

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF DENMARK
Danida

TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICE

MONITORING AND INDICATORS IN THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR



TECHNICAL NOTE

2006

MONITORING AND INDICATORS IN THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

Technical Note

**Technical Advisory Service
DANIDA**

April 2006

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF DENMARK
Danida

Monitoring and Indicators in the Agricultural Sector
April 2006

Publisher

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
Asiatisk Plads 2
DK-1448 Copenhagen K
Denmark

Phone: +45 33 92 00 00

Fax: +45 32 54 05 33

E-mail: um@um.dk

Internet: www.um.dk

Design

Technical Advisory Service

Print

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

The publication can be downloaded or ordered from:

www.danida-publikationer.dk or

www.danida-networks.dk

The text of this publication can be freely quoted

ISBN 87-7667-463-0 (print version)

ISBN 87-7667-464-9 (internet version)

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The Agricultural Sector	1
3. Internationally-Defined Goals, Indicators and Targets	2
4. Objectives and Indicators in PRSPS	2
5. Objectives and Indicators in SPS	2
6. Methods of Sector Monitoring	4
Annexes	7

ABBREVIATIONS

PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
SPS	Sector Programme Support
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
ASPS	Agricultural Sector Programme Support
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic (Relevant), and Time-bound
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
SWA	Sector Wide Approach
M & E	Monitoring & Evaluation
VPA	Annual Business Plan
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DAO	District Agricultural Officer
DA	Development Areas
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
HQ	Head Quarter

1. Introduction

This Note offers a brief introduction to indicators and monitoring tools relevant to the agricultural sector in Danida's countries of cooperation. It is primarily aimed at supporting officers at the Danish representations or at HQ responsible for preparing and managing Danish bilateral development assistance. The Note may also be of assistance to staff in partner organisations responsible for monitoring, their Danida advisers, and consultants who assist in preparing and managing programmes and projects.

The present Note should be read in conjunction with the technical note on "Monitoring at Programme and Project Level – General Issues", which presents definitions of relevant monitoring terms and explains important aspects of the monitoring challenge at the programme and project level.

Comments on this Note may be sent to the contact person in the Technical Advisory Service: Senior Advisor Lars Eskild Jensen (larjen@um.dk).

2. The agricultural sector

Agriculture is basically a *private* sector, i.e. dominated mainly by private stakeholders such as farmers, managers of (small-scale) private businesses, the middlemen, traders and shop-owners, the food-processing industries, farmers' associations, etc. In many countries, ministries of agriculture are increasingly concentrating on formulating policies and strategies, developing and enforcing laws and regulations, collecting information, and monitoring at the national level.

Even if the extension system remains mostly funded and managed by the state, actual responsibility for agricultural extension services is often decentralised to the regional/district level, thus breaking with the old-style direct chain of command from ministry to district-based extension staff.

The complex nature of the sector has to be considered when monitoring is organised. In information collection and data quality, the level of ambition should take account of the number and diversity of players, bearing in mind that – contrary to more government-controlled sectors – the multiplicity of private stakeholders in agriculture cannot simply be instructed to deliver information. The design of a monitoring system within the sector should ideally reflect this, letting data collection be based on the principle of mutual interest rather than on the enforcement of dictates.

With a project-based approach – including some sector programmes in which the national initiative to start a sector-wide programme has yet to take shape – the project/programme will often concentrate on establishing a monitoring system serving its own needs, rather than meeting the requirements of the sector as a whole. This option holds the advantage of being relatively quick to implement, and the donor-funded activities in question can be monitored closely. In addition, it is possible to include monitoring of sensitive issues, which are otherwise overlooked by the ministry for political or other reasons. Conversely, it represents a limitation that such a system is usually donor-driven, possibly of less value and relevance to the receiver, and hence not necessarily sustainable in the long run.

Another option is to support the establishment of a single monitoring system, which tries to cater for both donor-specific and national government requirements simultaneously. Such a system may initially address mainly donor-supported activities, and then gradually expand to cover the entire sector or mandate of the ministry.

Finally, when the sector programme is a hybrid between general types of sector support (e.g. basket funding and budget support) and earmarked support provided solely by Danida, one option is to establish the two

aforementioned systems concurrently, ensuring that donor-funded activities can continue to be monitored during the presumably lengthy process of establishing a monitoring system for the entire sector. This combines the best of the two approaches. However, it imposes the cost of establishing and maintaining two systems, drawing on scarce human resources to develop and feed data into two parallel systems, thus making a pragmatic choice of one system over the other preferable in most cases.

