

# **Global Poverty Action Fund PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT 2015**

## **Please read the following instructions carefully**

This Project Completion Report template includes DFID reporting requirements for 2015. It is designed to provide a **report on your project as a whole** which:

- ✓ enables you to communicate to DFID what GPAF funding has achieved through your project
- ✓ establishes a record of project achievement against its outcome and outputs
- ✓ draws out conclusions and lessons learnt of value and wider application
- ✓ contributes to learning on emerging results
- ✓ informs a wider analysis of all GPAF projects
- ✓ checks compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant.

The template is aligned to the 2015 Annual Report template where changes were made in response to the Fund Manager's experience from previous rounds, input from the GPAF Evaluation Manager and DFID requirements and considerations. The templates also reflect feedback from grant holders attending the Results and Learning seminars in January 2015. Revisions have been made to strengthen the documents, whilst maintaining a high degree of continuity with last year's reports.

The key changes are:

- strengthened guidance and clearer wording of some questions, for example on logframes, risk and value for money
- a new sections on methodological tools, to support GPAF evaluation
- a revised and more open section on learning
- some different questions on project accountability to stakeholders
- a few new questions, for example on assumptions, collection of beneficiary data and meeting the requirements of your grant arrangement
- removal of a few questions, for example on beneficiaries

### **What is required?**

- Refer back to your 2014 Annual Report feedback letter which might well contain pointers for completing the PCR.
- Use the 2015 Project Completion Report template (this document) without altering its structure
- Cover the whole period of your project
- Keep within page length limits
- Ensure that you draw on and refer to the findings of your external evaluation
- Submit the report and all accompanying documentation including separate annexes as WORD /Excel documents, not as PDF files
- Send all required documents by e-mail to [gpaaf@tripleline.com](mailto:gpaaf@tripleline.com). Hard copies are not required
- Entitle your email "GPAF [reference number] PCR and closure documents"

The PCR report is due **three months** after your project end date (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Fund Manager).

## What to send – use as checklist:

### 1. Narrative Report (this document)

Check box	Section and Title		Page limit	Notes
	1	Basic Information	2	Basic project data
	2	Summary, Progress & Achievements	6	A narrative summary of project progress and achievements including section 2.2 which, unlike the rest of the report, specifically covers the final period of the project
	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	Project mechanisms to gather beneficiary feedback and the challenges of responding
	6	Learning	2	Lessons from project implementation for learning and dissemination
	7	Requirements of Grant Arrangement	1	New section to ensure that the requirements of the Grant Arrangement have been met
	8	Comments on Independent Final Evaluation	2	Grant Holder comments on the findings and recommendations of the project Independent Final Evaluation
	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. Includes table to record methodological tools used.
	Annex B	Consolidated beneficiary table	2	An overall 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)

Check box	Document	Notes
	Reporting Logframe	<p>Most recently approved Logframe and Activity Log in Excel format, <b>with ‘Achieved’ boxes completed</b> for each indicator, and each relevant milestone.</p> <p>Please label this document: <b>“GPAF (ref. no.) PCR Logframe (+ date prepared)”</b>.</p>

Check box	Document	Notes
x	Final (External) Evaluation Report	Please name the document "GPAF [ref. no] final evaluation report". For guidance please refer to "Independent Final Evaluations – overview for GPAF grantees" and FAQs recently circulated
x	Photograph(s)	New photograph(s) which illustrates or tells a story of your project.  Attach as a separate file(s) (i.e. do not embed into another document), preferably as a JPEG file.
	Supporting statement for photograph(s)	In separate document please provide: * captions or explanations of the photo(s); * the photographer's name, if possible; * assurance that subjects have given their consent, both for the photograph to be taken and for its possible use in learning/publicity materials.

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

Check box	Document	Notes
x	Final Annual financial report	Worksheet 2 of excel template showing expenditure in FY 2014/15
x	Financial summary	Worksheet 4 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 detailed 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.

**4. Closure documents**

Check box	Document	Notes
x	Final claim or statement of expenditure	The appropriate template will be sent separately (as dependent on nature of claims)
x	Inventory of disposal of assets	Please use template provided with PCR document pack
x	Asset transfer letter	Please use template provided with PCR document pack
<b>End July 2015</b>	Annual Audited Accounts (if available – see note)	A hard copy of your Annual Audited Accounts for the financial year in which your project ended must be posted to the Fund Manager four months after the end of your financial year, unless an alternative deadline has been agreed in writing by the Fund Manager.

## **Information and References**

### **Purpose of the GPAF**

The Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) is a demand-led fund supporting projects which are focused on:

- poverty reduction and
- pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

through tangible changes to poor people's lives including through:

- service delivery
- empowerment and accountability
- work on conflict, security and justice

**Further Guidance documents** that may help with the completion of this Project Completion Report:

### **Gender and Diversity:**

- Gender guidelines prepared specifically for the GPAF: [Gender and the Global Poverty Action Fund](#)  
(Please note that these guidelines are due to be updated, after which the hyperlink above will not work. The new guidelines, once uploaded, will be under 'project documents' accessible through this [link](#).)
- [DFID Disability Framework 2014](#)

### **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 reporting requirements, please contact the Fund Manager at [gpaf@tripleline.com](mailto:gpaf@tripleline.com) or on 0208 788 4680.

Common questions with answers and further guidance are being circulated as Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) alongside this report, drawing on the issues raised by grant holders at the Results and Learning seminars held at the end of January 2015.

## GPAF PROJECT COMPLETION 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> (01/04/2012) <b>To:</b> (31/03/2015)
<b>1.10</b>	<b>Total project budget</b>	£ 949,988
<b>1.11</b>	<b>Total funding from DFID</b>	£ 712,492
<b>1.12</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 £237,496 List all contributions £ 80,532 – Big Lottery Fund £ 45,000 - Benfield Motors Charitable Trust £ 18,000 - Evan Cornish Foundation £ 30,000 – Isle of Man Government £ 6,000 – Persula Trust £ 6,575 – Medium Size Trusts £ 17,868 – Small Trusts & Individual Supporters £ 33,640 – Traidcraft Exchange
<b>1.13</b>	<b>Date report produced</b>	30/06/2015
<b>1.14</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>1.15</b>	<b>Name, position &amp; email address for the main contact person for correspondence relating to this project</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>Email 2:</b>
<b>1.16</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>
--	-----------------

**1.17 Acronyms**

Please try not to use too many acronyms, and explain all that you do use e.g. *CHW – Community Health Worker*.

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
APONE	Alleviating Poverty in North-East Bangladesh
BINA	Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAE	Department of Agricultural Extension
DEW	Development Wheel
DLS	Department of Livestock
GSIS	Group Savings and Investment Scheme
ICM	Integrated Crop Management
IFDC	International Fertilizer Development Corporation
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOF	Ministry of Fisheries
MOL	Ministry of Livestock
PMT	Project Management Team
SRDI	Soil Resource Development Institute
TX	Traidcraft Exchange

## SECTION 2: SUMMARY, PROGRESS AND RESULTS (Up to 6 pages)

**2.1 PROJECT SUMMARY** (max 12 lines)  
**a.** In your own words please describe your project, its context, who has benefitted from it and how and what overall change has been achieved.

This project ensured sustainable livelihoods for 8,130 poor and marginal farmers, particularly 4,182 women and 1681 from ethnic minorities, in Northern Bangladesh through collective operations and improvements to agriculture. Although agriculture is the main source of income, small-scale farmers faced a multitude of problems in their production system - low productivity and sales and high production costs. They faced discrimination in accessing government services & resources and there was a frequent threat of crop-failure, accentuated by climate change, leading to distress sales. By organising farmers, building capacity and linking them to information, skills, services and markets, the project reduced costs of production, increased productivity & sales, improved access to services & resources and diversified production & income sources. This led to increased income and improved wellbeing, directly benefitting 8,130 households (40,650 people); around 16,260 neighbouring households (81,300 people) indirectly benefited as spill over impact. External final evaluator reveals that “the project achieved a five-fold return on project budget i.e. for every £1 invested in the project, the return was £5.13”.

**b.** Please provide a couple of direct quotations from beneficiaries that illustrate how the project intervention has improved their lives.

***Bilkis, a female farmer in Haluaghat, Mymensingh:*** “I joined the APONE group, learned many things and increased my income through improved agricultural practices. I can now afford to provide a more nourishing diet for my family which includes fish, meat, egg, vegetables, etc, and also can take care of their education. Now I can manage everything.”

***Ahola, an ethnic female farmer in Jhenaigati, Sherpur:*** “After having witnessed my achievements, my group members and neighbouring producers now follow my cultivation practice and seek my advice for production techniques. APONE changed me greatly, I became involved in other activities outside the house and I have been working as a vaccinator amongst neighbouring famers and earning a significant amount. Now I have my own electricity line and have renovated my sanitary system.”

