:</b> <i>Your assessment of risk probability &amp; impact</i>	
1. Political unrest may continue and get worse in forthcoming months		Developed comprehensive contingency plan to include re-scheduling of events, reshuffling working days/hours, and prepared alternative plans for vehicle use and movement.		Probability: high; Impact: medium	
2. Staff turnover may be higher since the project in phase-out stage		We are in process of developing phase-out plans to handover our role to local CSOs, and national partner. Also, we are engaging farmer associations in organising and managing different activities effectively		Probability: medium; Impact: low	
3.					
4.					
<b>2.12</b>	<b>If you anticipate new risks please submit a revised risk matrix.</b>				
	Revised risk matrix attached highlighting new anticipated risks?				

	<i>(Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box)</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	
--	--	------------	----------	-----------	--

### SECTION 3: VALUE FOR MONEY (Aim for no more than 2 pages)

See intro section above for guidance and resources on VfM.

**3.1 Economy:** What has the project management done this year to buy and employ inputs at an optimum value-for-money price (DFID considers inputs to include: staff, consultants, raw materials and capital to produce outputs)? In other words, what has the project done to drive down costs while maintaining the required standards of quality? Include references to the use of any relevant unit cost benchmarks.

Please explain and provide examples:

The different ways to achieve economy have included: **a.** efforts to keep staff morale to reduce staff turnover by regular refresher training and mentoring to build their professional competence. This has kept the cost of re-hiring new staff low, particularly in the field. **b.** We have worked closely with government departments and existing market players to leverage the services already available so that we do not replicate services. **c.** all procurement of goods and services are done through a tendering processes which includes inviting at least 3 tenders where possible and decisions taken by a Procurement Committee instituted for ensuring Value for Money; **d.** Staff policies ensure good work-life balance for teams to prevent burn out. **e.** Up to march 2014, £701,654 has been spent on the project covering 7,963 farmer households (about 39,815 people). Hence the cost per farmer is approximately £88. In addition, the farmers have raised £82,078 through their own savings, £10.31 per farmer. This excludes savings through reduced cost of production and higher returns on sale of crops.

**3.2 Efficiency:** How do you ensure resources (inputs) are used efficiently to maximise the results achieved? Include references to the use of any relevant cost comparisons (benchmarks) at the output level (e.g. standard training cost per trainee); and any efficiencies gained from working in collaboration with others.

The project assisted small-scale farmers to build their capacity and establish linkage with 252 trained private service providers, 52 trained public service providers and 390 output market traders as a result they have accessed a wide range of services. Through this support farmers have achieved economies of scale, improved cultivation practices and better market access that have led to reduced production costs, increased productivity & sales and in turn increased profits. Mid-term evaluation notes, "In addition to achieving a range of non-tangible benefits (cohesiveness, new skills, confidence, access to government bodies, etc.), 55% (4380) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 52% (4141) farmers have reduced 15% production costs and 60% (4778) farmers have increased 30% sales". The project has accelerated it efficiency through collaboration with other NGOs and research organizations. For instance, BINA has provided 124 kg rice seed and 24 kg mustard seed to establish 45 demonstrations- more than 6,000 farmers have improved knowledge about eco-friendly cropping pattern and crop diversification through 45 field/result demonstration days. Likewise, International Fertilizer Development Corporation (IFDC) has provided training in collaboration with DAE to 452 farmers on fertilizer management. World Vision has conducted a collaborative event with our project and provided veterinary medicine support to 210 cattle farmers, distributed 55 pigs and 5 cattle amongst 60 farmers as alternative livelihood option, and installed two deep-set hand tube-wells to solve drinking water problem.

**3.3 Effectiveness:** To what extent do you consider the project to be effective in bringing about the anticipated changes for beneficiaries and target groups? How well are the outputs of the project working towards the achievement of the outcome?

Our working/facilitation model required field-level monitoring & mentoring, networking and organizing for implementation. In order to do so, TX has been working with DEW, and engaging with 2 local level CSOs – Grameen Manobic Unnayan Sangstha (GRAMAUS) and Rural Development Sangstha (RDS). This partnership has been working very well in supporting the needs of groups and associations and maintaining relationship with local stakeholders such as local administration, local government, traders, extension departments, etc. Local CSOs have been integrating groups into their regular programmes (such as health, education, renewable energy, enterprise loan, etc) which show they are taking ownership of the project and indicates well for the group’s sustainability.

TX and its partners have been working in this region for over 7 years and our experience has shown that building the power of farmers is the most sustainable and cost-effective way to achieve desired impacts. The formation of farmers groups and associations enable small farmers to achieve economies of scale and allow more cost-effective training. The groups are thus at the heart of service delivery (networking, advocacy, lobbying, negotiation etc), enterprise development and sustainability for the project. The groups are giving, both the public sector and the private sector, an instrument to increase outreach to their services and products. For instance, DLS are using the farmer groups for their vaccination program and provided training to 7963 farmers on livestock vaccination. Similarly, DAE provided training on improved rice cultivation practices to 7963 groups and SRDI provided soil testing services to 3240 farmers.

