

1. Overview

Program	Partnerships Initiatives in the Niger Delta (PIND)	
Audit visit dates	23-27 September 2019	
Overall final ratings ¹	MUST	507/600=85%
	RECOMMENDED	219/270=81%
Coverage	Market Development component of the Economic Development Program including aquaculture, business linkages, cassava, cocoa and palm oil sectors.	
	All control points were checked.	
DCED Standard	Version VIII, April 2017	

Signed:



Dara Akala
Executive Director, PIND:

25/10/2019
Abuja, Nigeria

Auditors:



Alexandra Miehlbradt

29/10/2019
Auckland, New Zealand
Date / place



Nabanita Sen Bekkers

29/10/2019
Rotterdam, Netherlands
Date / place:

¹An overall rating of 100% implies that the project meets the compliance criteria and has a strong measurement system of acceptable quality within the boundaries of what the programme has set itself to measure, not that it has a perfect measurement system.

Table of Contents

1. Overview	1
2. Summary of the Programme and Results Measurement System	3
3. Summary of the Audit Process.....	5
4. Summary of Findings.....	6
5. Summary of key areas for improvement	16
Annexes.....	17

Acronyms

ASP	Aquaculture Service Provider
BSP	Business Service Provider
DCED	Donor Committee for Enterprise Development
EIA	Early impact assessment
Ffb	Palm oil fresh fruit bunches
IA	Impact assessment
IG	Intervention guide
IHT	Improved Harvesting Tools
MRM	Monitoring and Results Measurement
PIND	Foundation for Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta
QRP	PIND's current quarterly results aggregation system
RC	Results chain
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
WEE	Women's Economic Empowerment

2. Summary of the Programme and Results Measurement System

2.1 Summary of PIND²

Foundation for Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta (PIND) is a Nigerian non-profit foundation established in 2010 with initial funding from the Chevron Corporation. The foundation supports a portfolio of socio-economic development programs in Nigeria's Niger Delta with the aim of improving the standard of living of communities in the region. PIND supports projects in collaboration with a diverse range of donor partners including bilateral and multi-lateral aid agencies, federal and state government agencies in Nigeria, private companies and foundations. PIND's first phase was from 2010-2014. It is currently in the second phase, which will be completed at the end of 2019. PIND is presently outlining its expected strategy for a third phase to start in 2020.

With an overarching goal of increasing income and employment in the region, the Foundation has four distinct but interrelated program areas. They are:

- An **economic development program** focused on generating opportunities for pro-poor market development and employment generation.
- A **capacity building program** that builds the service delivery and engagement capacity of government, civil society and communities.
- A **peace-building program** that strengthens conflict resolution mechanisms for enabling integrated peace and economic growth.
- An **analysis & advocacy program** that improves analysis and understanding of systemic constraints to growth in the Niger Delta region.

The economic development program identifies specific forces driving growth in market systems and addresses underlying constraints hindering the achievement of economic growth, particularly for poor people, in the region. Within the economic development program, there are three components:

- Market Development
- Appropriate Technology Enabled Development (ATED)
- Niger Delta Youth Employment Pathways (NDYEP)

The audit covered only the Market Development component. Within this component, PIND works in five sectors:

- Aquaculture
- Business Linkages
- Cassava
- Cocoa
- Palm Oil

Access to finance is a cross-cutting service for all sectors. The program puts a focus on reaching women in all sectors. PIND facilitates interventions together with co-facilitators, local NGOs active in the sectors above. In each intervention, PIND partners with selected private and, in some cases, public actors to develop sustainable business models that will deliver services to small holder farmers and SMEs over the long term.

² Taken largely from the assignment Terms of Reference and the PIND website.

2.2 Key features of the results measurement system

The Market Development component of PIND has adopted the DCED Results Measurement Standard to guide the internal monitoring and results measurement system. The work in each sector is underpinned by a value chain analysis and sector strategy. Before each intervention starts, the staff prepare an intervention justification that outlines how the intervention links to the sector strategy and what it aims to achieve. Some of PINDs interventions, in palm oil and aquaculture for example, are reasonably mature, having started at the end of Phase 1 or early in Phase 2. In these sectors, PIND has started to see systemic change evidenced by crowding in of service providers and farmers copying successful practices, as well as changes in government practices in some cases.