3. Internationally-defined goals, indicators and targets

The official policy of Denmark emphasises that Danish development assistance pursues objectives linked to each of the various national poverty reduction strategies (PRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Consequently, Danida's monitoring requirements are subordinated to those of national policies as well as PRS and MDGs¹, and SPS-level indicators should be aligned with those of the MDGs.

However, the MDGs do not include indicators for monitoring of economic growth and primary production². The current MDGs most relevant to agriculture include Goal 1: "Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger", Goal 2: "Promote gender equality and empower women", and Goal 7: "Ensure environmental sustainability". Indicators for these goals most related to agriculture are:

- Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption,
- poverty headcount, poverty gap ratio,
- income distribution,
- child malnutrition,
- under-nourishment, and
- ratio of area protected to maintain biological diversity to surface area.

As agriculture is not the only sector with a role in pursuing these goals and indicators, it can only make a *contribution* towards national cross-sector monitoring of MDG indicators. Some time in the future, the MDGs may be complemented to include indicators pertaining specifically to agriculture.

4. Objectives and indicators in PRSPs

The current generation of poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) do not always contain indicators for agriculture, while national agricultural sector programmes often operate without coherent sector monitoring systems. Indicators selected in Danish-supported agricultural sector programmes (ASPS) are mostly designed to measure the specific effects of Danida's support, making them unlikely to serve as nationally-selected sector indicators. This calls for assessing how ASPS monitoring and indicators can be adjusted in support of national sector and PRS monitoring. The PRSPs are being constantly revised, either to produce completely new papers or as part of the annual PRPS revision process. This usually offers good opportunities for aligning – within a reasonable timeframe – PRSP indicators with international standards (i.e. MDGs), or for aligning ASPS indicators with PRSP or other national standards.

5. Objectives and indicators in SPS

Although agricultural issues are only indirectly addressed by the MDGs, while many PRSPs have little to say about agricultural objectives and activities, it is necessary to consider how to design country- and sector-

¹ For further elaboration on this issue, please refer to the general note "Monitoring at Programme and Project Level."

² For further reading, please refer to "Agriculture and Achieving the Millennium Development Goals", World Bank and IFPRI, 2006.

specific monitoring and indicator systems to support the monitoring of the PRS and MDGs. Some of the indicators with related monitoring tools listed in Annex 2 are relevant to both MDGs (poverty monitoring) and purely agriculture activities and objectives. Although these are frequently used indicators in agriculture sector programmes, it is important that the list should neither be understood as a blueprint nor as an exhaustive collection of possible agricultural indicators. It is to be used for inspirational purposes when monitoring and designing programmes or projects.

The list has been organised so that both indicators and monitoring tools relate very closely to each level of the LFA matrix as well as to each other. Serving only as examples detached from any specific context, these indicators and objectives are not entirely SMART, as outlined in the general note, since no timeframe or quantified value are attached to them.

The list focuses mainly on capacity-building objectives, outputs and activities, since capacity-building is a central element in most programmes. As will be seen, indicators from the level of immediate objectives downwards have been outlined at three stakeholder levels: Farmers' level, district/ implementers' level and MoA national level, whereas the development objective and the intermediate objectives are the same for all stakeholders, indicating that the activities and outputs of all three stakeholder levels will eventually lead to the same development objective.

One important feature to note is the difference between “output indicators” and “impact indicators”. “Number of farmers trained” is a typical output indicator, in fact merely accounting for the fact that the activity has taken place. But in addition to ascertaining this, we would like to know how many farmers actually changed their behaviour because of the training. This is normally a much more complicated aspect to monitor. Even so, the programme management, anchored within the national institution, should be ambitious enough to do so. The achievement of simple output indicators can easily become a pretext for complacency, with the risk of wasting money and efforts over a long time without measuring any real outcome and impact on the ground.