**3.4** **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?

From our Mid-term evaluation, it is clear that there is a lot of multiplication going on in the project. These include neighbouring farmers- (i) attending training provided to groups by government service providers; (ii) coming to the groups for advice; (iii) attending at Agro-fairs and field demonstrations and hearing the talks, getting to know the service providers present and seeing the demonstration plots; (iv) bringing their livestock to vaccination programmes organized for the groups. For instance, DLS vaccinated 100 cattle for farmer groups. But in addition he vaccinated 400 cattle brought by neighbouring farmers.

In Bangladesh, Agriculture Extension departments usually use a multiplier of 5 to report on their own activities (e.g. every farmer that they provide advice to, passes this advice on to 4 others). TX’s experience from a previous project is that it is around 3. For example, the project formed 7 groups, but an additional 14 were formed by other farmers themselves. On this basis, our 7,963 beneficiaries may be accompanied by an additional 15,926 farmers benefiting from the multiplier effect.

## **SECTION 4: SUSTAINABILITY** (Aim for no more than 1 page)

**4.1** What have you done during this reporting period / what are the plans to ensure that positive changes to peoples’ lives will be sustained beyond the lifetime of the GPAF grant?

***Collective power and tested inclusive approach:*** As demonstrated through Traidcraft’s work with over 20,000 small-scale farmers and workers across of Bangladesh, forming groups/associations and building their capacity ensures financial and institutional sustainability. We have been using a tried and tested methodology that promotes and strengthens collective power of 7,963 farmers (supported by capacity building, mentoring and ensuring good governance of existing structures). We are encouraging beneficiaries to work collectively to access services/support and negotiate with private/public service providers on an ongoing basis. Facilitating inclusive groups/association formation ensures that groups and associations benefit all members and gain full community support.

***Win-win relationship:*** The project has facilitated linkage building amongst farmers groups and service providers. It 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. Mid-term evaluation reveals that the relationship amongst farmers and service providers is very strong and win-win which ensure that they have a stake in continuing to engage with each other.

***Training of Trainers approach:*** The project trained 304 public and private service providers and 524

group leaders to create locally available cost effective service provision for the farmers. It has a multiplier effect to the transfer of knowledge and skills to large numbers effectively and leaves behind a sizeable knowledge transfer resource that can continue to support replication and scale-up after the project ends.

Investing in local institutions: We have been building the capacity of DEW and local CSOs to ensure project impact continues. DEW and the CSOs are committed to improving rural livelihoods in the agriculture sector and target area.

Leveraging networks: Local CSOs have excellent networks in the project areas, including partnerships with local government and membership with local development forums, which will help beneficiaries access support on an ongoing basis.

Access to resources: The project has been facilitating and providing mentoring support on group savings to improve resilience and joint investment to help farmers reduce vulnerability during natural calamities and avoid distress sales of crops. Producer records reveal that farmers have raised £40,145 through their own savings and jointly investing in different small-scale farm and non-farm businesses such as cattle fattening, land leasing, agro-machinery renting, rural transport, etc. For them, this is a source of alternative livelihood options.

**4.2** If the project is introducing new or improved services that need to continue beyond the life of the grant, what have you done / what are the plans to ensure the sustainability of the service?

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. According to Mid-term Evaluation, a large proportion of the key benefits that the farmers have seen so far from the project are through their relationship with the public service providers. Many farmers themselves mentioned this as the key benefit of their group membership to date. The relationship between the farmers groups and the public service providers is strong enough for them to continue accessing government services and resources after the project ends. Private service providers are also convinced that there is a business case for them to acquire loyal customers through the provision of better products and services. We now need to ensure that the Associations can continue to promote its policy mandate and continue to ensure that small farmers are recognised by decision makers and market players alike functioning effectively even after the life of the project.

## SECTION 5: PROJECT ACCOUNTABILITY TO STAKEHOLDERS

(Aim for no more than 1 page).

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.

**5.1** 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?

The project collects feedback from beneficiaries to answer the following questions (list up to 4 examples):

- a. Have you been benefited from being a member of your group and association? If yes, how?
- b. Have you been able to access any service from the project stakeholders such as service providers, local CSOs, project staff, etc? Are you satisfied with the quality of these services? How can we improve the services?
- c. What are the benefits you have received from the market? What changes have you experienced since being part of the APONE project?
- d. Do you have any feedback/ suggestions / learning that you want to share with the project team or other groups and associations?