***Motaleb, a male farmer in Haluaghat, Mymensingh:*** “If I did not join the project, my future would have been very bad. If I stayed as before, I could not have given food to my children or could have done nothing properly. My family would have been in problem.”

***Runigaon farmer group in Nokla, Sherpur:*** “We reached out to village elders to contact the Sub-district Chairman. Once the Chairman heard there were 30 families and a whole village behind us, he arranged an appointment to meet us. At that meeting each of us spoke about our hardships for remote location. Once he understood how dire the situation is, he immediately sanctioned government resources to build a small raised road connecting the village to the main road”

***Sajeda, a female farmer in Phulpur, Mymensingh:*** “When I took a loan from the group savings fund to increase vegetable cultivation at our home, my husband was 100% supportive of my project activities. In fact, this morning I started cooking early in order to be able to go for the group meeting, he pushed me away from the stove saying that he would do the day’s cooking; but I should not be late for the meeting”

***Taposh Kumar Pal, an inputs seller in Sherpur:*** “I have about 100-125 new customers from APONE group members. I often sacrifice the profit margin for them, because their good performance might encourage their neighbours to come to my shop which will increase my customer base”.

***Dr. Rezanul, Livestock Officer in Jhenaigati, Sherpur:*** “Development organisation funded training programmes are dime-a-dozen. Most important is how it is designed, its flexibility, relevance to farmers’ needs and interests and capacity of trainers. This is where APONE’s strategy has excelled over other projects that I have been involved in.” They (APONE staff) identified areas and beneficiaries in such remote locations where my own field staff have never been to.”

**2.2 PROGRESS SINCE THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE LAST ANNUAL REPORT**

**a.** What are the dates of this final reporting period?

April 2014 to March 2015

**b.** Please outline progress during this final period and any significant challenges (max 10 lines)

The project has focused on activities in year 3 based on the recommendations from the Mid Term Review and phase-out action plan. These included: (i) capacity building for farmer associations so that they operate effectively after the life of the project, (ii) mentoring for CSOs to enhance the sustainability of groups and associations, (iii) refresher training for farmer groups on technical issues, (iv) mentoring of groups on their savings and investment schemes, (v) market access, and (vi) policy advocacy, with an agriculture policy paper being submitted to MOA, MOL and MOF. Based on Triple Line's suggestion, qualitative information such as anecdotes, case studies, and video clips have been documented in order to track changes occurring in their lives. Bangladesh has experienced political instability in the last year leading to national strikes. This has created stress though not directly affecting project delivery due to the project teams being located within the project area, supported by a contingency plan.

	<b>c. Have there been any significant changes in relation to the following?</b>	<i>Mark Y or N</i>
	i. Project design	<b>N</b>
	ii. Partner(s)	<b>N</b>
	iii. Context	<b>Y</b>
	iv. Availability of match-funding (where relevant)	<b>N</b>
	<b>d. Provide a brief explanation of what changed and why:</b>	

There were no significant changes in relation to project design, partners and availability of match funding. However, political instability led to regular strikes and uncertainties. With the team based in the project area the project did not get disrupted; we assessed the risks and operated with a contingency plan.

**2.3 RELEVANCE TO CONTEXT**  
Please explain what you did to ensure that the project interventions continued to respond to the priorities and needs of the target population and any change in context. To what extent did your GPAF project remain relevant in the context where you are working?

Traidcraft Bangladesh has extensive operational experience in the project area through its previous SLIPP project. Therefore, APONE started from an advanced point in northern Bangladesh – building on established successes to scale up TX's work there – and have gained a large amount of experience and knowledge in the process, including working with our project partner DEW, local CSOs, and various public and private stakeholders. Based on previous experience therefore, TX was aware of the problems of the small and marginal farmers and viable solutions in line with the local dynamic context. In order to achieve the aim of the project several interventions facilitated simultaneously: (i) the project organised 8130 small-scale farmers (3948 men, 4182 women including 1681 ethnic) into 262 self help groups, 6 sub-district associations, 3 district associations and 1 regional association, (ii) through meetings, visits, workshops, the project facilitated linkages between farmers and 304 public and private service providers, (iii) farmers supported to adopt climate smart and environment friendly cultivation practices so they are more resilient to shocks and stresses, and (iv) farmers 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. External final evaluator reveals that "from the alignment with MDG goals to identifying the correct beneficiaries, their problems and feasible solutions, every aspect of the project was analysed, customised to local context and designed for maximum efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of impact. The project's design also ensured additional benefits of improving social harmony among the ethnic minorities (Garo) and the Bengali community."

**2.4 EQUITY (GENDER & DIVERSITY)**  
Did the project contribute to equity – i.e. equitable poverty reduction and the empowerment of men, women, girl and boys and relevant marginalised groups to participate in decisions that affect them at the local and national level and start to equalise their life chances? (*Mark with an "X" in the appropriate box*)

<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>To some extent:</b>	
------------	----------	-----------	--	------------------------	--

**a.** Please explain your response in the space below, including reference to the gender and other power relations encountered by the project, and any socio-economic analysis undertaken:

4182 women and 1681 from ethnic minorities were organised and empowered under the project. Women generally do not maintain a social circle outside the family, let alone have professional interactions and are more disadvantaged and vulnerable due to the patriarchal society, and their dependency on income from men. 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. Their technical, institutional and leadership capacity has been built enabling them to increase their income, social capital and make their voices heard with decision makers at local and national level. As per the external evaluation, “for ethnic groups, the impact is even stronger but less tangible. Participating in APONE has enabled Garo members to engage in their communities, within and beyond their groups”

**b.** What has the project done to ensure that it was designed, implemented and monitored in such a way that gender needs and issues were addressed or mainstreamed, and that it delivered and tracked improvements in the lives of women and girls? What analytical tools did you use, if any, to do this? *(Please refer to the guidance referenced on page 4)*

Particular strategies were adopted to address women’ needs and issues. These include: (i) women project staff were recruited at the field level to enhance communication and build support with the women and girls, (ii) formed 145 mixed groups comprising men, women, Garos and Bengalis to help develop an inclusive society, (iii) project activities were organised to facilitate active involvement of women and girls, (iv) training events were organised on the rights of women, ethnic minorities, the elderly, the young, the disabled, the extremely poor and those affected by HIV/AIDS. As a result of the work, 878 women hold leadership positions in groups and 32 women have been elected to leadership positions to the farmers associations at local and regional level External evaluation reveals that “the women have been empowered to call upon the government officers directly for advice and some even go to input-retailers to buy inputs for agricultural activities they have undertaken with the encouragement of the project. Women are now able to express their opinions and exert greater influence in their homes and communities. This has made communities less conservative and more progressive. Through APONE we have seen women moving from mere presence in groups, to proactive participation and decision-making and, in some cases, to leadership both within groups and in the wider community. We have had similar experience with ethnic minority groups. Internally, Traidcraft has nominated gender champions who promote gender learning and experience within the organisation. This includes ensuring that project design specifically takes into consideration the needs of women and minority groups but also supporting women project staff to build their competence through mentoring support. We do not have specific tools. Here are some results.

Women leadership in mixed groups

Number of mixed groups	Total Leadership positions	Number of women leaders	Positions for President	No of women as Presidents	Positions for Secretary	No of women as Secretary
145	1595	878	145	47	145	74

Women leadership in associations

Total association leadership positions	No of women association leaders	Number of women vice-president	Number of women joint-secretary	Number of women organizing secretary	Number of women executive members
150	32	08	07	01	16

**c.** What steps did the grant holder and implementing partner(s) take to support the principles of equity, diversity and inclusion through:  
i) organisational policies and practice, including the staffing profile of the project?  
ii) promoting inclusion skills and competencies within the organisation?  
Please respond particularly with reference to gender and disability.

As a leading pioneer of Fairtrade, gender equality and inclusive development is an implicit and core element of Traidcraft's values and mission. Traidcraft has internal policies to support this through the Equality & Diversity at work Policy, the Gender Policy, and the Dignity and Respect at work Policy. Traidcraft's principle on women's empowerment in APONE was that "women in extremely poor, traditional, isolated and rural communities of Bangladesh achieve greater equality with men so that their agency is increased and they are empowered to have more of a say on the decisions that affect them, their families and their communities". This includes ensuring that households from ethnic communities are integrated in the development process through formation of mixed groups wherever possible, organising joint activities and consciously promoting inclusiveness. Here is some data of working with ethnic groups:

Number of farmer groups	Total number of group leaders	Number of Ethnic group leaders	Total positions of President	Presidents from Ethnic community	Total positions of Secretary	Secretary from Ethnic Community
262	2882	442	262	39	262	48

Our partner DEW and local CSOs work with marginalized communities and have particular experience in grassroots mobilization and gender-based projects that focus on women's rights and empowerment.