When monitoring complex issues such as poverty alleviation, proxy indicators³ can be of great help. Poverty reduction is often monitored by means of a long range of indicators, such as *production levels for various crops, income levels in cash and kind, nutritional levels, various rights (access to land, safe water etc.), knowledge (literacy rates, school enrolment etc.) and health (mortality rates, birth weights etc.), all related to both gender and social group.* However relevant such indicators may be, they are very costly to monitor in programmes targeting large segments of the population, especially in countries without up-to-date high-quality statistics. In order to overcome this constraint, proxy indicators could be used instead. In East Africa, a more crude proxy indicator of poverty reduction related to agricultural activities could be, for example, *malnutrition in children under five*. Instead of monitoring income levels, e.g. through comprehensive income surveys (which are difficult and unreliable due to the sensitivity of the issue), it is possible to monitor proxy indicators such as the *number of houses with tin roofs* and *average number of bicycles per household*. Indeed, this example has also been applied in East Africa. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that wealth-related proxy indicators tend to be locality-specific, as people's degree of wealth and poverty may find different expressions from one place to another. Such proxy indicators may therefore not be the best to compare between different localities.

In sector budget support and most SWAs, the natural M&E objective is to establish or strengthen a sector monitoring system, and not to measure the effects of a particular donor's support to the sector programme. In such cases, the results of Danida's inputs cannot be monitored separately. The aim is to build up a system and solid monitoring capacity that responds to the requirements of the sector, thus ensuring sustainability.

³ For explanation of the concept, see the general note.

The system will often include monitoring of the development activities of the support programme(s), as well as other processes taking place in the agricultural sector, including the impact of policies and strategies.

It is generally beneficial to build the monitoring system into the overall management information system of the ministry, though the latter must also address the monitoring challenges posed by the vast non-governmental part of the sector. Establishing this rather complex system is potentially very time-consuming, and it relies heavily on the availability of local resources and monitoring capacity. Due to the complexity and time involved, the challenge is more daunting than establishing a system for monitoring a particular donor's support only, but necessary nonetheless.

However, there is a risk that the focus on establishing or strengthening a comprehensive monitoring system for the entire sector will leave programme managers with insufficient information on their particular intervention during the prolonged period in which the system is set up. It may therefore become necessary to establish, or maintain, some programme monitoring, while the national system is under construction.

6. Methods of sector monitoring

The following presents examples of data-collection methods and procedures at the activity, output, outcome and impact level. Some are sector-specific methods, while others can be used in several sectors.

However, before choosing the methods, it is necessary to consider the objective of the monitoring at hand, the cost issue, how to foster ownership, relevance and local-monitoring capacity:

1. Objective: identify the objective of the monitoring exercise before choosing the tools. Is the aim to monitor a particular programme intervention or to monitor the entire sector development? Is it control, documentation or learning?
2. Costs and resources: for example, use existing data and monitoring procedures as much as possible, and avoid expensive surveys whenever possible.
3. Ownership: self-monitoring may foster ownership and fast use of results, but without sufficient quality control, its quality may easily become substandard.
4. Relevance: identify the most precise way of monitoring the chosen indicators.
5. Capacity: the choice of monitoring system must take existing institutional capacity into account.

These five considerations may clash, and it is often necessary to reach a suitable compromise between them.

Impact monitoring

Impact monitoring is complex, and it is usually not the task of individual programmes or even sectors. In fact, impact monitoring normally relates to the general process of poverty reduction as monitored by the national systems of PRS monitoring. In certain cases, however, it may be necessary to collect impact-related information at the level of each programme. In such cases, existing statistical material on income levels, nutritional levels etc. can be of great help – provided the data is reliable, updated and targets the relevant geographical area and population sections, which is far from always the case in developing countries. If there is no data of the required quality, it may be necessary to undertake more comprehensive household baseline and impact surveys. Using sampling methods and proxy indicators – as mentioned in the general note – may greatly reduce the cost of such surveys. It is, for instance, possible in an African context to substitute simpler analysis of the development in housing quality (e.g. from thatched roof to iron-sheet roofs) for large-scale household surveys on poverty, supplemented with statistics from local clinics regarding malnourishment among children under five years of age.

Outcome monitoring

The outcome of a given intervention would normally be to fulfil its immediate objectives. In the DAC terminology⁴, outcome is defined as “the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs”.

Data for monitoring at the outcome level may be found in existing statistics, e.g. on crop yields, service delivery levels etc. In some cases, it may be relevant to conduct specific surveys as a means of adjusting intervention strategies and activities. Such surveys may be part of the regular work of extension agents or other service providers. Another method is to have the target group conduct surveys of itself, e.g. letting an organisation conduct its own survey of its members’ satisfaction. Self-monitoring can also take place at the level of farmers, who register the inputs and outputs in relation to a given activity.