**5.2** How often do you collect and analyse beneficiary feedback data? (Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box)

When a complaint is made by beneficiaries	<b>x</b>
---	----------

	Once a year	<b>x</b>
	Mid-term	<b>x</b>
	Final evaluation	<b>x</b>
Other (explain in brief): We have developed a beneficiary feedback tool under monitoring and evaluation framework and collecting their feedback quarterly. As part of the midterm review process views were sought from a range of stakeholders, including farmers (men and women), groups and association representatives, private and public service providers and the project team.		
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Provide brief example(s) of how beneficiary feedback has influenced project decisions on implementation.</b>	
Project staff got a feedback from beneficiaries that they are unable to work effectively with input traders. As a result the project worked to facilitate relationship-building and create a win-win situation for both sides to interact positive. The results are very positive. Another example is feedback from some beneficiaries that they do not know how to use vaccine for their livestock which is very crucial to reduce mortality rate. As a result we facilitated hands on training session for the 262 farmer groups by involving livestock officers. Livestock Officer has shown some ways to preserve and inject vaccine effectively.		
<b>5.4</b>	<b>After their views are analysed, what feedback if any does the project provide to beneficiaries and how?</b>	
Regular monthly meetings with groups & associations are held by the project team to share learning and seek feedback. Project staff also encourages groups to invite government officers and private service providers to their group meetings to seek viable solutions of their problems. Training and mentoring sessions are also organised to deal with specific issues that are raised by members of groups. As part of the midterm review process a dissemination workshop will be organised shortly to share the findings with representatives of groups and associations.		

## **SECTION 6: LEARNING** (Aim for no more than 3 pages)

**Please note you do not have to provide lessons learned under each area.** Try to identify clear and specific lessons from your project so far; how you have applied these lessons to improve project delivery and achieve results; and/or explain how your learning 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”).

**6.1 Innovation:** Describe lessons learned from any project innovation<sup>1</sup> which have the potential for scaling-up or replication by your own or other organisations.

<sup>1</sup> DFID defines successful innovation as: ‘the creation and implementation of new or improved processes, products, services, methods of delivery or other aspects of an approach that result in significant improvements in impact, outcomes, efficiency, effectiveness or quality’ (GPAF Impact Window Guidelines, 25 Nov 2013).

The project combines technical agricultural support & market access activities with rights awareness & collective actions for marginalised groups. Lobbying key decision makers is vital to benefit from existing policies/change policies, but services are also crucial to provide immediate benefits, develop confidence and keep communities motivated. Both rights and technical interventions have created this synergic impact among beneficiaries. We have tried to create a win-win situation for farmers, government, and private sector players all of which has led to tremendous results for all three sides – farmers have seen growth in income, government now has better ways to achieve their targets, and market players are making more sales (and even changing their ways of working - moving from one-to-one work to working with groups as this leads to better sales.

For instance, the government’s extension has various schemes designed to benefit farmers but which generally do not reach the small and marginal farmers. These include the provision of agricultural equipment at highly subsidized rates (e.g. ‘Urea Super Granules’ making machines, power tillers, spray machine, Shallow Tube Well), free leaf colour charts (for assessing the urea fertilizer status by the colour of their leaves), demonstration plots and training on Integrated Pest Management. The farmers involved in APONE are now able to take advantage of these schemes through effective negotiation and use these free extension services to improve their cultivation practices.

**6.2 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?

The location of key project activities affects the participation of women. Locating these at the village level, rather than in town, enables better participation. For instance, in the previous SLIPP project, Agro-Fairs were held in the towns where key stakeholders are based, for example, PSPs and BSPs. In APONE these Agro-Fairs have been organised around clusters of 10 villages at a time and take place at this village level. The project staffs have observed much more active participation of women farmers in their fairs as a result. They also conducted proactive bargaining with the traders (mostly men) to get optimum price of their product. We feel that in the less-familiar surroundings of town, those women that do attend feel less comfortable and therefore are more reticent. In addition, social constraints regarding women’s travel prevent some women from participating in these events when held in town. The project staffs do not feel that holding them in the villages has had a correspondingly negative effect on the participation of the private service providers and public service providers.

Our experience and learning also suggests that 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 126 mixed groups 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.

**6.3 Capacity building:** Describe any key lessons learned from your experiences of building the capacity of civil society to address poverty and/or to negotiate and claim their rights? Which approaches have been most successful?

Capacity building is fundamental to achieving all project outcomes and outputs. The project has been building the capacity of 7,963 farmers to: (i) increase the collective capacity to manage groups and develop skills in improved production practices; (ii) collaborate and build alliances at local, regional and national level (through groups/associations); (iii) access services and inputs provided by public/private providers; (iv) access government schemes/resources (e.g. welfare services); and (v) adopt additional/alternative livelihood options and access new markets. In addition to building the capacity of the farmers, the has been building the capacity of 252 private and 52 public service providers to provide appropriate services and support to farmers ongoing basis. Mid-term evaluation reveals that it is possible to improve the service provision of both private and public service providers through appropriate training such as technical training for private service providers and effective service delivery training for public service providers. This enhances their service offer to small and marginal farmers, and helps them achieve their missions. Complementariness can be developed between the private and public sector. The two need not be in opposition and the project has worked successfully with both – they now work well together. We see that building the relationship between farmer groups and service providers is key to sustaining impact. The group-based methodology enables this process to occur.

**6.4 Monitoring & Evaluation:** What lessons have been learned from the tools and methods you have designed and used for measuring and demonstrating results and evidence of the project (including beneficiary feedback mechanisms)?