## 2.5 KEY RESULTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS FROM THE OUTSET OF THE PROJECT

Please provide a heading and summary of the three most significant project results or achievements over the whole project period (up to 10 lines each). This section provides you with an opportunity to tell the story of the project's success and what you are most proud of. Please be as specific as possible in describing the target groups; how many citizens benefited (men/women; girls/boys); and how they have benefitted. Make it clear where the results and achievements were made in coalition or partnership with other, non-project actors. Where possible please with particular reference to the objectives of the GPAF.

### 1. Achievement of MDG Goals:

**a. MDG 1- Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.** By the end of the project, 8130 farmers (3948 men, 4182 women including 1681 ethnic) achieved significant increases in income. The increase in average annual household income is GB £1,063, which is 40% higher than the project originally targeted. 74% (6016 farmers) have reached or exceeded the 50% increase in income level. These improvements can ensure not just improved quality of life for families, but their very survival in times of adversity. It is due to improved production practices, diversification of crops and farming activities, higher productivity & sales combined with lower input costs, and additional income through GSIS scheme. The project linked farmers with different levels of service provision so they accessed appropriate and affordable technical and business services. 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."

**b. MDG 3- Promote gender equality and empower women:** APONE empowered 4182 women beneficiaries both economically and socially by providing them with access to financial and technical resources, promoting their leadership and representation in institutions and building their capacity to diversify their income sources. 51% of project participants were women, exceeding the 40% originally intended. Considering all 262 groups (men only, women only and mixed), there are 2,882 leadership positions out of which 1,494 are women (52%). If we consider only mixed group then percentage is 55%. 32 women are also in leadership positions in farmers associations at local and regional level. Final evaluation reveals “women beneficiaries gained greater decision making power and voice in their households and community level”. Final wellbeing survey reveals “men report improvements in their wellbeing across all wellbeing domains. Women also report improvements across all domains, and their improvements are much larger than those of men with regard to baseline score. Given the project’s focus on women’s empowerment, this is an important achievement.” *“Women groups have better group cohesion compared to male groups. Thus, in many interventions there were differences in level of impact of interventions among male and female. This can be seen in leadership qualities among women. In women-only groups, the women leaders are clearly vocal and able to communicate with anyone now. Most female group leaders explicitly mention this to be a result of APONE project which developed their communication skills and inner confidence. This is an intangible impact which may be highlighted via interventions making use of this greater voice to achieve certain goals like engaging the market or major government officials; which are normally highly unlikely for women.”* If we compare women from mixed groups and women-only groups, there were some differences noticed. Women in mixed groups did better on technical skills, performing well in both Agriculture and Livestock due to the support and mentoring they received from male members, while women in women-only groups did well in Livestock rearing rather than Agriculture. Moreover, leadership skills seemed to be better in mixed groups – probably because they were competing with men and needed to prove themselves or be ignored. The third area of difference was on Mobility as women in mixed groups were more confident to travel in the district and region due to the presence of male members increasing their sense of confidence of being safe.

**c. MDG 7- Ensure environmental sustainability:** APONE facilitated activities to promote environmentally sustainable agricultural practices and to help smallholders to use climate-adaptive farming techniques. For instance, the project trained service providers to promote (i) 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, (ii) soil management practices through soil testing and compost fertilizer, and (iii) eco-friendly cropping pattern to save water and energy. This aspect of the project has been ‘hugely successful’, as 93% (7561 farmers) have adopted at least one environmentally sustainable practice. Rush Debi from Jhenaigati in Sherpur said that “I have been using compost fertilizer since last two years which reduced chemical fertilizer doses by around 30% and improved soil health. As demonstration effect, neighbouring farmers want to follow my cultivation technique which increased my confidence and social capital.”

**2. Value for Money:** For every pound received from UKaid, we have achieved a return on investment of £5.13. This has been achieved through increased income, increased access to government resources, increased skills, sustainable people’s institutions and access to finance.

**3. Alternate Financing System:** With the resources received from UKaid, we matched the savings of the groups and created a Fund as a sustainable way to support self-reliance, reduce vulnerability, and have resources for financing productive investments, as well as manage household emergencies. Therefore the shock-absorbing capacity of marginal households has been increased.

**a.** Please list key factors that contributed positively to your overall achievements

<p>Key factors that contributed positively to our overall achievements are: (i) programmatic approach – utilizing learning and platform gained from previous project, (ii) Adaptive project management system to constantly readjust interventions in response to changing circumstances, (iii) consistent understanding between Project Management Team (PMT) and project, (iv) customised feedback systems as part of our unique M &amp; E system (v) continuing staff capacity development activities coupled with their commitment, (iv) efficient use of given resources, and (iv) cooperation from beneficiary groups and other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Final evaluators also stated that “the strongest sign of effectiveness was found in the networking with public institutions. Beneficiaries and government officials stated mutual benefit from the repeated engagements during trainings. Relationship with public and private service providers was strengthened and many of the beneficiaries believed that without the help of APONE they would not have been able to access the service providers. At the same time, GSIS was one of the major motivational factors for the most members of the group. Having had the earlier experience of being in micro credit groups that were dysfunctional, the group members in APONE found the multiple functions of their group (savings, matching grants, income activities, and training) strong enough factors that helped promote their livelihoods and expand their economic activities.”</p>
<p><b>b. List key challenges or factors which impacted negatively on progress and how they were addressed</b></p>
<p>The project only really encountered one, major difficulty – the ongoing political instability across Bangladesh. This has created stress though not directly affected project delivery due to the project teams being located within the project area, supported by a contingency plan. Travel to the project area had to be deferred on several occasions, teams travelled and worked through weekends to completed planned activities, which also created physical and mental strain on personal health the family relationships. However, the satisfaction came from the project remaining on track. This was therefore due, in large part, to the determination of the project staff, who were commended by the external evaluator for their resourcefulness and their ‘highly practical’ adaptation of activities.</p>
<p><b>2.6 UNINTENDED (POSITIVE) OUTCOMES</b> Were any unintended outcomes that have been observed as a result of your project implementation during the project period? Please list and explain below.</p>
<p>Although there are a number of NGOs working in project areas their work is not focused on supporting small-scale agriculture. TX, DEW and CSOs have been consulted by these organisations on a regular basis. All organisations stressed the need for activities to help improve returns from agricultural operations and to diversify income sources. The organisations shared a commitment to support and collaborate where possible. Accordingly, we collaborated with these organisations. For instance, the International Fertilizer Development Corporation (IFDC) provided training in collaboration with DAE to 1224 farmers on fertilizer management. BINA has provided 250 kg rice seed and 44 kg mustard seed to establish 62 demonstrations on eco-friendly cropping pattern and crop diversification. World Vision has conducted a collaborative event with our project and provided veterinary medicine support to 483 cattle farmers worth GBP1670, distributed 55 pigs and 5 cattle amongst 60 farmers worth GBP 2784 as an alternative livelihood option, and installed two deep-set hand tube-wells worth GBP487 to solve the drinking water problem. Spill over effect has also been significant. It is estimated that about 16,260 neighbouring households (81,300 people) indirectly benefited from project activities by attending demonstration days, seeking advice from groups and associations and observation of other project activities.</p>
<p><b>2.7 UNINTENDED (NEGATIVE) CONSEQUENCES</b> Did project implementation lead to any unintended negative effects during the project period? Please list and explain below.</p>
<p>There has been a sense of frustration among neighbouring communities who could not join the project. The project increased its direct outreach by 36% to cope with the severe pressure for inclusion but could not go beyond. However, project tried to benefit them through organising open field days. Project also capacitated the Association to carry forward the project work and expand their outreach as much possible within their capacity. As Traidcraft has taken a programmatic approach in the areas of “<b>sustainable small scale agriculture</b>”, it hopes to scale up its work in the future.</p>

<b>2.8</b>	<b>PROJECT LOGFRAME</b>		
	a. On the basis of your project implementation experience, do you consider there to be any key aspects of your project which have not been sufficiently captured in your project logframe (such as hard-to-measure qualitative results)? (mark box):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If yes, please use the space below to explain.			

--	--	--	--

<b>b.</b>	Did any of the assumptions underpinning your logframe or wider 'theory of change' come under challenge? Please explain what happened and, broadly, the impact.
-----------	--

Not applicable.	
-----------------	--

<b>2.9</b>	<b>RISK MANAGEMENT &amp; MITIGATION</b>
With reference to the project's risk management matrix, please use the table below to describe the main risks you faced during the project period and how you dealt with them.	