All PIND market development and co-facilitator staff are involved in monitoring and results measurement. The PIND sector staff take the lead in developing an intervention guide that summarizes the intervention and how the team expects to monitor and measure progress. In addition to a summary of the intervention, the intervention guide includes a results chain, indicators and a monitoring plan, as well as the team's thinking on related issues such as displacement, incentives for sustainability, expected systemic changes and the disaggregation of indicators by women and men. Co-facilitators take the lead in monitoring the intermediate results of interventions and gathering market intelligence to identify unintended effects and signs of systemic change. PIND conducts impact assessments among the beneficiaries of interventions roughly annually, in order to generate primarily quantitative information on impacts such as increased incomes and job creation. The impact assessments are almost always carried out by the PIND and co-facilitator staff with hired enumerators when needed. The PIND staff conduct periodic field visits to check on progress and gather additional information on results.

PIND uses the "Adopt, Adapt, Expand Respond"³ framework to help staff to identify and monitor systemic changes related to interventions. In addition, expected systemic changes, particularly the crowding in of service providers and farmers copying one another, is sometimes outlined in intervention results chains and monitoring plans. Early in the next phase, PIND plans to conduct some systematic studies on systemic change in relevant sectors.

An MRM Coordinator manages PIND's results measurement system across the economic development program with support from an MRM intern. This team takes the lead in designing and overseeing impact assessments and coordinating the aggregation of results for reporting. The economic development program MRM Coordinator also provides support to the implementation team and co-facilitators in all aspects of the MRM system. The foundation's MRM Manager oversees results measurement in the economic development program. In addition, the MRM Coordinator for PIND's other components and the MRM Coordinator for the economic development program support each other to conduct studies and quality assure MRM across the programs.

PIND has a structured system of quarterly internal technical reviews to discuss progress based on information on results and adapt interventions and sector strategies to maximize results. PIND reviews its overall economic development and program portfolios annually, using information on results to adjust resource allocation and revise strategies as a key part of the annual planning process.

³ For more information, see <https://www.springfieldcentre.com/adopt-adapt-expand-respond-a-framework-for-managing-and-measuring-systemic-change-processes/>

2.3 Evolution of the results measurement system

In May 2017, PIND commissioned a pre-audit review of its results measurement system in the Market Development component. The review identified strengths and gaps related to the compliance of the system with the DCED Results Measurement Standard. Since 2017, PIND has been working to address the identified gaps in order to achieve compliance with the Standard.

3. Summary of the Audit Process

PIND was audited under Version 8 of the DCED Results Measurement Standard, published in April 2017. The audit covered only the Market Development component of the economic development program which is active in five sectors including aquaculture, business Linkages, cassava, cocoa and palm oil.

The sample selection for the audit is a two-stage process. The first stage is to select the sectors.

- I. Sector selection: Since there were five sectors to audit, three sectors had to be selected, to meet the minimum requirement of the Standard.⁴ Aquaculture was purposively selected as it shared by PIND as the only sector within the audit sample where a full impact assessment was conducted. Cocoa was deliberately removed from the sample as it was a new sector where PIND started working in January 2019 with a small budget and no early signs of impact yet assessed. From the remaining three sectors (business linkage, cassava and palm oil), two were chosen at random, using a website that generates random numbers (www.randomizer.org). These two turned out to be business linkage and palm oil.

The audit reviewed a representative sample of all current and past interventions in these sectors. The number of interventions per sector were selected as follows:

- II. Intervention selection: For both aquaculture sector and business linkage sectors there were two interventions per sector. So, for these two sectors, all interventions were selected, to meet the minimum requirement of the Standard.⁵ For palm oil, there were four interventions in the sector and two had to be selected, to meet the requirements of the Standard (The square root of 4=2). From the four interventions, one intervention increasing harvest of palm oil was purposively selected as it had the biggest budget within the sector. One intervention, access to oil palm seedling was deliberately removed from the sample as it was too early to assess any result for that intervention. Out of the remaining two, one was chosen at random (Improving palm oil processing) using the website that generates random number mentioned above.

The interventions selected can be seen in the following table:

Table 1: Interventions Selected for the Audit

Sector	Code	Intervention name	Total Budget (USD)	Start date	Expected end date	Intervention status
Aquaculture	1	Improving productivity of catfish farmers through demonstrations	550,000	July 2012	December 2018	Activities completed and

⁴ The total sample size should be the square root of the total number of sectors (with a minimum of 3).