When conducting self-monitoring, one should pay attention of the risk of the organisation or farmers not being completely objective. Manipulation of data is particularly likely if participants suspect a certain outcome to be “better” than another to substantiate continuation of the support in question.

Output monitoring

Monitoring at the output level relates directly to the “product” of a given activity e.g. number of courses conducted, meetings held, area restored, research conducted etc. Such data will often be collected anyway, as part of routine administration. As the outputs are linked closely to the activities, aspects of budget performance will form part of output monitoring (i.e. assessing the link between money spent and outputs achieved).

Indicators required for reporting on the annual business plans of representations (VPA indicators) are selected among the output indicators in the various programme components.

Activity monitoring

Activity monitoring oversees the progress of scheduled activities, one by one, and is usually highly quantitative (amount of people, extent of area, etc.). At this level, physical and financial progress may easily be compared, matching reports on advances on the ground with expenditure data.

Physical monitoring is normally based on the implementers’ reporting on own activities. It may be supplemented by, for instance, farmers’ verification of the data before compilation. Table 1 presents an example of a management information system that summarises data on activity monitoring in a programme.

⁴ The DAC “Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management” (2002) can be downloaded from www.oecd.org/dac

Table 1: Management-level monitoring reporting, summarising component and programme progress

Components ^o	Irrigation	Institutional support	Seed industry	Livestock production	Programme total
No. of activities planned to be started	100	100	100	100	400
% of activities actually started compared to target	90	95	80	90	88.75
% of completed activities compared to the period's target	85	75	79	50	72.25
% of activities achieving 90-100% of the period's target	70	70	65	45	62.5
% of activities attaining less than 50% of the period's target	10	5	2	1	4.5
No. of people involved:					
Women:	4000	40	300	35	4375
Men:	5000	50	400	200	5650
% of activities started more than 2 weeks later than planned	30	28	4	24	21.5
% of activities overspending by more than 10%	6	9	2	0	4.25

Annexes

Annex 1

This annex contains a list of relevant literature. Of particular interest is document no. 2: a working paper on Monitoring Systems in (Danida) Agriculture Sector Programme Support, which is based on the findings from a web-based discussion carried out during 2001-02. The working paper provides more details and examples on the subject than the present Technical Note and may be consulted for more in-depth descriptions and discussions.

Relevant literature:

1. Development of Indicators for ASPs and FSPs VPAs, Danida 2003
2. Monitoring Systems in Agriculture Sector Programme Support – A working Paper; Danida; 2002 (Result of web-based discussion in Danida and co-operating countries)
3. Monitoring and Evaluation of Agriculture and Rural Development Projects; Dennis J. Casley and Denis A. Lury; The World Bank; 1998
4. Reporting on the Millennium Development Goals at the Country Level; United Nations Development Group; October 2001
5. Indicators for Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals; United Nations Development Group; 2003
6. Monitoring the millennium development goals; Carraro, L., S. Khan, S. Hunt, G. Rawle, M. Robinson, M. Antoninis; Oxford Policy Management; May 2003
7. PRSP Source Book, Chapter 3: Monitoring and Evaluation; Prenzushi, G., Gloria Rubio, K. Subbarao
8. "Agriculture and Achieving the Millennium Development Goals", World Bank and IFPRI, 2006

Annex 2

This annex contains four logframes for an ASPS with three intermediate objectives pertaining to the development objective. These are shown in Table 1, with their respective indicators. Under each of the three intermediate objectives (i.e. for each of the components), a particular logframe shows the underlying immediate objectives, the outputs, the activities and the inputs, all with their indicators. (Table 2 to 4). All tables also contain the “monitoring tools” (or “means of verification”) allowing the indicators to be monitored.