An M&E system/framework agreed with project partners and stakeholders at the start of the project, and staff trained in participatory tools and approaches. Ongoing assessment of activities and results has been measuring progress against the indicators in the logframe. This includes regular measurement and analysis of training progress, farmer records, savings record, service provider records, etc. Information collected includes economic, empowerment and safety measures data disaggregated by gender and ethnicity. The information collected has been feeding into annual review and planning cycles with project partners and other stakeholders, and incorporated into reports. According to Mid-term evaluation, one of the effective tools the project is using to track and demonstrate evidence of project achievements is a producer record. This tool records cost of production, productivity, sales, profit, etc by taking into account each crop season and harvesting cycle (for livestock and fish) .

We found that internal midterm evaluation is very effective to check progress and agree any adjustments needed to keep the project on track. It enables the project management team to assess the progress in delivery of the project in terms of its own stated objectives and expected results and helpsto take decisions on recommended changes that need to be made to the project during its remaining time.

**6.5 Approaches to Empowerment and Advocacy:** a) What lessons have you identified and learned from in relation to factors that enhance approaches to empowerment or advocacy processes? b) What lessons have you identified and learned from in addressing resistance against the empowerment of marginalized groups?

The project has been supporting small-scale farmers to voice their concerns with relevant stakeholders and decision-making authorities at local, regional and national level. The project formed 262 farmer groups and 8 associations and provided training in negotiation, lobbying and advocacy skills. We found that this enabled them to participate in more effective relationships with duty bearers and lobby for group members' needs, such as provision of services, resources, subsidies, etc. Our mid-term evaluation reveals that 89% (235) farmer groups taking negotiated action with local stakeholders and estimated value of the negotiated action is GBP 44,851. For instance, 1200 farmers in Jhenaigathi, Sherpur got free vaccine from department of livestock through negotiation. We have been supporting advocacy efforts by ensuring beneficiaries participate in local and regional forums (e.g. union agriculture committees, IPM & ICM clubs and local civil society forums) to make their voice heard. An advocacy plan has been prepared based on our policy consultation with relevant stakeholders.

**6.6 Other lessons learned:** Please include any other key lessons learned that you think may be useful for other partners, grant holders or DFID

Three years is a bit challenging in which to bring about sustained change in agricultural practices. However, APONE seems to be achieving this. The way the project has utilised learnings and resources developed through previous projects, and the strong linkages it has built with existing service providers are crucial to this success.

The following learning and actions have also emerged from the Mid Term Review:

- To spend year 3 of the project to strengthen the district and regional association so that they operate effectively after the life of the project.
- The importance of supporting, integrating and building the capacity of the CSOs to enhance the sustainability of the groups and associations post project.
- Utilise the monitoring data collected by the project to help the team understand the impact of the project across different groups (gender, ethnicity, farm size).
- Consider the regular collection of data on the gender make-up of group committees and association committees. Consider ways to support women's empowerment through their take-up of such positions. Engage with the potential tension between rising incomes and women's empowerment.
- Monitor and support the farmers groups with their savings and loans schemes.
- Collect case-studies on the same participants several times during the life of the project in order to track changes occurring in their lives.
- Since the project is achieving much more than is being measure, need to consider simple ways to quantify the leeching/multiplier effects by tracking the presence of non-project farmers in key activities

## **SECTION 7: RESPONSES TO DUE DILIGENCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

(Aim for no more than one page)

Please provide an update on any actions taken during this period in response to the recommendations of the Due Diligence Assessment of your organisation by KPMG (Please note that you do not need to comment on recommendations included as specific terms and conditions in section 4 of your Grant Arrangement).

Traidcraft has taken all the necessary actions based on the recommendations of the Due Diligence Assessment by KPMG.

The only outstanding action is to continue to raise match funds during the life of the project. We have raised all the required funds to cover costs to date and match funds continue to be raised for the final year of the project.

To date we have raised a total of **£ 133,596** funds and the rest is being covered by our reserves supported by public fundraising support.

## ANNEX A: OUTCOME AND OUTPUT SCORING

Please read the instructions on this page carefully and complete all sections

**Before working on this section, please complete the relevant indicator 'achieved' boxes on your 'Reporting Logframe' (which should be based on the the most recently approved version of your logframe).**

### SCORING

ANNEX A asks you to score performance against your Outcome and Outputs making a judgement based on the actual achievements compared to expected results as indicated in the logframe milestones for this reporting period. Use the five-point scoring system below to rate your achievement of results.

- Complete what has been 'achieved' under each outcome and output indicator in your **logframe**
- Within this document (**Annex A**) provide an overall score against the outcome and each output.
- Provide an explanation for each outcome and output score describing the progress made against the outcome or output indicators in the reporting year. Do not simply describe activities.
- Back up statements of progress/achievements with references to evidence that can be checked if necessary, and comment on the strength of evidence provided.