Which risks materialized in the project period? Describe briefly.	Was the risk anticipated? Yes / No / To some extent	What action did you take to address the risk? Briefly explain.	Was this action sufficient? Yes / No / To some extent
1. Political unrest in Bangladesh	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.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

**SECTION 3: VALUE FOR MONEY** (Up to 2 pages)

See introductory section on page 4 for guidance and resources on Value for Money

<b>3.1</b>	<b>Economy: Buying inputs of the appropriate quality at the right price.</b> What policies and practices have been followed by the project to ensure that funds were used to purchase inputs economically? What did the project do to drive down costs whilst maintaining the necessary standards of quality? Include references to the use of any relevant unit cost benchmarks. (DFID considers inputs to include staff, consultants, raw materials and capital to produce outputs.)
------------	--

Please explain and provide examples: The PMT has practiced the following policies to achieve economy and ensure optimum VFM. A sub-committee (Procurement Committee) has been in place.

- Staff based at sub-district level rather than at district headquarters. This not only helped increase wellbeing of staff, but also supported better coordination and contributed to reduce travel costs.
- Kept staff morale up to reduce staff turnover through regular refresher training and mentoring to build their professional competence. This reduced the cost of re-hiring staff, particularly in the field.
- Staff policies ensured good work-life balance for teams to prevent burn out
- PMT meetings have been held regularly but we have restricted expenditure to light refreshments.
- All goods and services were procured through a tendering process which included inviting at least 3 quotes where possible and setting up a procurement committee to decide value for money.
- Through increased outreach (reached 8130 against 6000 target scale) we have reduced the cost per farmer. £949,988 spent on the project covering 8130 farmer households (about 40,650 people). Hence the cost per farmer is approximately £116.85. These numbers continue to grow.
- In addition, farmers raised £382,315 through own savings, £47.80 per farmer. This excludes savings through reduced cost of production and better prices - a significant safety net for times of crisis.
- External evaluation reveals “the project achieved a five-fold return on project budget i.e. for every £1 invested in the project, the return was £5.13”.

**3.2** **Efficiency: Converting inputs to outputs through project activities.** What steps have you taken during the project to ensure resources (inputs) were used efficiently to maximise the results achieved, such as numbers reached or depth of engagement? 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.

Please explain and provide examples: We worked closely with government departments and existing market players and linked farmers with 642 private and 52 public service providers as a result they have accessed a wide range of services. As a result, 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. According to final evaluation findings, 76% (6178) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 80% (6504) farmers have reduced 15% production costs and 88% (7154) farmers have increased 30% sales. The good ROI of the project has been attributed to a combination of factors, including a highly competent staff in a cohesive team, the multiplier effect of our trainer-of-trainers methodology, the formation of groups for the collective initiatives and the extensive experience and networks of the TX and partners. The project has accelerated its efficiency through collaboration with other NGOs and research organisations. For instance, International Fertilizer Development Corporation (IFDC) provided training in collaboration with DAE to 1224 farmers on fertilizer management. BINA has provided 250 kg rice seed and 44 kg mustard seed to establish 62 demonstrations on eco-friendly cropping pattern and crop diversification. World Vision has conducted a collaborative event with our project and provided veterinary medicine support to 483 cattle farmers worth GBP1670, 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.

**3.3** **Effectiveness: Project outputs achieving the desired outcome on poverty reduction.** To what extent do you consider the project to have achieved the anticipated changes for beneficiaries and target groups? How well did the outputs of the project work towards the achievement of the outcome?

Please explain: Using project partner DEW and local CSOs, the project managed to get a strong foothold in the project areas from its inception. This strategy led to pinpoint accuracy in beneficiary and group leader selection, which lay at the heart of APONE's success. 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 8130 farmers on livestock vaccination. Similarly, DAE provided training on improved rice cultivation practices to 8130 farmers and SRDI and DAE provided soil testing services to 5772 farmers. The PMT embraced an adaptive project management system. They took constant feedback from field teams and beneficiaries to bring relevant changes to project implementation in order to achieve maximum impact. Since women and Garo members made up large portion of beneficiaries, the field team was designed with female and ethnic staff (6 members of the team were women or belonging to the ethnic community) to maintain an effective engagement that drove behavioural change, along with additional focus on livestock based training programmes for women beneficiaries. Final evaluation stated that *“performance on effectiveness was highly satisfactory with most of the outputs clearly over-achieving. 74% (6016 farmers) have reached or exceeded the 50% increase in income level. Strongest effectiveness was found in the systematic strengthening of linkages with public institutions. Moreover, since the trainings were designed effectively (via training needs analysis) and given at the right time (before relevant cultivation season) most of the trainings had a high level of recall and led to changes in knowledge, attitude and practice.”*

**3.4** **Have there been or do you anticipate multiplier effects from this project?** Multiplier effects include leveraging additional funds, longer term or larger scale implementation or replication of approaches and results. Where additional project funds were secured, how were they used to enhance delivery? In the PCR, we are particularly interested in assessing the potential and likelihood of scale up or replication.

Please explain and provide examples: APONE has exceeded its outreach. For example, it aimed to directly benefit 6,000 farming households but this number ultimately rose to 8,130 households due to the demand in communities for inclusion through demonstration effect. A further 16,260 neighbouring households (81,300 people) indirectly benefitted through awareness drives, field days, agro-fairs, vaccination, group training, etc. They are following improved production practices. For instance, DLS vaccinated 150 cattle in a village for farmer groups. But in addition he vaccinated 350 cattle brought by neighbouring farmers. With support from Big Lottery Fund, we were able raise some of the match funds for this project while also expanding the impact to cover another 4000 households, including an additional district. Besides this new project will also enable us to further strengthen the district associations.

## SECTION 4: SUSTAINABILITY (Up to 1 page)

**4.1** What have you done to ensure that **project outcomes** - positive changes to peoples' lives - will be sustained beyond the lifetime of the GPAF grant?

There are many elements of the project which will successfully contribute to its long-term sustainability. **Win-win relationships**: Mutually-beneficial relationships have developed between participating farmers and service providers, who all report that this has been the single most beneficial aspect of participation, and who have committed to continue good relations. It is cost-effective and sustainable as it enables service providers to reach large numbers of farmers. Where previously input sellers/retailers had no relationship at all with project beneficiaries, they now have considerable interest in nurturing their relationships with these farmer groups because there is a strong business incentive to do so. **Access to own and affordable financial resources**: Farmers' savings funds are vital for sustainability, and the beneficiaries understand their importance for protecting them against market (for instance, distress sales) and environmental shocks. Women in particular have benefitted from the opportunity to be economically productive, which has enhanced their voice and their decision-making power in the household. The efforts to ensure that farmer groups have strong foundations have paid off, in that members now report a sense of group identity which commands recognition by government, service providers and the wider community, and so helps to ensure for them a continuing flow of benefits.

**Investing in local institutions:** TX has been worked with DEW, and 2 local level CSOs to ensure project impact continues. This partnership has been worked 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 indicate well for the group's sustainability.

**Formation and strengthening governance of farmer groups and associations:** Ensuring that groups are membership-based provides an inbuilt degree of financial and institutional independence and sustainability. Facilitated inclusive group and association formation with women and ethnic minority representation also ensured groups act in the interests of all community members and therefore gained full community support during the project period and this will continue beyond project completion. The success of group and association activities combined with efforts to encourage more farmers groups to join associations will also help ensure future sustainability of project activities.

**4.2** If the project has introduced **new or improved services** that need to continue beyond the life of the grant, what have you done to ensure the sustainability of the services?

The project has enabled beneficiaries to develop a collective voice and address common challenges through collective operations. Input sellers/retailers and government service providers report that groups are now willing and able to identify and communicate their own needs. The relationship between farmer 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 continue to meet its policy mandate and ensure that small farmers are recognised by decision makers and market players alike functioning effectively after the life of the project. With help from GPAF, the project has also introduced the Group Savings and Investment Funds to match group savings when they reached the Tk. 50,000 mark. The groups have total control over this resource and they have put in place systems to support individual and group needs after the project ends. The resources are being well used to support group and individual enterprise development as well as contingency needs of households.

**4.3** Which elements of the project rely on **continued funding**?

There has been a strong demonstration effect on neighbouring communities seeing the project's benefits and demanding inclusion. We increased the number of beneficiaries from 6000 to 8130, but were unable to increase further. Any further expansion will require additional funding as the level of capacity building of farmer groups cannot be underestimated. Again, capacity building of associations, match funds to build alternate source of finance, strengthening agro-value chains, also need funding for scale up. GSIS and Strengthening Agro-Value Chains have immense potential to form independent projects.

