

**THE MITCHELL GROUP  
TANZANIA FEED THE FUTURE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROJECT**

**REPORT OF DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT (DQA)  
TANZANIA STAPLES VALUE CHAIN ACTIVITY (NAFAKA)  
MARCH-MAY 2013**

**INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW:**

In accordance with procedures laid out in Automated Directive (ADS) 203, specifically, that “a data quality assessment must...be conducted at least once every three years for those data reported to Washington,” the Tanzania Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation Project (TFtF-M&E), the M&E Contractor to the USAID/Tanzania Feed the Future Initiative (FTF/T), conducted a Data Quality Assessment (DQA) on the Tanzania Staples Value Chain Activity indicators during March-May 2013.

The Tanzania Staples Value Chain Activity, commonly referred to by its Kiswahili name - Nafaka - is the FTF/T Implementing Partner (IP) charged with increasing the production of rice and maize and the productivity and earnings of smallholder rice and maize farmers, and expanding the markets for those commodities. Nafaka is a multi-partner endeavor organized around four (4) major functional components - Agricultural Productivity, Agricultural Marketing and Trade, Development of (Farmers) Associations, and Vulnerable Populations.

The Nafaka prime contractor, ACDI/VOCA, has sub-contracted with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) who, in turn, has sub-sub-contracted with the Archdiocese of Ifakara (Aol), Farm Input Promotions (FIPS), the International Fertilizer Development Corporation (IFDC), Mtandao wa Vikundi vya Wakulima Tanzania (Network of Farmers' Associations) (MVIWATA), Kilimanjaro Agricultural Training Center (KATC), and the Rural and Urban Development Initiative (RUDI), all of which are NGOs (non-governmental organizations), and the private, for-profit firms Kilombero Valley Teak Company (KVTC) and Kilombero Plantations (KPL), to implement specific project sub-activities and service specific beneficiary groups.

(There are additional Nafaka sub-contractor/partners, including Danya, Crown Agents, and others; and, while those entities play important roles in the Project - Danya, for example, provides SBCC (Social and Behavioral Change Communications) messaging – it is our understanding that they do not manage results data, and, therefore, they are not discussed herein.)

Nafaka's Headquarters office is located in Dar es Salaam and staffed by the Chief of Party (CoP), the M&E Manager, and administrative and financial personnel. The Project operates principally out of an office in Morogoro (Urban), where the Deputy Chief of Party (DCOP), M&E Specialist, and technical staff are based. A number of agronomists are stationed at KPL in Mngeta, Kilombero District, Morogoro Region; and, two (2) more M&E Assistants are stationed in sub-offices or small field operating units in Ifakara and Kibaigwa, Kongwa District, Dodoma Region, the latter also providing coverage for operations in Kiteto and Babati Districts in Manyara.

## DQA ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE:

Due to the wide geographic coverage of the Project – it operates in five (5) districts across all three (3) regions of the Feed the Future/Tanzania initiative (FTF/T) (mainland) Zone of Influence (ZOI) – Dodoma, Manyara and Morogoro, and Zanzibar, the relatively large number of entities and organizations involved, the different data collection and management methodologies employed, and, important, the different working combinations of the partners, we felt it necessary to establish a basis upon which we could rationally view and analyze Nafaka's management and the flow of results data. Nafaka operations appear to be organized, mainly, around three major Project functional components - Productivity, Marketing, and Association Development and, to a lesser degree, Vulnerable Populations – and what are referred to as “clusters;” and, while the cluster concept or orientation may be useful for logistical and programming purposes, it is, as far as we could tell, a geographic paradigm that in our opinion does not serve to further the understanding of the flow of results data.