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

### BENEFICIARY DATA

**ANNEX A** also asks you to summarise disaggregated **beneficiary data at the Outcome level**.

DFID is also interested in finding out about the **number of people engaged by the project at Output level**, and the nature of their engagement. The delivery of the outputs is considered as the means of achieving the desired changes to the lives of the beneficiaries identified at the outcome level. Although many of those engaged at output level will experience positive changes to e.g. skills, awareness or improved capacity, for the purposes of this GPAF progress reporting, they are not defined as beneficiaries.

**ANNEX B** asks you to record the total consolidated outcome level beneficiary numbers without double-counting individuals who may benefit in different ways.

## ANNEX A: OUTCOME AND OUTPUT SCORING

(Aim for no more than 12 pages). *Retain in portrait format*

### OUTCOME

**A.0.1** **Outcome:** *write in full your project outcome in the box below*

Reduced poverty and more sustainable livelihoods for poor and marginal communities in Mymensingh and Sherpur through sustainable agricultural practices.

**A.0.2** **Outcome Score:** *Please provide an overall outcome score (C – A++)*

A+

**A.0.3** **Justify the score:** The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against outcome indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.

Mid-term evaluation and our farmers' record reveal that 60% farmers (against target scale 30%) have increased 50% income through reduced production costs and increased productivity and sales. A number of project interventions have contributed such as using less fertilizers, irrigation and pesticides, quality inputs, efficient on-farm management through improved skills on improved cultivation techniques, agro-fair. Improvement in well-being not measured in mid-term evaluation, but survey planned at final evaluation in year 3.

**A.0.4** **For each of the indicators:** Write in full each outcome indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement.

**Indicator 1:** Farmers that see a 50% increase in disposable income (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 30% (1800 of 6000 farmers; 720 Women/ 540 Garo)

Achieved: 60% (4778 of 7963 farmers; 2341 Women/ 1099 Garo)

**Indicator 2:** Farmers who perceive an improvement in their well-being (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 40% (2400 of 6000 farmers; 960 Women/ 720 Garo)

Achieved: not measured in mid-term evaluation, but survey planned at final evaluation in year 3.

**Indicator 3:**

**Indicator 4:**

**Indicator 5:**

**Indicator 6:**

**A.0.5** **Disaggregate the number of citizens benefitting from this outcome; describe briefly who they were and how they benefitted** NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description (e.g. farmers)	Change/improvement (e.g. income increased)
2437	2341	0	0	4778	Farmers benefited on Indicator 1	Reduced cost of production; increased productivity and increased sales

<b>A.0.6</b>	<b>State the evidence used to measure the progress described.</b> <i>Please comment on the strength of the evidence (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).</i>
As per Monitoring and evaluation framework, farmer level production related data recorded by the farmers for each season, across all crops. The data collected and aggregated by the project staff members. 150 farmers have been selected at random from each sub-district (900 farmers in total). These farmers are tracked through the life of the project. At the end of each agricultural season field staff complete the Producer Records for the selected farmers in their sub-district. During mid-term evaluation, An assessment has been conducted using external consultants who looked at 900 farmer records.	

**OUTPUT 1**

**A.1.1** Output 1 Write in full

Target farmers are working collectively and collaboratively

**A.1.2** Output 1 score (C – A++)

A+

**A.1.3** Justify the score: The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against output indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.

Farmer group registers note that 100% farmer groups (against target scale 50%) are working collectively and 89% farmer groups (against target scale 40%) taking negotiated action with local stakeholders. Farmer groups were encouraged to approach different public institutions highlighting their problems, needs and demand services & resources which are the mandates for those organizations. Farmers' feedback suggests that 80% farmers perceived benefits from membership of local groups.

**A.1.4** For each of the indicators: Write in full each indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement (add extra rows if required).

**Indicator 1.1:** Indicator 01: Farmer groups taking collective actions

Milestone 2: 50% (120 of 240 farmer groups)

Achieved: 100% (262 of 262 farmer groups)

**Indicator 1.2:** Farmer groups that negotiate with local stakeholders for improved resources and services

Milestone 2: 40% (96 of 240 farmer groups)

Achieved: 89% (235 of 262 farmer groups)

**Indicator 1.3:** Farmers that perceive benefits from membership of local groups (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 75% (4500 of 6000 farmers; 1800 Women/ 1350 Garo)

Achieved: 80% (6370 of 7963 farmers; 3121 Women/ 1465 Garo)

**Indicator 1.4:**

**A.1.5** Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Type of engagement
4078	3885	0	0	7963	Farmers have take collective actions	Collective action has led to tangible results
3614	3473	0	0	7087	Negotiated action by groups	Groups had to negotiate for resources
3249	3121	0	0	6370	benefits from group membership	Farmers achieved benefits as members of groups

<b>A.1.6</b>	<b>State the evidence used to measure the progress described.</b> <i>Please comment on the strength of the evidence (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).</i>
Farmers' register: Farmer groups keeping records on collective actions and negotiated actions with effective mentoring support from project staff members. Farmers' feedback through group meeting also reveals the results. This data is further aggregated at the level of the project.	