Table 1: Logframe 1: Development and intermediate objectives of logframes for all stakeholders

<p>Development objective: Standard of living of the target population sustainably improved, including decrease in extreme poverty and hunger (MDG 1)</p>	<p>Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MDG indicator 1: Proportion of population below \$1 per day ● MDG indicator 2: Poverty gap ratio incidence x depth of poverty ● MDG indicator 3: Poorest quintile's share of national consumption ● MDG indicator 13: Under-five child mortality rate ● Income per head – disaggregated by gender, age, and ethnicity ● Proportion of population with access to public and/or private services ● Distances to public and private services ● No. of household members attending school ● Off-farm income earning opportunities ● Monthly business profits ● Type of housing (e.g. from thatched to tin roof) ● No. of days with inadequate food 	<p>Monitoring tools (means of verification)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identification and use of area-based official statistics of sufficient quality when available ● Household surveys as an alternative to official statistics ● Baseline surveys using participatory rural appraisal (PRA) methods ● Impact studies using PRA methods ● Participatory monitoring/monitoring of unexpected impact: stakeholders identify relevant indicators; perceptions of poverty situation/living standard ● Measure nutritional diversity and levels
<p>Intermediate objectives: A. Sustainable farming practices and increased agricultural production in <u>supported districts</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Soil conservation, e.g. tree coverage, farm terraces and vegetation cover on rangeland among target and non-target population in supported districts ● MDG indicator 25: Proportion of land area covered by forest ● MDG indicator 26: Land area protected to maintain biological diversity ● Volume of marketed surplus ● Output per hectare for various crops ● Amount of livestock per hectare in various agro ecological zones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Arial, satellite-based and/or panoramic photo survey ● Existing statistics on agricultural production levels ● Survey: monitoring selected fields via sequential monitoring ● Farmers' own assessment ● Farm budget surveys ● Market surveys on pricing and price structure ● Livestock count
<p>B. Demand-driven, cost-effective and gender-responsive extension approach adopted by MoA <u>in all districts</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No. of districts and number of development areas per district where the demand-driven approach is implemented ● Percent of population reached ● New research results reach target population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports from DAOs ● Visits to districts to monitor quality of the approach practised ● Survey of farmers' knowledge of latest research results ● Farmers own assessment
<p>C. MoA's capacity to regulate and monitor the sector is increased</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enforcement of regulations ● Early warning systems regarding famine are functioning ● Private sector is well monitored ● High level of co-operation between research stations and extensionists ● Proactive policy and strategy development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Survey: Are regulations known and seen as legitimate by stakeholders? Do they regard them as being enforced? ● Character and numbers of open conflicts ● Timely relief reaches farmers ● Quality control of produce ● Questionnaire survey among extensionists ● Survey: Stakeholder satisfaction with existing policies/strategies

Table 2: Immediate objective, output, activity and input indicators related to farmers and their organisations

<p>Immediate objectives:</p> <p>A 1. Improved management by farmers of soil, water, vegetation and animal resources.</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adoption rates: extension messages followed regarding, for instance, improved ploughing and terraces laid correctly ● Management improvements (transparency etc.) ● Organisations' activities and objectives match ● Increasing number of members 	<p>Monitoring tools (means of verification):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Field sample surveys on degree of extension messages followed by farmers ● Aerial and satellite surveys
<p>A 2. Formal and non-formal farmers' organisations strengthened</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● List of members ● Annual/financial reports of organisations ● Interviews with participants on the relevance, practical effect and usefulness of courses, and observing the courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Survey among members about the improvements ● Survey among members on whether the organisation makes a difference in their lives (would it matter to live without the organisation?)
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>A. 1.1: Gender disaggregated indicators and strategies on how to increase sustainable management of farming resources developed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strategy paper used for planning of gender-responsive extension activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Checking quality of strategy paper
<p>A 1.2: Training of male and female farmers in improved farming methodologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No. of farmers trained ● Ratio of male/ female farmers trained ● No. of farmers who find the training relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● List of participants ● Visits at training courses ● Check of evaluation forms and interviews with farmers

<p>A.2.1: Formal farmers' organisations trained in bookkeeping, management, project management etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of farmers trained No. of courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants Check of logbooks and evaluations forms Auditing reports
<p>A.2.2: Non-formal farmers' organisations incl. women's groups trained in bookkeeping, management, project management etc., and training of trainers (ToT) in methodologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of farmers trained No. of courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants Check of logbooks and evaluations forms
<p>A. 2.3: Coaching during actual project management and ad hoc analysis of organisational problems/ opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of coaching sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports, visits to groups, log books
<p>(selected) Activities: A. 2.1.1 Develop training methodology A. 2.1.2 Identify trainers A. 2.2.1 Identify trainers A. 2.3.1 Develop coaching methodologies A. 2.3.2 Select areas to test methodologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of new training methods developed No. of field trials No. of trainers identified No. of methodologies approved No. of test areas selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports from field staff Quality check of documented methodologies Participation in field trails and evaluate training Check of approvals Progress reports from field staff
<p>(selected) Inputs: Funds disbursed in timely fashion by MoA to districts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of all disbursements which are timely Percentage of all budgeted funds which are disbursed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial reports from districts and MoA