⁵ All interventions are audited if there are 2 or fewer.

		of improved practices in the Niger Delta				monitoring on-going
	2	Improving processing for aquaculture products for farmers and traders through introduction and promotion of smoking technologies for increased quality	300,000	January 2014	December 2019	Activities and Monitoring on-going
Palm Oil	2	Improving Palm oil processing for farmers (processors) through introduction and promotion of small scale processing equipment (SSPE) for increased quality and quantity of palm oil, for processors in the Niger Delta	300,000	Jan 2013	September 2019	Activities and Monitoring on-going
	3	Increasing harvest of oil palm fresh fruit bunches through the introduction and promotion of improved harvesting tools for increased quantity and quality of fresh fruit bunches for the oil palm farmers	400,000	August 2012	September 2019	Activities and Monitoring on-going
Business linkage	1	Business Linkages support, through developing and facilitating Business Service Providers' support to micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) in the Niger Delta	500,000	July 2015	July 2018	Activities completed and monitoring on-going
	2	Access to improved market for poultry farmers through linkages to improved processing plants; and farmers access to local poultry services for increased productivity for farmers.	350,000	July 2015	July 2019	Activities and monitoring on-going

The audit scored against all control points. However, selected compliance criteria in the Standard were not applicable and were not scored. Specifically:

- Compliance criteria 2.7.2 and 2.7.3 could not be scored because PIND is not making forward projections of quantitative results for their interventions. PIND set targets which are based primarily on a top down process that allocates a share of program targets to each sector and intervention, rather than a bottom up process based on the changes outlined in the results chains (as required by the Standard).
- Compliance criteria 4.2.6 and 4.2.7 could not be scored for all reviewed interventions because PIND had not yet assessed the results of systemic change at the market actors and beneficiary level for all interventions.

4. Summary of Findings

PND scored 85 % (507 out of a possible 600 points) for 'must' compliance criteria and 81 % (219 out of possible 270 points) for 'recommended' compliance criteria. As noted above, some compliance criteria

in the Standard are not applicable for PIND and were not scored. Hence, the maximum 'must' and 'recommended' scores have been adjusted to exclude the compliance criteria that were not scored.

Table 2 summarises the scores for each section of the DCED Standard. Detailed scores are outlined in Annex 1.

*Table 2: Scores by DCED Standard Section
(disaggregated mandatory and recommended compliance criteria)*

		Total maximum	Total actual	%
Section 1: Articulating the results chain	Must	80	74	93
	Rec	15	15	100
Section 2: Defining indicators and other information needs	Must	80	72	90
	Rec	15	9	60
Section 3: Measuring attributable change	Must	205	180	88
	Rec	80	66	82
Section 4: Measuring systemic change	Must	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Rec	100	72	72
Section 5: Tracking costs and impact	Must	55	34	63
	Rec	20	20	100
Section 6: Reporting results and costs	Must	50	38	76
	Rec	40	38	95
Section 7: Managing the results measurement system	Must	130	108	83
	Rec	N/A	N/A	N/A
Totals	Must	600	507	85
	Recommended	270	219	81

The following sub-sections outline the scores for each control point and summarise the findings according to the strengths and weaknesses of each section. More detailed findings for each sector are outlined in **Annex 2**.

4.1 Section 1: Articulating the results chain

Table 3: Score: Articulating the results chain

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score ⁶
1.1	An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each intervention.	M	20	19
1.2	Each intervention results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis	M	15	15
1.3	Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities.	M	25	21
1.4	The intervention results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players and the programme circumstances.	M	20	20
1.5	Each intervention results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis on gender.	R	5	5
1.6	Each results chain is supported by research and analysis that considers the risk of displacement.	R	10	10

Strengths	Weaknesses
All interventions have results chains. They are mostly logical and sufficiently detailed.	The results chains have some discrepancies in logic and detail. In particular, for some results chains, a key change or market actor is left out of the results chain.
The intervention guides (IGs) and/or staff mentioned all critical external risks to the interventions. The sector logic, sector strategy, value chain analysis, intervention justifications and IGs explain the link of the interventions to the sector strategy and the evidence supporting the links between the changes outlined in the results chain. The IGs outline the incentives for all key market actors.	
PIND and co-facilitator staff can clearly explain the results chains, describing how the activities are expected to lead to changes among market actors and benefits for farmers, SMEs and other beneficiaries. The PIND staff provided clear examples of how they use the results chains in their work to guide monitoring and review of progress and to consider adaptations during review meetings. The co-facilitator staff provided some general points on how they use results chains.	Some of the co-facilitator teams did not provide clear and specific examples of how they use results chains in their work.
The results chains are reviewed quarterly with the	