<b>4.4</b>	Have you <b>secured</b> future funding? (check appropriate box)	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Work in progress</b>	X
------------	--	------------	--	-----------	--	-------------------------	---

**4.5** What do you consider to be the **main risks to sustainability** beyond the end of the project? How likely are these to occur and what would be their impact?

Political unrest may continue and get worse in future (Probability: high; Impact: medium). This will increase farmer's production costs through higher inputs and transportation costs and reduce sales price due to lack of market access. As a result, farmer's income will be reduced. Though our farmers have additional livelihood options through their GSIS but long time political unrest may impinge on sustainability negatively. Hence support from the CSOs is crucial to keep up people's morale.

**SECTION 5: PROJECT ACCOUNTABILITY TO STAKEHOLDERS** (Up to 1 page).

DFID is particularly interested in project mechanisms to enable project beneficiaries to provide feedback to project managers, and project responses to it. The purpose of beneficiary feedback is to maintain accountability to the people who the project is designed to assist or empower, and to ensure the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the intervention. The questions below aim to enhance understanding of the use of beneficiary feedback mechanisms within the GPAF portfolio.

**5.1 Method:** What feedback do you seek from primary beneficiaries, how have you collected this information and when?

The project embraced an adaptive and participatory project monitoring and evaluation system. It took constant feedback from beneficiaries and field teams to bring relevant changes to project implementation in order to achieve maximum impact. Our accountability to stakeholders began with project inception workshops at district level, where all stakeholders invited project details with budget were shared. Periodically we also organized stakeholder workshops to provide updates. Cost information was also shared with beneficiaries, and encouraged them to ask project staff about the budget and cost of events. If they found it questionable, then they were advised to raise it with higher level staff during their visits. We have developed a beneficiary feedback tool under monitoring and evaluation framework and collected feedback each quarter/season through group discussion/FGDs. For instance, we asked the following questions:

- Have you been benefited from being a member of your group and association? If yes, how?
- 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?
- What are the benefits you have received from the market? What changes have you experienced since being part of the APONE project?
- Do you have any feedback/ suggestions / learning that you want to share with the project team or other groups and associations?

This information is collected about twice a year through intensive focus group discussions led by the Project Management Team. The feedback is then discussed in PMT meetings and changes suggested and communicated to groups by the field team.

**5.2 Challenge:**  
a. What challenges did your project face in **collecting** feedback from its primary beneficiaries?

According to our M&E framework, we agreed that farmers will record their production information, group activity, savings and any investments, training register, etc. Initially it was challenging for the project as farmers are not aware and knowledgeable enough to record these kind of information. Also, they were not keen to record information. A lot of motivation is required to push for ensuring accurate data.

b. What challenges did your project face in **acting upon** beneficiary feedback?

There were no challenges in acting upon beneficiary feedback. Project and partner staff were trained on participatory monitoring tools and approaches. Thereafter, meetings and training organized to motivate, improve knowledge and mobilise beneficiaries to record relevant information. Trained staff also mentored the beneficiaries to record their information and share feedback on regular basis. Regular monthly meetings with groups & associations were held by the project team to share what was done based on their feedback and information.

**5.3 Change:** If you made any significant change to project design and / or delivery as a result of beneficiary feedback, please describe it here.

There was no significant change to project design but we did try to approach challenges by finding long term solutions. For instance, one feedback was that retailers selling adulterated fertilizer which affected their productivity and production cost negatively. To address this problem, we have facilitated a meeting between the Agriculture officer and group members. Agriculture officer has shown some ways to detect adulterated fertilizers which gave farmers a 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, which they acted on successfully. 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 262 farmer groups by involving livestock officers. Livestock Officer showed ways to preserve and inject vaccine effectively.

## SECTION 6: LEARNING (Up to 2 pages)

Please identify the top 5 lessons you have learnt from this project, including from things which have not gone well and innovative approaches. Be specific and clear in describing the lesson and in explaining how you applied learning to improve project delivery or wider organisational practice.

Provide each area of learning with a descriptive title and an explanation. By way of illustration, these could include:

- **innovation** – how could models tested by the project be replicated or scaled up?
- **equity and gender** – did you learn about approaches to reducing inequalities, working to challenge power dynamics; participation in decision-making?
- **capacity building** – have you learnt how to enable civil society to address poverty or negotiate or claim their rights? What worked well?
- **monitoring and evaluation** – what have you learned about measuring results, successful tools and methods, demonstrating achievement?
- **empowerment and accountability** – what enhances these processes? how have you overcome resistance or indifference?
- **design** – did original assumptions about what would work to deliver outputs or outcomes need to be changed? How did you know? What did you do?
- **organisational constraints** – did you encounter difficulties due to organisational culture, practice or capacity which you had to address?

	<b>Learning (Provide both a title and an explanation)</b>	<b>How did this lead to changes or improvements in the way you (i.e. grant holder or partner) have worked?</b>
1.	<b>Empowerment and accountability:</b> A collective identity for marginalised groups is crucial to access rights and resources.	The project formed 262 farmer groups and 10 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. This has been seen in the work done with institutions like DAE, DLS, DOF, BINA, SRDI and local administration. Final evaluation reveals that 100% (262) farmer groups are negotiating actions with local stakeholders and estimated value of the negotiated action is GBP 150,940. For instance, 1530 farmers in Haluaghat, Mymensingh got free vaccine from department of livestock through negotiation.
2.	<b>Capacity building:</b> We learned a direct correlation between the capacity of groups and access to services and resources.	The groups which are better organised and cohesive have very strong relationships with service providers/other value chain actors. So we

		are convinced that in the case of marginalised communities, forming groups and building capacity on effective group management, technical issues and business management are most cost effective solution to attaining rights, accessing services and market. The project also built the capacity of 304 service providers to provide appropriate services and support to farmers on an ongoing basis. This enhanced their service offer to small and marginal farmers, and helps them achieve their missions. We see that building the relationship between farmer groups and service providers is crucial to sustaining impact.
3.	<b>Equality and gender:</b> Our experience has demonstrated that once women are economically empowered, the level of acceptance in families and communities increases significantly. Contribution to household income gives them more respect and attention, particularly in conservative communities.	The specific attention of this project has been to involve marginalised women in income generating activities. 4182 women trained with skills on production, leadership, and governance and this has enabled them to increase their income and make their voice heard. Our experience and learning also suggests that it is important and effective to work with mixed farmer groups to reduce inequalities amongst men, women, and ethnic groups, while supporting women and minority with inputs to strengthen their voices. We have formed 145 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.
4.	<b>Monitoring and evaluation:</b> We found that internal midterm evaluation is very effective to check progress and agree any adjustments needed to keep the project on track.	As mentioned in the project proposal, TX Monitoring and Evaluation expert conducted the midterm evaluation. It enabled the project management team to assess the progress in delivery of the project in terms of its own stated objectives and expected results and helped to take decisions on recommended changes that need to be made to the project during its remaining time.
5.	<b>Innovation:</b> Group savings and investment scheme is a source of finance for additional livelihood options to increase income and reduce vulnerability	Savings was crucial in not only creating a safety net for beneficiaries, but also to increase diversification of income sources. The savings fund provides loans to beneficiaries, reducing their dependency on micro-loans, which generally have higher interest rates and lack the flexibility in payback terms. In addition, farmers were willing to pay interest on savings fund loans because they knew it adds back to the group fund, thus meaning a larger return on their group savings if it ever gets split up among the members in the future. Farmer records reveal that farmers have raised GBP382,315 through their own savings (GBP 274,207) 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.

**Are there any other lessons (up to 3) which you have learned that you think may be particularly useful for other partners, grant holders, the fund manager or for DFID?** Please describe them and explain their wider relevance below.

- Our experience has demonstrated that once the farmers have increased income and are economically empowered, the level of social capital and wellbeing are increased significantly
- Women groups have better group cohesion compared to male groups. Thus, in many interventions there were differences in level of impact of interventions among male and female.
- Three years is not a significant time to bring about policy changes at the government level especially in times of political turmoil.

**SECTION 7: REQUIREMENTS OF GRANT ARRANGEMENT** (Up to 1 page)

**7.1 Responses to Due Diligence Recommendations**

Please use the space below to comment on any actions taken during this final period in response to any Due Diligence recommendations not implemented by the time of the last report.

Traidcraft has taken all the necessary actions based on the recommendations of the Due Diligence Assessment by KPMG. We have raised all the required match funds to cover costs to date. To date we have raised a total of **£ 203,975** and the rest is being covered by our reserves.

**7.2 Use of DFID logo**

Clause 58 of your original Grant Arrangement commits you, unless agreed otherwise, to explicitly acknowledge DFID's support through use of DFID's UK Aid logo in all communications with the public or third parties about your project. Please outline the ways in which you have done this during the reporting period.