Table 3: Immediate objective, output, activity and input indicators related to the district or implementer level

Immediate objectives:	Indicators:	Monitoring tools (means of verification):
B 1. An extension system based on a demand-driven and gender-responsive approach is established in development areas (DA) in selected districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of male/female farmers requesting support from the extensionists Extent/degree of farmers' cost sharing % in (DA) No. of farmers repeating new farming methodologies in subsequent years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of extension activities carried out including scan of recipients' gender Cost-sharing registries Sample surveys (i.e. by satellite) of farming practises focussing on sustainable management of soil, water, vegetation and animal resources
B 2. Demand-driven extension approach introduced nationwide (after test in selected districts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of district-level meetings about the approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress report from dissemination team
B 3. Gender-responsive organisational strengthening of extension services obtained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of job-satisfaction among staff at the extension organisations (management, tasks and related working conditions) Number of male/female staff at all job levels A gender-responsive strategy for extension activities adopted Activities targeting female farmers, such as advice on small-scale poultry rearing, sustainable firewood collection, and cattle raising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey of satisfaction with advice and assistance from the extension staff, based on interviews with farmers and other users of the extension system Check of staff lists Check of strategy Interview with staff and farmers about implementation of the strategy as well as the no. and kind of specific gender-responsive activities carried out
B 4. Latest research results are included in extension packages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of districts where appropriate planting material and soil conservation methods are used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of curriculum and sample survey extension activities
Outputs: B 1.1: Up to 20-30 Development Areas (DA) in 4 pilot districts organised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of development area plans completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of no. and quality of plans No. of plans with clear area-bound planning and budgets
B. 1.2: DA committees established as gender responsive community organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of regulations describing scope, working procedures and activities for DA committees approved No. of women members/ chairpersons etc. No. of times DA Committees meet No. of operational decisions taken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field progress reports on work Check of prepared regulations Check of lists of members Check of minutes of meetings
B 1.3: Participatory planning process based on participatory rural appraisals (PRA), and detailed planning based on community LFAs, established and implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of high-quality curricula for training in use of participatory tools No. of PRAs and LFAs undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of no. and quality of curricula developed Check of PRA/LFA reports
B 1.4 Selected extension officers trained in participatory planning tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of courses and persons trained No. of participants that find the training relevant No. of participatory plans made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants; logbooks and evaluations forms Interviews with participants on relevance, practical effect and usefulness of courses; visits to courses

B 2.1: Low-cost and gender-focused tools for evaluation and dissemination of demand-driven extension approach established (tested in DA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of tools approved by MoA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of meetings incl. conclusions on action to be taken
B 2.2: Dissemination of approach to districts nationwide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of district meetings on the subject No. of exchange visits to pilot areas No. of districts carrying out new activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress report from dissemination team Quarterly progress reports on dissemination of the DA approach
B 2.3: Extension officers trained in the approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of persons trained Participants who find training relevant and of high quality No. of farmers receiving new types of training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants, training logbooks and evaluations forms Interviews with participants and visit courses
B 3.1: Staff trained in IT, team-building, gender responsiveness in employment and farmers' training etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of participants Quality of training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lists of participants, logbooks and evaluation forms Interviews with participants on relevance, practical effect and usefulness of courses
B 3.2: Supply office equipment, computers, vehicles to districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of items delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports, delivery notes and visit to districts
B 4.1: Extensionists trained in latest research methodologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Evaluation reports
B 4.2: News bulletin produced and sent to extensionists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of issues and number of copies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of number of copies as well as quality
B 4.3: Extension staff trained at research centres in practical development of appropriate planting material and soil conservation methods and other relevant issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of participants No. of participants that find the training relevant No. of plants produced in home districts No. of soil conservation measures taken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants, logbooks and evaluation forms Interview with participants on relevance, effect and usefulness of courses (document in report) Check of documentation of test results (report)
(selected) Activities: B 2.3.1 Prepare training needs assessment B 2.3.2 Develop curriculum on training in communication, team-building and assertiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TNA analysis received, presented and accepted among staff No. of curricula developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on TNA analysis Check of curricula
(selected) Inputs: Sufficient manpower available on time in MoA and districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of man-hours available for the activities outlined above Sufficient budget for activities available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of rosters and list of training participants Check of budgets and plans