⁶ The actual scores have been rounded up. If the deductions are less than 0.5 points, the scores are rounded up to full points.

reviews recorded in each IG log. The PIND staff provided examples of changes they have made to results chains to reflect changes in strategy based on information on results.	
PIND has quantitative information related to gender roles for all sectors. PIND staff explained how women's participation is encouraged in interventions.	
Each intervention guide outlines the risk of displacement for specific workers. The PIND staff explained why there was minimal risk of displacement for farmers and other beneficiaries.	

4.2 Section 2: Defining indicators of change and other information needs

Table 4: Score: defining indicators of change and other needs

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
2.1	There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each change described in the results chain(s).	M	10	9
2.2	Qualitative information on how and why changes are occurring is defined for each intervention.	M	30	25
2.3	A small number of indicators at the impact level can be aggregated across the programme.	M	20	20
2.4	There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results.	M	10	8
2.5	Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress.	M	10	10
2.6	There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of gender differentiated results.	R	15	9
2.7	Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators to appropriate dates.	R	35	0

Strengths	Weaknesses
There are indicators for almost all changes outlined in the intervention results chains. The indicators are mostly specific and relevant to the changes outlined.	There are no indicators for a few of the changes outlined in the results chains. A few of the indicators are not clear or sufficiently relevant to the specified change. Units are not clearly specified for some of the quantitative indicators.

There are some qualitative indicators in the MRM plans for all interventions. Qualitative information is relevant to understanding how and why changes are occurring. Interviews, co-facilitator reports and field visit reports showed that PIND and co-facilitator staff are gathering some additional qualitative information beyond what is specified in the MRM plans.	For some interventions (e.g. Palm Oil Processing and Aquaculture Demonstration Scale Up), the qualitative information defined is insufficient. For these interventions there is no qualitative information defined for some market actors or the information defined does not cover both why and how changes are happening. While satisfaction and willingness to continue are classed as qualitative indicators, they are often quantified in surveys with limited additional qualitative information.
Benefit outreach, additional income and jobs created are included in the intervention MRM plans or can easily be calculated based on the indicators in the MRM plans.	
There are indicators in the MRM plans to assess sustainability for most market actors involved in the interventions. For the most part, the indicators cover both quantitative and qualitative aspects of sustainability and are relevant, specific and measurable.	Indicators of sustainability are missing for a few market actors involved in the interventions (e.g. financial institutions in Palm Oil Processing and Poultry and aquaculture service providers in Aquaculture Smoking Technology). In a few cases, the indicators defined are insufficient to adequately assess sustainability.
Both PIND and co-facilitators staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate progress of the interventions.	
There are plans in the IGs to disaggregate selected indicators by women and men in line with the objectives of increasing participation of women in specific roles related to the interventions.	There is no qualitative information defined in the MRM plan or in practice that would assist in determining how and why/why not women are participating as expected.
	There are no forward projections of quantitative results for the interventions. There are targets made annually for the subsequent year, but they are based primarily on a top down process that allocates a share of program targets to each sector and intervention, rather than a bottom up process based on the changes outlined in the results chains.

4.3 Section 3: Measuring attributable change

Table 5: Score: Measuring attributable change

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
3.1	Baseline information on all key indicators is collected.	M	60	53
3.2	Monitoring information on all key indicators is collected.	M	60	53
3.3	Impact assessment is conducted to assess attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains using methods that conform to established good practice.	M	60	49
3.4	The programme implements processes to use information from monitoring and results measurement in management of interventions and decision making.	M	25	24

3.5	The programme has a system for assessing and understanding differentiated results by gender.	R	60	46
3.6	The programme monitors to identify unintended effects.	R	20	20