Throughout the APONE project period we have followed the DFID's visibility guidelines strictly. An acknowledgement of DFID funding and DFID's UK Aid logo as directed in the visibility guidelines have been affixed/mentioned in all materials, such as presentations, project website, banners, signboards and brochures. The guideline was also followed in all printed materials, such as, effective group operation manual, lobbying & advocacy manual, group savings manual, savings passbook, farmers ID card, production manuals (crop, livestock and fisheries), market access guidebook, service provider's manual for effective service delivery. The same has been followed in the banner for the training workshop with groups & associations, training workshop with public and private service providers, workshop with policy makers & other civil society actors, capacity building training for project and partner staff, etc. The events and activities were documented in pictures.

**SECTION 8: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS** (Up to 2 pages)

**8.1** Please enter key conclusions / recommendations from the Independent Final Evaluation report – and the project management responses

Evaluation Conclusions/ Recommendations	Your response
---	---------------

<p>1. <b><u>Crossing the Poverty Line needs time:</u></b> Project duration would be 5 years.</p>	<p>Income more than doubled within the project duration which is a commendable achievement considering the target was to increase income by 50%. Thus, the project has clearly achieved its goal of reducing poverty. If the income increase trends continue for beneficiaries, it is highly likely they will cross the poverty line (\$ 1.25/ person/ day) permanently in 2 more years. We agree with the recommendation - at least it would be 4 years. Traidcraft is also beginning work on the concept of 'Living Income' which we believe is critical if people really get beyond just the poverty line and have sufficient income to live a decent life. All of this needs to be defined and is a challenge in itself.</p>
<p>2. <b><u>Policy interventions:</u></b> For short duration projects, it may not be advisable to indicate policy change</p>	<p>We agree with the recommendation. Policy dialogue is an ongoing process that requires substantive time due to bureaucratic complexities. Three years is not a significant time to bring about policy changes at the government level. However, there has been a positive change in the attitude of policy makers and implementers, with better responses related to existing agricultural policy implementation. Groups and associations continue to lobby and negotiate to benefit from existing policies. Independent final evaluation reveals 100% (262) farmer groups taking negotiated action with local government bodies, estimated value of the negotiated action is GBP 150,940.</p>
<p>3. <b><u>Market Access:</u></b> establish link with trader association</p>	<p>Linking downstream actors is beneficial but it depends on nature and scale of operation. We dealt with very marginal producers where in most cases it is found that selling at farm gate is economical and less risky. Again without conducive and enforceable legal frame work around contract arrangement as recommended by the evaluator is often counter-productive for marginal farmers. Through our comprehensive market access interventions we ensured that 88% farmers have increased sales by 30%. So we think the evaluator's recommendation is a general one, not our project specific.</p>
<p>4. <b><u>Sub-district association:</u></b> Every effective to connect and provide required service to grass-root level groups</p>	<p>There was no sub-district level association in the project design. The formation of Sub-district associations arose from beneficiary feedback and our experience during implementation stage. It was an example of the adaptability of project staff and management team to overcome challenging circumstances to achieve project goals. The formation and achievements of Sherpur Sub-district associations have proven this to be an effective strategy. We agree with the recommendation.</p>

5. <b>Ethnic Minority Groups:</b> Get competent staff from same ethnic minority or train respective project staff on ethnic language.	In general, ethnic minorities have a different cultural background and perspective who are relatively less vocal and have much slower pace of life. These cultural differences and language barrier meant bringing behavioural change among Garo beneficiaries were relatively harder than Bengali groups. APONE managed to find a competent field staff from Garo ethnicity to create easier working environment. We agree with the recommendation.
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
<b>8.2</b>	Please use the space below for any further comments on the Independent Final Evaluation (IFE) report, or the IFE process.
Independent final evaluator concluded that “APONE has exhibited excellence in design and implementation achieving outreach and impacts significantly beyond its targets. It has demonstrated high potential for expansion into areas with similar beneficiaries and challenges. With achievements like doubling income, provision of safety funds for all and five-fold return on project budget, APONE serves as an strong model of group mobilisation strategy to reduce extreme poverty, women empowerment and inclusion of ethnic minorities.”	

## ANNEX A: OUTCOME AND OUTPUT SCORING GUIDANCE

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 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 targets. Use the five-point scoring system below to rate your achievement of results.

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

### REPORTING PERFORMANCE

- Complete what has been 'achieved' under each outcome and output indicator in your **logframe**
- Within this section of the 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, or the barriers to 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. **Be as specific as possible, avoiding general references like 'project monitoring records'**. Examples could include 'field training reports and attendance records completed at the end of each wave of training', 'sample survey of heads of household in two villages from each of the project locations, February 2015', 'local district exam results, verified through teacher focus groups, July 2014.' Cross refer to section A7 to avoid repetition as necessary.
- Comment on the **strength of evidence** provided. 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. See [BOND Quality of Evidence Guidelines](#)
- Be sure to complete the final section (A.7) on **methodological tools**.

## **BENEFICIARY DATA**

**Annex A** also asks you to disaggregate **beneficiary data at the Outcome level**. It is this data, consolidated in Annex B, which DFID uses to assess the numbers of people **benefitting** from GPAF projects.

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 (e.g. to skills, awareness or improved capacity), for the purposes of this GPAF progress reporting, they are not defined as beneficiaries.

## ANNEX A: OUTCOME AND OUTPUT SCORING

(Up to 12 pages).

### OUTCOME

**A.0.1 Outcome:** write in full your project outcome statement 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** (A++ to C)

A+

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

Final evaluation reveals that the increase in average annual household income is GB £1,063, which is 40% higher than the project originally targeted. 74% (6016 farmers) have reached or exceeded the 50% increase in income level. These improvements can ensure not just improved quality of life for families, but their very survival in times of adversity. It is due to improved production practices, diversification of crops and farming activities, higher productivity & sales combined with lower input costs, and additional income through GSIS scheme. Also, final wellbeing survey reveals that 100% (8130 farmers) have improved wellbeing. At baseline stage the participants' overall wellbeing score was 3.21. At final evaluation it was 3.96.

**A.0.4 For each of the indicators:**

- write the outcome indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe;
- state the target and report against it; and
- provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.

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

Target: 80% (4800 of 6000 farmers; 1920 Women / 1440 Garo)

Achieved: 74% (6016 of 8130 farmers; 3068 Women/ 1263 Garo)

The under-achievement has been due to the fact that the final evaluation was completed before the harvest in the final year (Winter crop) so was not included in the figures. We would have achieved the target if this was included. Again, the total number of farmers who achieved the 50% increase was more than our initial target (6016 vs. 4800), due to the growing number of farmers joining the project.

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

Target: 80% (4800 of 6000 farmers; 1920 Women/ 1440 Garo)

Achieved: 100% (8130 of 8130 farmers; 4182 Women/ 1681 Garo)

This was assessed at baseline and end of project through a wellbeing survey. The survey found that once farmers have increased income and feel economically empowered, the level of well-being grew. 100% farmers have seen an increase in income even if they did not achieve the planned 50% increase

**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.** Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description (e.g. farmers)	Change/improvement (e.g. income increased)

2948	3068	0	0	6016	0	Farmers (men and women)	Reduced cost of production; increased productivity and increased sales
3948	4182	0	0	8130	0	Farmers (men and women)	Increased economic resources and social connections; increased agency and participation; improved health and self-worth

**A.0.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength. Please refer to the [preceding guidance on Annex A](#) on how to complete the section effectively.

As per project 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 final evaluation, an assessment has been conducted using external consultants who looked at 900 farmer records. The findings were cross-checked by the evaluators through FGDs. A wellbeing survey was also conducted at the start (as baseline) and at the end to record changes in wellbeing of men and women.

**OUTPUT 1**

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

Target farmers are working collectively and collaboratively

**A.1.2** Output 1 score (A++ to C)

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.

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

**A.1.4** For each of the indicators (add extra rows if required):  
a) write the indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe;  
b) state the target and report against it; and  
c) provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.

**Indicator 1.1:** Indicator 01: Farmer groups taking collective actions  
Target: 75% (180 of 240 farmer groups)  
Achieved: 100% (262 of 262 farmer groups)  
Due to the tangible benefits being achieved by groups they were motivated to continue working

together. All groups have taken at least three collective actions throughout the life of the project. Collective actions include: seeking group training, group savings and investment, joint bank accounts, group purchases and selling, etc.

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

Target: 50% (120 of 240 farmer groups)

Achieved: 100% (262 of 262 farmer groups)

All groups have achieved strong linkages with government and private stakeholders through different meetings, training and workshops. The groups were also trained on networking lobbying and negotiations skills. This has enabled them to negotiate achieve positive results. Negotiated resources and services include: vaccines and medicines from DLS, demonstration and training from DAE, soil testing from SRDI, agricultural equipment from DAE, etc.