Our view of Nafaka – which, we emphasize, was adopted to facilitate the conduct of the DQA and is not intended as a recommendation that Nafaka alter its organizational thinking or structure – is that of a program that addresses agricultural production and productivity and the development of markets and farmers associations – what, henceforth, we refer to as “value-chain activities” – with smallholder rice and maize farmers (at the time the DQA was conducted, Project beneficiaries were overwhelmingly rice farmers) that serves as an umbrella for eight (8) sub-activities that, in no particular order of priority, we would briefly describe, as follows:

1. **Value-chain activities:** with smallholder rice farmers implemented by ACDI/VOCA, FIPS, IFDC, and RUDI in the vicinity of the towns of Mlimba, Ifakara, and Mang'ula in the District of Kilombero.
2. **Value-chain activities:** with smallholder rice farmers implemented by ACDI/VOCA, IFDC, FIPS, and MVIWATA in the District of Mvomero.
3. **Value-chain activities:** with smallholder maize farmers implemented by ACDI/VOCA, FIPS, and IFDC in the areas of Kongwa (Dodoma) and Kiteto (Manyara).
4. **Value-chain activities:** with smallholder rice farmers - KPL out-growers - through the System for Rice Intensification (SRI) - implemented in conjunction with the Kilombero Plantations (KPL) and IFDC in ten (10) villages adjacent to KPL in and around Mngeta, Kilombero.
5. **Value-chain activities:** with smallholder rice farmers-members of the UWAWAKUDA Water-Users Association implemented by ACDI/VOCA, IFDC, and Kilimanjaro Agricultural Training Center (KATC) in Dakawa, Mvomero.
6. **Formation of Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILCs):** implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and the Diocese of Ifakara with vulnerable households in Kilombero.
7. **Value-chain activities:** with smallholder rice farmers employed by the Kilombero Valley Teak Company (KVTC) and other smallholder rice farmers implemented by ACDI/VOCA, IFDC, and KVTC in villages adjacent to the operational area of KVTC in Kilombero.

8. **Demonstration Plots:** the dissemination to smallholder rice farmers of improved agricultural practices through demonstration plots implemented by ACDI/VOCA in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture of the government of Zanzibar at four (4) sites in three (3) districts of Zanzibar.

The sum total of the sub-projects and related activities outlined above constitutes what is commonly referred to as “Nafaka.”

**Note:** We were led to believe that some of the sub-projects and activities above were in different stages of planning for expansion into additional districts and targeting a larger number of beneficiaries.

## **SUMMARY LISTING OF ALL INDICATORS ASSESSED BY CLASS:**

### **FEED THE FUTURE INDICATOR(S):**

#### **OUTCOME INDICATORS:**

- **4.5-4** Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country)(RiA)
- **4.5.1-27 and CBLD-5:** Score, in percent of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)
- **4.5.2-2** Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)(WOG)
- **4.5.2-5** Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)(WOG)
- **4.5.2-23** Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)
- **4.5.2-28** Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)(WOG)
- **4.5.2-38** Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)

#### **OUTPUT INDICATORS:**

- **4.5-10:** Total increase in installed storage capacity (m3) (S)
- **4.5.2-7** Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA)(WOG)

- **4.5.2-11** Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA)(WOG)
- **4.5.2-12:** Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)
- **4.5.2-13:** Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)
- **4.5.2-14:** Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)
- **4.5.2-29** Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA)(WOG)
- **4.5.2-30:** Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)
- **4.5.2-37:** Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (S)
- **4.5.2-39:** Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development:
  - ...in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance
  - ...in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance
  - ...in Phase III: made possible for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)

**USAID/T CUSTOM INDICATOR:**

**Yield** – Kilogram per hectare for rice, maize and horticulture (*this indicator is one of five data points used to calculate indicator 4.5-4 gross margin*)

**NAFAKA CUSTOM INDICATOR:**

- Number and Value of buyer agreements (informal or formal)

**USAID/T/BFS TECHNOLOGY INDICATOR:**

- Nafaka monitors a disaggregate of indicator 4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance: *the number of hectares under which Urea Deep Placement (UDP) technology is applied for rice production.*

**OVERARCHING FINDING(S):**

- a) ACDI/VOCA (A/V) has invested considerable resources and made a sustained effort to develop and put into practice what is intended to serve as a comprehensive M&E framework and performance management system and to put in place a staff capable of implementing that system; and, that effort should be commended and recognized as proof of their desire to provide to USAID results data of the highest possible quality on a timely basis.

