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PROPCOM: Outline of presentation

- Introduction to PrOpCom
- The Standard results measurement system – our story
- Interventions in Fertilizer
- How it helped us
- In the end….it did really matter
PrOpCom

- Design: Dec 2002
- Inception: Dec 2004
- Pilot: May 2006
- Implementation: May 2008
- Extension: May 2011

- Full Implementation
- Working in Field
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to Jun 2008</td>
<td>RCs used by programme management only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jul - Dec 2008 | Institutional changes  
Examples and advice from Katalyst                                            |
| Jan - Jun 2009 | Tried the Standard results measurement initiative  
Consultant to help with market study and analysis                            |
Start looking for specialist to guide monitoring                           |
| Jan - Jun 2010 | Senior Monitoring Specialist starts work  
Consultants hired to make IG for all interventions  
Hans and Harald run results measurement course                              |
| Jul - Sep 2010 | Monitoring field staff now increased to 6  
Mock audit – positive result                                                 |
| Oct ’10-Dec ‘11 | Fine-tune, use to extend program  
Measure and aggregate impact for programme closing                         |
Fertilizer

- No good distribution channel
- No innovation necessary
- Un-reliable supply
- Usage information
- Funds
- Affordability
- Availability
- Education
Intervention(s)

- **Will it work?** Pilot in 2 States (Fast Track): Oct 2009 – May 2010
  - Did it work?
    - Make a Results chain
    - Measure at the end of the season
- **Scale up to 12 States (On-Track):** Mar 2010 – Jan 2011
  - Signs of change
  - Measure changes
  - Connect to log frame indicators
- **Sustainable? (2011 Scale up):** Feb 2011 – Oct 2011
  - Can the company continue?
  - Measure results
Fast Track

The Pilot Intervention
Impact on the poor → Increased employment → Additional income → Increased well being

Core market

Increased productivity → Additional profit from fert use

Support Market (Fertilize)

Framers from demos able to correctly apply fert and know of 1 kg bags → Demo plots organized by VPs → VPs capable of doing demos and providing information → FIPS trains VPs on ag practice related to fertilizer → Notre and distributors select Village Promoters (VP) → Identification & selection of an appropriate fertilizer supply company → 1 Kg bags available in market → Increased sales of fert by VPs / agrodealers → Farmers purchase small bag fert

Activities

Farmers apply fert in correct manner → Additional income → Increased employment → Increased well being
Fast track – Measuring results

- Results chain
  - What have we done to achieve what change
- Measure results
  - No baseline
  - Go beyond support market
  - Finding control groups – 10 users vs. 10 non-users
- Review intervention – Quarterly
  - Price – sales, anecdotes
  - Distribution structure
  - Farmer education process – who learned better and how
On-track

The Scale up to 12 States
**Impact on the poor**

- Increased employment
- Additional income
- Increased well being

**Core market**

- Additional profit from fertilizer use
- Increased productivity

- Farmers buy and apply fertilizer correctly
- Other farmers also purchase small bag fertilizer and apply correctly

**Support Market (Fertilizer)**

- VP organize demos and market storms to sell 1 kg pack
- Other VPs are hired to sell more fertilizer

- VPs are trained and capable of conducting demos and advising farmers
- Notore adjusts price of fertilizer

- Company trains VPs on demos and sales
- FIPS Africa provides technical assistance on training VPs

- Company and distributors identify and select VP
- Market study on fertilizer prices
- Notore agrees to incentivize VP for sales and demos

**Activities**

- Selection of target areas

**Review of previous intervention**
On-track

- What really is key for the intervention
  - What can show efficiency of partner/process
  - What can show change in farm level
- Results chain
- Measuring
  - Where to measure: 6 states
  - Using control farmers: 10 users vs. 10 non-users
  - Aggregating across Nigeria
- Review over the year
- Extension period
# Achievements of the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of demonstrations</th>
<th>No. of states covered</th>
<th>Sales (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Track</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>217,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Scale up</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE jobs</th>
<th>Number of Farmers</th>
<th>Increased income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>36,857,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£146,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Track</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>60,589</td>
<td>84,145,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£334,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Scale up</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,003,418</td>
<td>1,020,476,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,042,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How it helped the program

- Running the program
  - Solidifying case for interventions being run
  - Structuring information needs for new intervention ideas
  - Catalytic Intervention Managers (CIM’s) reporting

- Making a case for extension
  - How long
  - Areas of work
  - Value For Money
In the end – it really does matter

• Planning of results measurement
• Measurement of results, extrapolation and validation
• Methodologies, triangulation etc.
• Special studies
• Programme closing
• Next steps
Thank you