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

Target: 90% (5400 of 6000 farmers; 2360 Women/ 1770 Garo)

Achieved: 100% (8130 of 8130 farmers; 4182 Women/ 1681 Garo)

Feedback from all farmers has indicated that they have benefited from group membership and collective initiatives. For instance benefits included collective & negotiated actions, established linkages with government bodies, social connections, close relationship amongst group members, etc.

**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. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description	Nature of engagement
3948	4182	0	0	8130	0	Farmers, (men and women) working together	Collective action has led to tangible results
3948	4182	0	0	8130	0	Farmers, (men and women) working together	Groups had to negotiate for resources
3948	4182	0	0	8130	0	Farmers, (men and women) as group members	Farmers achieved benefits as members of groups

**A.1.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength. Please refer to the [preceding guidance on Annex A](#) on how to complete the section effectively.

Farmers' register: Farmer groups kept records on collective actions and negotiated actions with effective mentoring support from project staff members. FGDs during final evaluation also reveal the results.

## Output 2

**A.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.

**A.2.2** Output 2 score (A++ to C)

A

**A.2.3** 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.

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 different government committees such as IPM & ICM Clubs. For instance, 8130 farmers got vaccine from department of livestock. Project trained 252 private service providers on technical issues and 52 public service providers on effective service delivery. As a result, effective service provision has been created. The project has prepared a policy advocacy plan for the farmer associations. 10 farmer associations have been formed and they have established network with relevant policy makers and implementers.

**A.2.4 For each of the indicators** (add extra rows if required):  
 a) write the indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe;  
 b) state the target and report against it; and  
 c) provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.

**Indicator 2.1:** Improvements in policies, practices or resources negotiated by the district or regional associations  
 Target: 4 improvements  
 Achievement: The project has been successful in enabling good level of policy implementation for small farmers. However, no policy changes have yet occurred. Dialogue is ongoing requiring substantial time due to bureaucratic complexities. Three years is not a sufficient time for policy change, which is a significant learning for us. However, there has been a positive change in the attitude of policy makers and implementers, with better response related to existing agricultural policy implementation. Groups and associations conducted lobbying and negotiation to get benefit from existing policies. Independent final evaluation reveals 100% (262) farmer groups taking negotiated action with local government bodies, estimated value of the negotiated action is GBP 150,940.

**Indicator 2.2:** Public & private service providers trained to provide more appropriate & affordable services to target farmers.  
 Target: 300 service providers trained  
 Achieved: 304 service providers trained  
 Achievement: We have increased the number of service providers from 300 to 304 within given resources to make an effective service provision for 8130 farmers.

**Indicator 2.3:** Percentage of farmers that perceive benefits from district/regional association membership  
 Target: 75% (4500 of 6000 farmers; 1800 Women/ 1350 Garo)  
 Achieved: 60% (4878 of 8130 farmers; 2488 Women/ 1024 Garo)  
 Achievement: In terms of percentage, 60% achievement against 75% target indicates under achievement. In year 2, we formed district and regional associations and experienced and learned that sub-district level associations are required to reach and work closely with 8130 farmers. Subsequently, we formed 6 sub-district level associations and they have been supporting farmers as per their needs. Growth trend reveals that it will exceed 80% by next year. However, in terms of number of farmers, 4878 achievement against 4800 target indicates over achievement, which is due to increased outreach.

**Indicator 2.4:**

**A.2.5 Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output. Describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.** Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description	Nature of engagement
238	66	0	0	304	0	Service Providers improved skills through training	Service Providers linked with farmers
2390	2488	0	0	4878	0	Farmers benefitting from Associations	Farmers achieved benefits as members of Association

<b>A.2.6</b>	<b>State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength.</b> Please refer to the <a href="#">preceding guidance on Annex A</a> on how to complete the section effectively.						
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. Final evaluation checked the records and validated the findings.							
<b>Output 3</b>							
<b>A.3.1</b>	<b>Output 3</b> Write in full						
Target farmers have improved their production practices (increased quality and yields, reduced costs etc.) and increased market access.							
<b>A.3.2</b>	<b>Output 3 score</b> (A++ to C)						
A++							
<b>A.3.3</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. Final evaluation reveals that in addition to achieving a range of non-tangible benefits (cohesiveness, new skills, confidence, access to government bodies, etc.), 76% (6179) farmers have increased 30% productivity and 80% (6504) farmers have reduced 15% production costs and 88% (7154) farmers have increased 30% sales.							
<b>A.3.4</b>	<b>For each of the indicators</b> (add extra rows if required): a) write the indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe; b) state the target and report against it; and c) provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.						
<b>Indicator 3.1:</b> Farmers who see a 15% decrease in production costs (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity) Target: 80% (4800 of 6000 farmers;1920 Women/ 1440 Garo) Achieved: 80% (6504 of 8130 farmers; 3317 Women/ 1366 Garo) Achievement: In terms of percentage, while it seems that we have achieved the target, it is important to note that we have covered 6504 famers against a target of 4800 due to the increased outreach. Farmers have reduced their unit production costs through improved cultivation techniques, soil & water management, vaccination, quality inputs, etc.							
<b>Indicator 3.2:</b> Farmers who see a 30% increase in productivity (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity) Target: 80% (4800 of 6000 farmers;1920 Women/ 1440 Garo) Achieved: 76% (6179 of 8130 farmers; 3151 Women/ 1297Garo) Achievement: While the indication is of under achievement we need to note that the final harvest during the life of the project (of Boro rice) has not been taken into consideration as the harvest was completed after the final evaluation was conducted so was not included in the productivity calculation. Our forecast however indicates that we would have over achieved. Again in terms of numbers, we had 6179 farmers against a target of 4800, so we have in fact overachieved on this indicator too. Farmers have increased productivity through improved and climate adaptive cultivation practices.							
<b>Indicator 3.3:</b> Farmers who see a 30% increase in sales (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity) Target : 75% (4500 of 6000 farmers;1800 Women/ 1350 Garo) Achieved: 88% (7154 of 7963 farmers; 3648Women/ 1502 Garo) Achievement: This is also an indicator where we have over-achieved as percentage as well as number of farmers covered. Farmers have increased productivity which increased their total sales. At the same time, farmers received a better price for quality products and improved market access.							
<b>Indicator 3.4:</b>							

<b>A.3.5 Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output. Describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged..</b> Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.							
Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description	Nature of engagement
3187	3317	0	0	6504	0	Farmers (men and women)	Reduced cost of production through improved inputs & management
3028	3151	0	0	6179	0	Farmers (men and women)	Farmers trained to increase productivity
3506	3648	0	0	7154	0	Farmers (men and women)	Farmers supported to increase sales
<b>A.3.6 State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength.</b> Please refer to the <a href="#">preceding guidance on Annex A</a> on how to complete the section effectively.							
Farmer record: 900 farmer level production related data recorded by the farmers for each season, across all crops. During final evaluation, an assessment has been conducted using external consultants who looked at 900 farmer records. The findings were cross-checked by the evaluators through FGDs.							

<b>Output 4</b>	
<b>A.4.1</b>	<b>Output 4</b> Write in full
Target farmers are less vulnerable to shocks and stresses, especially natural disasters and climate fluctuations.	
<b>A.4.2</b>	<b>Output 4 score</b> (A++ to C)
A++	
<b>A.4.3</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.
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 GBP382,315 through their own savings (GBP 274,207) 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. Final evaluation reveals that “93% (7561) farmers have adopted environment friendly cultivation practices, 86% (6992) farmers have improved their soil fertility, 100% (8130) farmers have adopted group savings and investment scheme.	
<b>A.4.4</b>	<b>For each of the indicators</b> (add extra rows if required): a) write the indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe; b) state the target and report against it; and c) provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.
<b>Indicator 4.1:</b> Farmers that diversify production and/or adopt more environment friendly cultivation practices (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity) Target: 80% (4800 of 6000 farmers;1920 Women/ 1440 Garo) Achieved: 93% (7561 of 8130 farmers; 3856 Women/ 1588Garo) Achievement: There is an overachievement of this target as well. Farmers have established strong linkage with government agricultural departments, demonstrated crop diversification & environment friendly cultivation practices amongst farmers. Farmers have seen the tangible benefits of crop diversification which accelerated the adaptation process.	
<b>Indicator 4.2:</b> Farmers that report an increase in soil fertility (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity):	

Target: 50% (3000 of 6000 farmers;1200 Women/900 Garo)  
 Achieved: 86% (6992 of 8130 farmers; 3566 Women/1468Garo)  
 Achievement: Soil testing was the key driving force as farmers reduced 30-40% of their fertilizer costs and improved their soil fertility. They have established strong network with SRDI and DAE to get this service. The project also developed soil collectors as barefoot service providers for the farmers. They worked very hard amongst farmers and with SRDI and DAE and enhanced the achievement.