<b>Output 2</b>
-----------------

<b>A.2.1</b>	<b>Output 2</b> Write in full in the box below
--------------	--

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

<b>A.2.2</b>	<b>Output 2 score (C – A++)</b>
--------------	---------------------------------

B

<b>A.2.3</b>	<b>Justify the score:</b> The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against output indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.
--------------	---

The project assisted small-scale farmers to establish linkage with 304 trained private and public service providers. Through this support farmers have achieved economies of scale, improved climate adaptive cultivation practices and better market access that have led to reduced production costs, increased productivity & sales and in turn increased profits. Though there in no policy level improvements but there has been good implementation of policy and farmer groups have managed to access a number of benefits and services. Farmers are now receiving improved extension services, being represented in differenct government committees such as IPM Clubs, and 3240 have succeeded in receiving soil testing services from the SRDI.

The project has prepared a policy advocacy plan for the farmer associations. 8 farmer associations have been formed this year and they are establishing network with relevant policy makers and implementers. We are building capacity as a way to increase the sustainability of the project.

<b>A.2.4</b>	<b>For each of the indicators:</b> Write in full each indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement (add extra rows if required).
--------------	---

**Indicator 2.1:** Improvements in policies, practices or resources negotiated by the district or regional associations

Milestone 2: 2 improvements

Achieved: 0 improvements (still working on this)

**Indicator 2.2:** Public & private service providers trained to provide more appropriate & affordable services to target farmers.

Milestone 2: 300 service providers trained

Achieved: 304 service providers trained

**Indicator 2.3:** Percentage of farmers that perceive benefits from district/regional association membership

Milestone 2: 40% (2400 of 6000 farmers;960 Women/ 720 Garo)

Achieved: 15% (1194 of 7963 farmers; 585Women/ 275 Garo)

**Indicator 2.4:**

<b>A.2.5</b>	<b>Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.</b>					
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Type of engagement
238	66	0	0	304	Service Providers linked with farmers	Service Providers linked with farmers
599	585	0	0	1194	Farmers benefitting from	Farmers achieved benefits as members of

					Associations	Association (refer to Section 2.4 for examples)

**A.2.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described.  
*Please comment on the strength of the evidence (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).*

Training register, group and association registers, constitutions along with Focus Group Discussion reveals the results. Group meetings record the issues discussed and the actions taken.

### Output 3

**A.3.1** Output 3 Write in full in the box below

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

**A.3.2** Output 3 score (C – A++)

A++

**A.3.3** Justify the score: The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against output indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.

Our farmer records and mid-term evaluation notes that in addition to achieving a range of non-tangible benefits (cohesiveness, new skills, confidence, access to government bodies, etc.), 55% (4380) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 52% (4141) farmers have reduced 15% production costs and 60% (4778) farmers have increased 30% sales. Linkage with government extension bodies and trained private service providers has benefited farmers to get information and knowledge on improved cultivation techniques which accelerated the results.

**A.3.4** For each of the indicators: Write in full each indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement (add extra rows if required).

**Indicator 3.1:** Farmers who see a 15% decrease in production costs (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 50% (3000 of 6000 farmers; 1200 Women/ 900 Garo)

Achieved: 52 (4141 of 7963 farmers; 2029 Women/ 952 Garo)

**Indicator 3.2:** Farmers who see a 30% increase in productivity (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 50% (3000 of 6000 farmers; 1200 Women/ 900 Garo)

Achieved: 55% (4380 of 7963 farmers; 2146 Women/ 1007 Garo)

**Indicator 3.3:** Farmers who see a 30% increase in sales (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 40% (2400 of 6000 farmers; 960 Women/ 720 Garo)

Achieved: 60% (4778 of 7963 farmers; 2341 Women/ 1099 Garo)

**Indicator 3.4:**

**A.3.5** Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Type of engagement
2112	2029	0	0	4141	Farmers see decrease in production costs	Cost of production reduced through a improved inputs management
2234	2146	0	0	4380	Farmers see increase in	Farmers trained to increase productivity

					productivity	
2437	2341	0	0	4778	Farmers see an increase in sales	Farmers supported to increase sales

**A.3.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described.  
*Please comment on the strength of the evidence (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).*

Farmer record: 900 farmer level production related data recorded by the farmers for each season, across all crops. The data collected and aggregated by the project staff members.

Focus Group Discussion: This is supported by a sample of focus group discussions with farmer groups.

#### Output 4

**A.4.1** Output 4 Write in full in the box below

Target farmers are less vulnerable to shocks and stresses, especially natural disasters and climate fluctuations

**A.4.2** Output 4 score (C – A++)

A++

**A.4.3** Justify the score: The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against output indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.

Farmers supported to access environment friendly cultivation practices and safety/mitigation measures, such as group savings and investment schemes. Farmer records reveal that farmers have raised GBP190, 186 through their own savings (GBP 82,078) and community fund from project (108,108) and investing in different small-scale farm and non-farm businesses such as cattle fattening, land leasing, agro-machinery renting, rice stocking, etc. Mid-term evaluation reveals that “55 farmers have adopted environment friendly cultivation practices, 41% (3240) farmers have tested their soil, 32% (2548) farmers have used IPM and ICM techniques, 25% (1991) farmers have applied improved irrigation method and 12% (956) farmers have followed eco-friendly cropping pattern.