Table 4: Logframe 4: Ministerial capacity building indicators on immediate objective, output, activity and input levels

<p>Immediate objectives: C 1: Early warning and private-sector monitoring systems functioning C 2: Management capacity of middle and top-level managers in MoA increased</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All famine situations reported on in timely fashion • Private sector: system for quality control of farm produce, production levels etc. established <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Motivated staff 2. Quick response to requests from service users 3. Quick response to request from policy level 4. Time spend on talking about managers by staff (as little as possible is good!) 5. Managers ability to give constructive feedback 6. Delegation of authority 7. Focus of meetings is agricultural and not internal ministerial issues 8. Form of meetings (dialogue or "speeches") 9. Management by budget frames or traditional detailed budgets 10. Budget delegation (central or decentral) 11. Transparent decision making 12. Time the manager spends in the organisation 13. Sharing of information and knowledge among employees 14. Staff turnover (brain drain) 15. Budget over/ under-spending 16. Regular planning/budget procedures 17. Management coherent with planning/budgeting 	<p>Monitoring tools (means of verification):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spot checks to compare reports with reality • Quality control of the system through spot checks of produce <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working environment survey 2. Service-user satisfaction survey at different levels 3. Interviews with politicians 4. Survey among employees 5. Survey among employees 6. Participation in meetings and interview employees 7. Participation in meetings and check of minutes 8. Check of organisational chart 9. Check of no. of persons authorised to sign official documents 10. Open tender procedures, minutes of meetings 11. Observations and interviews with employees 12. Access to records/material; staff magazine; availability of management meeting minutes; employees' experience of knowledge sharing 13. Observations and interviews, checking flow of information (are the rules followed?), are the employees working alone or in teams? etc. 14. Check of staff registry, "leavers" educational background and age profile of organisation 15. Check of accounts <p>In general: participatory monitoring regarding managers, officials and end-users' assessments of the management capacity</p>
<p>C 3: Ability to master various professional fields increased</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved skills (as per professional field) incl. word processing etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality check of word-processing in selected reports and letters

C 4: Organisational structures and procedures improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computerised financial administration system in place • Monitoring system in place • Quality assuring system in place • Conducive organisational culture • Personnel administration system in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checks of quality and timeliness of financial reports, annual expenditure reviews etc. • Checks regarding monitoring reports • Checks of quality assessor's signature on important documents • Observation of behaviour, analysis of outputs • Salaries paid on time and personnel regulations known by employees
Outputs: C 1.1: Early warning system database established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early warning reports based on new database printed on a regular basis • Procedures approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality check of reports
C 1.2: Procedures for collecting early warning data established		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check of approval
C 2.1: Modern management training (communication, feedback, conflict management, facilitation etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Trained • Managerial Operations Manual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports • Training evaluation reports
C 2.2: Exchange visits/ stationing of managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of participants and no. of trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports • Training evaluation reports
C 2.3: Onsite facilitation and coaching of managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of consultations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisor/consultant reports
C 2.4: Analysis of organisational capacity gaps including baseline survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis/baseline report approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality check of report
C 2.5: Transparent motivation procedures created	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New carrier guideline produced • Incentives given according to guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality check of guideline • Interviews with stakeholders
C 3.1: Training in various professional skills (e.g. word-processing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports • Training evaluation reports
C 4.1: Organisational structures and procedures analysed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report containing the analysis is approved • Institutional Analysis: Mandate, Structure, Procedures, Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality check of report
C 4.2: Financial, monitoring and quality assurance systems improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparent and high quality reports produced timely • Reports build into procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative analysis of reports
(selected) activities C 4.2.1: Analyse current financial, monitoring and quality assurance systems and requirements C 4.2.2: Develop new procedures, formats and software	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report containing analysis approved • Procedures, formats and software tested and approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality check of report • Check of approvals

<p>(selected) inputs: Funds disbursed in timely fashion by MoA and donor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pct. of all disbursements which are timely • Actual disbursement compared to budgeted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial reports from donor and MoA
---	--	--