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>PIND collected baseline information for most market actors at the start of the interventions. For interventions involving the introduction of new technologies (e.g. Palm Oil Processing and Harvesting, Aquaculture Smoking Technology), the quantitative baseline for the sales of technologies was zero. Similarly, the baseline for market actors introducing new services to sectors (e.g. aquaculture service providers) was zero. PIND planned and collected baseline information from most beneficiary groups through recall during annual impact assessments. The baseline research was timely and the sample size and approach for most respondent groups was adequate. The planned approach to assessing attribution was also adequate for most respondent groups.</p>	<p>In one case (SME Development), the recall period of three years was too long. In one case (Poultry), there was inadequate information gathered from market actors on the reasons for not making changes prior to the intervention. In one case (Palm Oil Processing), there is no documented evidence that baseline information was collected from farmers; it was assumed that all farmers selling to processors were benefiting without checking where farmers were selling before, in what quantity and at what price. In some cases (e.g. Palm Oil Processing and Harvesting), the sampling for the baselines was inadequate. In one case (Aquaculture Demonstration Scale Up), early baseline information on farmers was not used to determine results and no further baseline information was collected.</p>
<p>There are MRM plans for all interventions. Many of the methods stated in the MRM plans are clear and specific. The stated approaches to attribution in the MRM plans are mostly satisfactory. PIND plans to gather information from beneficiaries annually. The planned timing and responsibility for monitoring are logical and clear. The PIND and co-facilitator teams have monitored as planned. The PIND and co-facilitator teams could verbally explain what qualitative information is collected.</p>	<p>In some of the MRM plans, the monitoring methods and/or the timing for monitoring are not clear. The documentation of quantitative monitoring, for example on sales of market actors, is often not sufficient. Qualitative monitoring methods are often not stated in the MRM plan and qualitative monitoring is not systematic in practice and does not always adequately cover the stated indicators. The compilation, analysis and reporting of qualitative information is also inadequate.</p>
<p>There are plans to track key performance indicators, typically sales, of market actors for all interventions. PIND and co-facilitator staff have tracked sales of market actors. Similarly, there are plans to conduct impact assessment on beneficiaries for all interventions, usually annually. The impact assessments have largely been carried out as planned. There are research plans for many of the impact assessments conducted. The planned sample sizes and attribution approaches in the research plans are adequate. The research, data entry and cleaning included a number of quality control measures.</p>	<p>The timeliness of data collection was inadequate in a few cases (e.g. Aquaculture Demonstration Scale Up for aquaculture service providers). In one case, (Aquaculture Demonstration Scale up), the approach to assessing attribution was not appropriate. Limited, documented evidence of the sales of market actors was available. The PIND database of beneficiaries and field reports do not provide sufficient evidence for the outreach figures reported. The sampling for the impact assessments in practice was sometimes smaller and more limited than planned, making the sample inadequate for extrapolation to the population of beneficiaries in some cases (e.g. Palm Oil Processing and Harvesting). The analysis of data from the impact assessments had flaws in some cases (e.g. SME Development). During the research, the co-facilitators often had too much discretion over the choice of respondents and there were insufficient quality checks</p>

	on the data collection and data entry.
PIND and co-facilitator staff can explain the quarterly review process for assessing the progress of interventions and sectors based on information on results. All PIND staff and almost all co-facilitators provided clear examples of using information to manage and adjust interventions. PIND senior managers can describe the process for using information on results to inform sector and portfolio development; they provided clear examples of shifting resources, closing interventions and entering new sectors based on information on results.	In one case, the co-facilitator team could not provide an example of how information was used for decision making.
There are plans in the IGs to disaggregate selected indicators by women and men. The practices used to disaggregate indicators are satisfactory. For one intervention, Aquaculture Smoking Technology, there is relevant qualitative information on the results of the intervention specific to women.	In one case (Palm Oil Processing), there is insufficient information on gender related to jobs created and participation of farmers. For most interventions, there is no qualitative information on differentiated results by gender.
The MRM Manual explains that staff will gather information on unintended effects of interventions and the diary tab in the IG provides a location for information on unintended effects. Both PIND and co-facilitator staff provided clear explanations of how they gather information on unintended effects of interventions and how the information is used in the management of the interventions.	

4.4 Section 4: Capturing wider changes in the system or market

Table 6: Score: capturing wider changes in the system or market

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
4.1	The programme has an overall plan for assessing systemic changes at programme level.	R	10	10
4.2	Systemic changes are assessed at market systems level and beneficiary level using appropriate methods.	R	90	62

Strengths	Weaknesses
The MRM Manual includes a definition of systemic change and a plan for how information on systemic change will be collected and analysed. The MRM Coordinator further explained the approach.	