**A.4.4** For each of the indicators: Write in full each indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement (add extra rows if required).

**Indicator 4.1:** Farmers that diversify production and/or adopt more environment friendly cultivation practices (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 50% (3000 of 6000 farmers;1200 Women/ 900 Garo)

Achieved: 55% (4380 of 7963 farmers; 2146 Women/ 1007 Garo)

**Indicator 4.2:** Farmers that report an increase in soil fertility (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity):

Milestone 2: 25% (1500 of 6000 farmers;600 Women/ 450 Garo)

Achieved: 41% (3240 of 7963 farmers; 1519 Women/ 620 Garo)

**Indicator 4.3:** Farmers covered by safety measures (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)

Milestone 2: 30% (1800 of 6000 farmers;720 Women/ 540 Garo)

Achieved: 100% (7963 of 7963 farmers; 3885 Women/ 1790 Garo)

**Indicator 4.4:**

**A.4.5** Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Type of engagement
------------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------	-------------------	--------------------

2234	2146	0	0	4380	Diversification of production	Improved crops, cropping pattern and cultivation technique suggested and supported
1721	1519	0	0	3240	Better soil health	Soil Testing and advice on fertilizer and crops
4078	3885	0	0	7963	Diversification of income	Group saving and investment scheme promoted

**A.4.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described.  
*Please comment on the strength of the evidence (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).*

Soil Health cards provided by SRDI indicates that 3240 farmers have tested their soil to manage soil fertility and adopt environmentally cultivation practices. At the same time, farmer record shows that farmers have practiced environment friendly cultivation technique and diversify their production. Group saving record shows their group savings. 262 groups have their own bank account.

## Output 5

**A.5.1** Output 5 Write in full in the box below

**A.5.2** Output 5 score (C – A++)

**A.5.3** Justify the score: The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against output indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.

**A.5.4** For each of the indicators: Write in full each indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement (add extra rows if required).

Indicator 5.1:

Indicator 5.2:

Indicator 5.3:

Indicator 5.4:

**A.5.5** Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Type of engagement

**A.5.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described.

**Please comment on the strength of the evidence** (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).

**Output 6**

**A.6.1** Output 6 Write in full in the box below

**A.6.2** Output 6 score (C – A++)

**A.6.3** Justify the score: The score is based on an aggregate of actual achievement against output indicator milestones in the logframe. Please explain how you determined this score.

**A.6.4** For each of the indicators: Write in full each indicator as included in most recently approved logframe and provide a narrative clarification of progress achieved against the relevant indicator milestone, including an explanation of any over or under achievement (add extra rows if required).

Indicator 6.1:

Indicator 6.2:

Indicator 6.3:

Indicator 6.4:

**A.6.5** Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output; describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged; NB. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	Brief description	Type of engagement

**A.6.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described.  
**Please comment on the strength of the evidence** (consider for example: how well samples represent the reference population; the extent to which the measure reflects the specific contribution of this project; triangulation of data; absence of bias; and the balance between qualitative and quantitative data).

## ANNEX B: CONSOLIDATED BENEFICIARY TABLE:

To be completed by all projects (Aim for no more than 2 pages)

You will need to use the beneficiary figures for the outcome level in Annex A to arrive at a consolidated total number of people benefitting at outcome level.

If the same beneficiaries are represented in more than one of the outcome indicators, **ensure you do not double count them** when calculating the consolidated total.

B.1	Consolidated Beneficiary Table	Gender and Age Disaggregation				
		OVERALL TOTAL	Adult Male (18 years +)	Adult Female (18 years +)	Child Male (under 18 years)	Child Female (under 18 years)
	Consolidated total number of project beneficiaries achieved <b>since project began</b>	7963	4078	3885	0	0
	Consolidated total number of project beneficiaries achieved in <b>this reporting year</b>	7963	4078	3885	0	0

**Provide a clear description of your outcome level beneficiaries in the box below** (e.g., people living with HIV/AIDS; disabled children; soapstone workers; child labourers).

The number in the above table denotes the number of beneficiaries who have benefited from the project since project began. All these beneficiaries have also been supported during this reporting period through different trainings, workshops and ongoing mentoring support.

Of these, the number of women is 3885; the number of men is 4078; and the number of beneficiaries who are from the Garo Community: 1790.

**How many of the project beneficiaries were unintended and how did they become beneficiaries?** *This response should be coherent with the response to question 2.7 above regarding 'Unintended Outcomes'*

Our target was 6000 small-scale farmers but we have reach 7963 due to local community demand.

**Indicate or estimate the percentage or number of disabled beneficiaries reached in the box below.**

Despite making conscious efforts we have not been able to draw people with disabilities to work in agricultural programmes. There is a taboo attached and it is difficult to challenge community sentiments. It is seen as an insult to family honour if people with special needs are made to work. However, we will keep pursuing this.