- b) Upon scrutiny, however, Nafaka M&E comes across as less a “system” than a patchwork of forms and loosely-defined and adhered-to procedures that conform to and accommodate the needs and capabilities of the sub-contractors who partner with A/V in implementing the Project.
- c) While Nafaka presents itself as a unified operational entity as opposed to a collective of disparate organizations and activities, the reality, for project M&E, is that there is little integration and coordination among the partners; and, the integration that does exist is forced and not a result of a systematic blending of the M&E-related tasks performed by the partner organizations. What you have, in fact, are separate and different programming philosophies and operational modalities, separate and different data collection methodologies, and separate and different reporting systems and formats, all needing to be harmonized at peak reporting-submission periods, precisely the most difficult time to accomplish such an objective.
- d) Nafaka M&E, while containing the essentials of sound results monitoring and reporting, e.g. data collection tools, personnel, equipment, etc., requires organization in order to effectively deal with the widespread geography of the Project, the myriad agents involved in Project implementation, and the logistics of transferring results data for a large number of indicators between and among the various management levels of the different organizations involved. The A/V M&E staff, upon whom the bulk of the responsibility for results reporting falls, while seemingly capable of managing project M&E, do not have project management experience and expertise in the depth required to systematize the flow of results data and effect its efficient collation so that it produces a coherent and stable snapshot of Project performance at any given point in time. The “system” is plagued, among other things, by the overlapping of coverage areas and beneficiaries served by Nafaka partners, creating a strong potential for multiple-counting of beneficiaries.
- e) Nafaka M&E is supported by M&E professionals at A/V headquarters in Washington, DC and the A/V Regional Office in Nairobi, Kenya. A/V has, in addition, contracted technical assistance from Kimetrica, a private firm that has designed and is in the process of installing a web-based data-management system intended, among other things, to store Project data and facilitate reporting. The aforementioned entities embody a considerable amount of M&E talent and expertise, however, they are removed geographically from and lack day-to-day contact with the on-the-ground programming realities and problems faced by Nafaka; and, while they should continue to provide advice and technical assistance to the Project, they cannot, in our opinion, take the place of a strong, local M&E presence and capability. Finally, while current Nafaka M&E staff appear to be knowledgeable, engaged, and diligent, they require mentoring and seasoning if they are to efficiently manage Nafaka M&E and provide results data and reporting of the quality and accuracy required by USAID.
- f) The above and other specific issues discussed herein cast doubt on the accuracy of the results data generated and reported by Nafaka and tend to diminish confidence in its overall reliability. It is our overarching finding that the current Nafaka M&E methodology requires organization and clarity in the forms and procedures employed, and, most important, in the roles and responsibilities of those tasked with M&E and reporting. We iterate that the elements required for a sound M&E system, including personnel, are in place; and, what is missing is the organization of system functions and the precise specification and timing of tasks to be performed by A/V and sub-contractor personnel. The foregoing assumes even greater urgency in light of the desire of USAID/T and the willingness of Nafaka to “scale-up,” i.e. increase both

the number of sites in which Nafaka operates and beneficiaries reached, not to mention the recent expansion of Project activities to Zanzibar.