<p>The pathways of expected systemic changes are outlined in the intervention justifications, the systemic change tabs of the IG and/or the sector strategy for all interventions. There are plans to gather information on systemic changes among market actors in the systemic change tab of the IGs. For most interventions, expected systemic changes are also outlined in the results chains and MRM plans for both market actors and beneficiaries. PIND and co-facilitators have gathered considerable information on systemic change among market actors. For Aquaculture Demonstration Scale Up, PIND has collected information on copying beneficiaries in a timely manner.</p>	<p>For all relevant interventions, there is no planned approach for assessing the attribution of systemic changes to interventions or the approach outlined is inadequate. For those interventions where assessment is already taking place, attribution is not sufficiently assessed in practice. In some cases, the process of gathering information on crowding in is not sufficiently systematic. In most cases, documentation of assessment among market players is insufficient. In one case (Palm Oil Processing), there is no plan to assess the results of systemic change among beneficiaries. In one case (Palm Oil Harvesting), the planned assessment of the results of systemic changes among beneficiaries has not taken place.</p>
---	--

4.5 Section 5: Tracking costs and impact

Table 7: Score: Tracking costs and impact

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
5.1	Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	M	20	20
5.2	Programme-wide impact is clearly and appropriately aggregated.	M	35	14
5.3	Costs are allocated by major component of the programme.	R	20	20

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>PIND is currently switching systems for tracking finances; both systems are adequate and track all costs accurately. The figures are provided clearly in internal and external reports.</p>	
<p>There is a system for aggregating results across interventions and sectors for reporting. The system includes a well-organized dashboard with key impact indicators. Some figures could be traced from external reports to the figures in the QRP. There is a plan to estimate overlap among interventions in future.</p>	<p>The aggregation system is complex with several parallel parts. There is no clear connection between the data in the IGs and the data in the QRP and dashboard. It is not possible to easily ascertain the sources and calculations used to arrive at many of the figures in the QRP and the dashboard. The transfer of figures into the QRP is by hand, raising the risk of errors. Overlap has not been taken into account in the aggregation of figures, although staff and reports clearly state that a significant number of beneficiaries are benefiting from more than one intervention in a sector. The database of beneficiaries provides fewer names than the figures reported. It was not possible during interviews to trace figures from external reports through the QRP to the relevant assessments and evidence for the results reported.</p>
<p>The financial system tracks costs by component, sector</p>	

and, for the new system, by intervention. These figures are clearly reported internally.	
--	--

4.6 Section 6: Reporting costs and results

Table 8: Score: Reporting costs and results

No.	Control points	Must/ Rec	Std max. score	Actual score
6.1	The programme produces a report at least annually which describes results to date.	M	50	38
6.2	Results of gender impact are reported.	R	10	8
6.3	Results of systemic change are reported.	R	20	20
6.4	Results are published.	R	10	10

Strengths	Weaknesses
PIND produces annual reports that describe results and expenditure. The 2018 annual report provides both quantitative and qualitative information on progress and discusses the sustainability of market actors' behaviour changes as well as beneficiaries' behaviour changes to some extent. Internal documents support the reported results to some extent.	There is insufficient information in the 2018 annual report on the sustainability of beneficiaries' behaviour changes and benefits. There is insufficient, documented evidence to support the figures in the report.
The annual report and quarterly reports mention some market actors and other programmes who contributed to the reported achievements. There is a comprehensive list of all public and private partners of the program available internally and to which the donors can have access. The website also lists many of PIND's partners.	The publicly available, annual report does not list all public and private partners that have contributed to PIND's reported achievements.
The 2018 annual report includes data disaggregated by women and men for outreach as well as limited qualitative information on gender differentiated results for some sectors.	The report does not include data disaggregated by women and men for jobs where this is relevant (e.g. Palm Oil Processing). The qualitative information provided is limited.
The 2018 annual report and 2019 Quarter 1 report includes information on systemic change among market actors and beneficiaries in aquaculture.	
The annual reports are publicly available through PIND's website and Facebook page.	