**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.*

The location of key project activities affects the participation of women. Locating these at the village level, rather than in town, enables better participation. For instance, in the previous SLIPP project, Agro-Fairs were held in the towns where key stakeholders are based, for example, PSPs and BSPs. In APONE these Agro-Fairs have been organised around clusters of 10 villages at a time and take place at this village level. The project staffs have observed much more active participation of women farmers in their fairs as a result. They also conducted proactive bargaining with the traders (mostly men) to get

optimum price of their products. The project team has been particularly conscious in taking it at their pace. Hence we are working with a mix of men and women in the field team. Also, we have formed 126 mixed groups irrespective of gender and ethnicity to reduce inequalities.

## ANNEX C: PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS

To be completed for all projects (Aim for no more than 3 pages)

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.**

<b>C.1</b>	Which of the <b>Millenium Development Goals (MDGs)</b> is your project contributing to directly? <i>You may choose up to 3</i>	<b>Please indicate:</b> 1 = <i>Primary MDG</i> 2 = <i>Secondary MDG</i> 3 = <i>Tertiary MDG</i>	<b>Please indicate: the relative level of contribution to the selected MDGs as a percentage (sum of entries should = 100%)</b>
	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		%

<b>C.2</b>	What is the <b>main methodological approach</b> being used by the project to bring about the changes envisaged? Please <b>select up to three factors</b> and <b>prioritise</b> them as 1, 2 and 3 (with 1 being of highest significance).	
<b>a. Rights awareness</b> e.g. making 'rights holders' more aware of their rights so that they can claim rights from 'duty bearers'		<b>3</b>
<b>b. Advocacy</b> e.g. advocating publicly for changes in policy and/or practice on specific targeted issues		
<b>c. Modelling</b> e.g. demonstrating best practice / approaches / behaviours which can be adopted or relicated by others to bring wider improvements in policy or practice		<b>2</b>
<b>d. Policy engagement</b> e.g. building relationships with decision-makers behind the scenes, pragmatic collaboration on policy development to achieve incremental improvements		
<b>e. Service provision in collaboration with government</b> e.g. working with government to enhance the services already provided		<b>1</b>
<b>f. Service provision in parallel to government</b> e.g. providing an alternative service		
<b>g. Monitoring of government policy</b> e.g. monitoring budget-making or enforcement of rights		
<b>If you are using other methodological approaches please note in the box below.</b>		
Not applicable		

<b>C.3</b>	Whose <b>capacity</b> (in the main) is being built through the project? Select (by mark with an "X" in the appropriate boxes) a maximum of 3.				
a.	End-beneficiaries (poor and vulnerable groups)				<b>X</b>
b.	Local leaders / change agents				
c.	Local community-based organisations				<b>X</b>
d.	Civil society organisations / networks				
e.	Local government				<b>X</b>
f.	National government				
g.	Local implementing partner(s)				
h.	Trade unions				
i.	Private sector organisations				
j.	Other (Please name below)				
<b>C.4</b>	<b>Environmental Impact and Climate Change Mitigation</b>				
a.	How would you describe the project's environmental impact? (Mark with an "X" as appropriate)				
	<b>Negative</b>		<b>Neutral</b>		<b>Positive</b>
					<b>X</b>
	Provide a brief justification for your choice of ranking: Farmers have been supported to adapt climate adaptive and environment friendly cultivation practices so they are more resilient to shocks and stresses, especially natural disasters and climate fluctuations. These include: soil testing & use of compost fertilisers to save soil ecology, Alternative Wet and Dry irrigation method and eco-friendly cropping pattern to save water, Integrated Pest Management method to reduce air and water pollution. Farmers also supported to access safety/mitigation measures, such as group savings schemes, to be used as a productive joint investment and social safety net in times of crisis. All of these actions are having positive impact on the environment.				
b.	Describe actions the project took to reduce negative environmental impact (use bullet points)				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has facilitated soil testing services among farmers by involving SRDI and DAE to reduce use of chemical fertiliser doses and improve soil fertility. 3240 farmers tested their soil and reduced 30-35% chemical fertilizer doses.</li> <li>Demonstration on compost fertiliser established to improve soil fertility and water holding capacity of the soil which reduces irrigation requirements i.e. less stress on ground water. Alternative Wet and Dry Method of Irrigation also promoted to reduce water consumption.</li> <li>The project also promoted eco-friendly cropping pattern along with crop diversification to reduce water requirement in crop cultivation process.</li> <li>Training and advice is also being provided to improve the mix of crops and means of livelihood to support adaptation to climate change situation.</li> </ul>				
c.	Describe any activities taken by the project to build climate change resilience (use bullet points)				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has conducted meeting and training workshop with government research organizations and extension departments to identify climate adaptive technologies/practices</li> <li>The project facilitated different technical training on identified technologies such as AWD irrigation method, IPM technique, compost production process, etc.</li> <li>The project has facilitated field demonstration and organised field days for farmers on climate resilience agricultural practices as given above.</li> <li>We have also facilitated linkages between farmer groups and government extension bodies to get climate resilience technology based on research and innovation by government research organisations</li> </ul>				