**Indicator 4.3:** Farmers covered by safety measures (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)  
 Target: 90% (5400 of 6000 farmers; 2160 Women/ 1620 Garo)  
 Achieved: 100% (8130 of 8130 farmers; 4182 Women/ 1681 Garo)  
 Achievement: Farmers have realised and seen the benefits of group savings and investment scheme. TX's GSIS model has been proved to be an affordable and flexible source of finance for them. All group farmers have invested their savings and earned additional income which reduced their vulnerability during crisis.

**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. Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description	Nature of engagement
3705	3856	0	0	7561	0	Farmers (men and women) through diversification of production	Improved crops, cropping pattern and cultivation technique suggested and supported
3426	3566	0	0	6992	0	Farmers (men and women) through better soil health	Soil Testing and advice on fertilizer and crops
3948	4182	0	0	0	0	Farmers (men and women) through diversified income sources	Group saving and investment scheme promoted

**A.4.6** State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength Please refer to the preceding guidance on how to complete the section effectively.

Soil Health cards provided by SRDI and DAE indicates that farmers have tested their soil to manage soil fertility and adopted 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. The findings were cross-checked by the evaluators through FGDs.

**Output 5**

**A.5.1** Output Write in full

**A.5.2** Output 5 score (A++ to C)

**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.

<b>A.5.4</b>	<b>For each of the indicators</b> (add extra rows if required): a) write the indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe; b) state the target and report against it; and c) provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.						
Indicator 5.1:							
Indicator 5.2:							
Indicator 5.3:							
Indicator 5.4:							
<b>A.5.5</b>	<b>Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output. Describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.</b> Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.						
Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description	Nature of engagement
<b>A.5.6</b>	<b>State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength.</b> Please refer to the <a href="#">preceding guidance on Annex A</a> on how to complete the section effectively.						

<b>Output 6</b>	
<b>A.6.1</b>	<b>Output 6</b> Write in full
<b>A.6.2</b>	<b>Output 6 score</b> (A++ to C)
<b>A.6.3</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.
<b>A.6.4</b>	<b>For each of the indicators</b> (add extra rows if required): a) write the indicator in full, as included in the most recently approved logframe; b) state the target and report against it; and c) provide a narrative explanation of any over or under achievement.
Indicator 6.1:	
Indicator 6.2:	
Indicator 6.3:	
Indicator 6.4:	
<b>A.6.5</b>	<b>Disaggregate the number of citizens engaged with this output. Describe briefly who they were and how they were engaged.</b> Adult = 18 years and above; Child = below 18 years.

Adult Male	Adult Female	Child Male	Child Female	Total	How many of the total given are people with disabilities (if known)?	Brief description	Nature of engagement
<b>A.6.6</b>	<b>State the evidence used to measure the progress described and comment on its strength.</b> Please refer to the <a href="#">preceding guidance on Annex A</a> on how to complete the section effectively.						

### A.7 Methodological Tools

The table below should be used to provide the details of the specific tools that you or your implementing partner uses to measure project indicators, particularly any bespoke tools you have developed for yourself but also details of any industry standard tools you have used. Please include sufficient information to describe the methods and to enable the reader to understand how the data was derived. There is an example of a response to this section of the report in the FAQ guidance. Add more rows if needed.

Method	Purpose of Tool	Summary of methodology
Producer Record	Data collected on cost of production, volume and quality of yield, sales price & volume of sales, total value of different sources of income (agri & non-agri), household expenditure Cost of production, volume and quality of yield, sales price & volume of sales, total value of different sources of income (agri & non-agri), household expenditure.	Data recorded three times a year by the farmers: end of Rabi, Kharif 01, and Kharif 02 seasons. Project team collected the records. The information collected has been feeding into annual review and planning cycles with project partners and other stakeholders, and incorporated into reports
Producers' Savings Record	Records of instances of reduced vulnerability (savings, investment, assets)	Data recorded in each month by the farmers. Project team collected the records. The information collected has been analysed and provided feedback to farmer groups.
Group Register	Record of collective actions, negotiated actions, group initiatives, group decision, etc.	Each group documented collective actions, negotiated actions, monthly meeting minutes, etc. Project team checked the register and provided feedback.
Association register	Record of collective actions, negotiated actions, association initiatives & decision, policy issues etc.	Each association documented collective actions, negotiated actions, monthly meeting minutes, etc. Project team checked the register and provided feedback.
Training Register	Record of training and workshop	Project staff documented training and workshop facilitated by the project on regular basis.

Service provider record	Data collected on Sales , customer base and feedback	Data collected four times a year by the service provider: end of each quarter. The information collected has been analysed and provided feedback to farmer groups.
-------------------------	--	--

## ANNEX B: CONSOLIDATED BENEFICIARY DATA (Up to 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.

If the same beneficiaries are represented in more than one of the outcome indicators and have therefore benefitted in more than one way, please **ensure you do not double count them** when calculating the consolidated total. (See FAQs for further guidance.)

### B.1 CONSOLIDATED BENEFICIARY TABLE

	OVERALL TOTAL	Gender Disaggregated Data			
		Adult Male (18 years +)	Adult Female (18 years +)	Child Male (under 18 years)	Child Female (under 18 years)
i) Consolidated total number of project beneficiaries achieved in this reporting year	8130	3948	4182	0	0
ii) Consolidated total number of project beneficiaries achieved by the project as a whole	8130	3948	4182	0	0

a. Please explain how you arrived at the figures given in row (ii) – beneficiaries reached by the project – with reference to the figures reported in the outcome section of Annex A.0.5

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

b. Provide a clear summary description of all your outcome level beneficiaries (e.g., people living with HIV/AIDS; disabled children; soapstone workers; child labourers) and how each group benefitted.

The project organised 8130 small-scale farmers into 262 self help groups and 10 associations. Of these, the number of women is 4182; the number of men is 3948; and the number of beneficiaries who are from the Garo Community: 1681.

c. 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.

### B.2 DATA COLLECTION AND DISAGGREGATION

a. What challenges and difficulties, if any, did the project encounter in collecting and reporting

i) exact beneficiary numbers

ii) disaggregated data (including particularly by disability)?

No difficulties/challenges encountered.

b. Did you disaggregate your data collection any further to better understand your beneficiaries? Examples might include extreme poor, widows, orphaned children, older men and women, ethnic groups, socio-economic status).

We have disaggregated the data as men, women and ethnic. We also disaggregated the number as men only group, women only group, men & women mixed group and Bengali and ethnic mixed group.

c. How did the collection and analysis of disaggregated data (including by gender and disability) influence project design, approach, delivery or learning?

Disaggregated data influenced on project activity design and facilitation. For instance, for women groups, livestock rearing training have efficiency in generating additional income source for households.

## ANNEX C: PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS (Up to 3 pages)

DFID captures and compare performance and results across the whole GPAF portfolio based on the information provided in project reports. Please answer each of the following questions.

<b>C1 MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS (MDGs)</b>		
<b>Which of the Millennium Development Goals has your project contributed to directly? Choose up to 3</b>	<b>Please indicate their order of importance for the project (1/2/3):</b>	<b>How much does the project contribute to the selected MDGs? (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 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH</b>	
<b>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).</b>	
<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 replicated 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>	<b>CAPACITY BUILDING</b> Whose capacity (in the main) has been built through the project? Select a maximum of 3. (Mark with an "X" in the appropriate boxes)
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 CHANGE 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: APONE facilitated activities to promote environmentally sustainable agricultural practices and to help smallholders to use climate-adaptive farming techniques. For instance, farmers used to apply 40% more fertiliser than needed because they did not know knowledge about correct quantities and usage. Farmers therefore received help to access affordable soil testing service. This had positive environmental impacts, for example helped farmers to apply optimum fertilizer dose and improve soil fertility, increase productivity, reduce water pollution and reduce costs.					
b. Describe actions the project took to reduce negative environmental impact (use bullet points)					
The project trained service providers to promote- (i) 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, conservation agriculture, etc, (ii) soil management practices through soil testing and compost fertilizer, and (iii) eco-friendly cropping pattern to save water and energy.					
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 facilitated different technical training on identified technologies such as IPM technique, compost production process, AWD technique, compost fertilizer, eco-friendly cropping pattern, conservation agriculture techniques, 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>• The project developed a crop production manual for the farmers with special focus on climate smart agriculture.</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> <li>• The project has conducted meeting and training workshop with government research organisations and extension departments to identify climate adaptive technologies/practices.</li> </ul>					