4.7 Section 7: Managing the system for results measurement

Table 9: Score: Managing the system for results measurement

No.	Control points	Must/ Recommended	Std max. score	Actual score
7.1	The programme has a clear system for using information from the results measurement system in management and decision-making.	M	30	30
7.2	The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.	M	50	44
7.3	The system is well managed and integrated with programme management.	M	50	34

Strengths	Weaknesses
The MRM Manual describes the system of quarterly reviews to channel information on results into intervention and sector management. Managers were able to explain this system and the system for using information to manage the economic development portfolio. The systems at all levels are appropriate and the staff and managers actively use them.	
There are two dedicated staff for MRM in the economic development program supported by a manager and assisted by the MRM Coordinator for other components. Roles and responsibilities among the MRM team, managers, implementation teams and co-facilitators are clear for almost everyone. The PIND implementation, MRM and management staff and the co-facilitator teams have most required skills for managing and supporting the MRM system. There is a reasonably comprehensive MRM manual; Staff and co-facilitators have been trained on MRM and can ask questions to the MRM team when needed. There are sufficient financial resources to fully support the MRM system.	There are not sufficient, dedicated MRM staff given the number of interventions, sectors and other components in the economic development portfolio. There are a few missing skills among the PIND implementation teams, MRM team and managers and some of the co-facilitator teams to adequately implement the MRM system. The MRM roles and responsibilities for some managers are not completely clear.
The MRM Manual outlines an adequate quality control system for most elements of the MRM system. Some quality assurance mechanisms are in place and practiced. They provide adequate checks on the IGs and assessment planning. PIND and co-facilitator staff clearly understand their roles and responsibilities in relation to MRM. MRM is included in all relevant job descriptions and is well-integrated into human resource management.	In practice, there is insufficient quality assurance in data collection, analysis and reporting for interventions. Quality assurance is also insufficient in relation to aggregation of results across interventions and sectors and consistently checking evidence and calculations supporting reported figures. There is no system to review the effectiveness of the overall MRM system.

5. Summary of key areas for improvement

Outlined below are the key areas for improvement:

- Ensure that all results chains are logical and sufficiently detailed;
- Enable all co-facilitators to use results chains in their work and cooperate with PIND to use information on results to manage interventions;
- Ensure that indicators defined capture all changes outlined in the results chain boxes;
- Ensure that all indicators are clear and relevant to the specified change in the results chain boxes, including units for quantitative indicators;
- Ensure that sufficient and specific qualitative indicators/information needs on how and why changes happen are included in the MRM plan;
- Ensure that there are relevant indicators of sustainability for all market actors involved in an intervention;
- Include qualitative information needs to assess differentiated results by gender in the MRM plan which would help in assessing how and why/why not women are participating as expected;
- Develop projections of quantitative results based on the changes outlined in individual results chains;
- Ensure that the baseline studies and impact assessments for all relevant market actors and beneficiaries are properly designed, timely and conducted based on good research practices;
- Ensure that monitoring methods and timing are properly reflected in the MRM plans;
- Systematically collect and document qualitative information on how and why changes happen for all interventions;
- Consistently document monitoring information on the performance/sales of market actors;
- Ensure that attribution strategies are appropriate for assessing change as a result of project activities;
- Ensure that data is always appropriately analysed;
- Strengthen quality checks on data collection and data entry;
- Ensure that data is disaggregated by men and women for all relevant indicators and that qualitative information is collected to understand gender differentiated results;
- Define attribution strategies for assessing systemic change and apply them in practice;
- Ensure that there is sufficient documentation of assessment of systemic change among market actors.
- Ensure that there is timely assessment of systemic change among beneficiaries for all relevant interventions;
- Simplify and streamline the aggregation system ensuring that all figures are easily traceable, strengthen the quality control of data entry and calculation processes and implement the plan to take overlap between interventions into account;
- Ensure that there is sufficient information in annual reporting on the sustainability of beneficiaries' behaviour change and benefits;
- Ensure that there is well-organized, documented evidence to support the figures of reported results;
- Ensure that all public and private partners that have contributed to PIND's reported achievements are acknowledged publicly;
- Ensure that annual reports include data disaggregated by women and men for jobs and there is sufficient qualitative information explaining change;

- Ensure that sufficient human resources with appropriate skills are allocated to manage MRM related activities;
- Ensure that the quality control of MRM related activities and outputs is sufficiently thorough.
- Ensure that there is a system to review the effectiveness of the overall MRM system.

Annexes

(provided as separate documents)

1. Overall and sector specific ratings
2. Sector specific findings
3. List of documents reviewed
4. List of interviews conducted