## **OVERARCHING RECOMMENDATION(S):**

- a) We recommend a systematic reconstruction of Project M&E aimed at the creation of a true “Nafaka M&E system” - a data collection and reporting system that unifies the M&E procedures and the results data generated by all Nafaka sub-contractors and implementing partners – a system that produces a singular, stable, and coherent measurement of Project achievement at any given point in time, particularly for those indicators shared by more than one partner and/or sub-project described above.
- b) Reconstruction should, in our opinion, begin with an examination of the Intermediate and sub-Intermediate Results of the Nafaka Results Framework by a team composed of Nafaka senior managers and key M&E staff, led by an external agent, to include an analysis of all current Nafaka indicators with an aim to clarifying their relevance and the methodologies to be employed in their monitoring and measurement. In other words: back to basics.
- c) We would emphasize the mention above of an external agent; and, would encourage Nafaka to use an outsider to lead or guide the development of a new M&E system. An external agent would, we believe, ensure a non-vested and objective view of the Project and Project M&E. S/he would bring to the exercise an element of distance and impartiality we feel will be difficult to attain by Nafaka M&E staff, particularly those who have had a hand in creating the current M&E framework.
- d) We have attempted to broadly outline such a system, which we recommend have, at minimum, the following components and characteristics:
  - A strengthened data collection capability at the primary or beneficiary level: (Far too many of the primary data-collection agents for far too many indicators are the farmers and beneficiaries themselves; and there is little evidence that they, the beneficiaries, are prepared and equipped to manage that task with proficiency and accuracy.)
  - A thorough understanding of each indicator by all relevant partners and agreement by the partners on the interpretation of the salient points of the indicator, i.e. what precisely triggers the counting of a beneficiary.
  - Collection of results data by each sub-contractor/partner on a quarterly basis for each indicator for which they have been assigned monitoring responsibility at each sub-activity implementation site; and, the collation of sub-activity results by each sub-contractor/partner into one consolidated report. For example, RUDI will collect and collate, i.e. summarize, its results data into one report for each sub-activity in which it is engaged; and, those reports will be collated by RUDI, i.e. summarized, into one report for submission to A/V on a quarterly basis. Similar reports should be produced through the same basic procedure and submitted by FIPS, MVIWATA, and CRS/Aol, and any other sub-contractor/partner assigned responsibility for an indicator. The point is that each sub-contractor/partner should be made responsible for producing on a quarterly basis a final report of results for the indicators assigned to the sub-contractor/partner.

- The sub-contractor/partner consolidated report discussed above is to contain relevant data for each indicator, i.e. baseline, target, and actual values, and an explanation of any deviation of 10% or more from the value of the target, positive or negative (see below for sub-contractor quarterly progress reporting).
- The supporting data for all consolidated reporting is to be stored and maintained by each participating or submitting sub-contractor/partner in a systematic and readily accessible manner or system designed in accordance with A/V specifications and with A/V approval; and, made available to A/V, whenever required.
- A formal schedule for the submission of data and reporting by the sub-contractors/partners; and, the enforcement of strict compliance with the schedule (in the absence of such compliance, formal non-compliance action to be taken by A/V).
- Data submitted that is “clean”, i.e. free of ambiguity, and verifiable (in the absence of data in the quality mandated, formal non-compliance action to be taken by A/V).
- An understanding that the reporting of data takes precedence over narrative progress reporting, which, if necessary, can be submitted at a later date due to the need by sub-contractors/partners to report to their headquarters’ offices.
- The definition of a formal data verification plan that provides for spot-checks of results data by specific M&E staff, including formal reporting of site visits and figures verified, and the definition of and compliance with formal verification methodologies, including the signatures of persons conducting the spot-checks et al.
- A determined effort to cut down on the verbosity and redundancy often displayed in quarterly narrative reporting. Quarterly narrative reporting by the subcontractors/partners that mimic, including branding, prime contractor reporting should be prohibited, particularly since all that is required, in addition to the results data, is a (maximum) 2-3 page summation of activities, progress toward sub-activity objectives or lack of same, and major activities to be undertaken during the upcoming quarter.
- Sub-contractor/partner quarterly progress reporting should follow the same format as that prescribed by USAID/T for the prime contractor.
- Along with a common understanding of the indicator being monitored (see above), the assigning of responsibility for the monitoring and reporting of certain indicators to specific organizations with the aim of precluding multiple-counting of beneficiaries.
- The collation by A/V of all sub-contractor/partner consolidated quarterly reports into one overall quarterly (data) report to take the form of a simple, uncluttered spread-sheet of all indicators with baseline, target, and actual figures and a brief explanation of deviation (+-10%), to be submitted to the CoP for his information and analysis.
- A quarterly meeting to be attended by the CoP, DCoP, M&E team, and other senior management with the sole purpose of discussing quarterly results with an aim to: a) the production of quarterly reporting to USAID/T; b) the facilitation of Project strategic planning; and, c) the gauging of progress toward key Project objectives as embodied in Project high-level indicators. (It is understood that meetings on specific M&E topics, issues, or problems, etc. can be convened at any time on an as-needed basis).
- The “internal” quarterly meeting discussed above to be followed immediately by a meeting between A/V and all sub-contractors/partners to discuss quarterly performance, progress toward the key objectives of each sub-contractor or partner and the Nafaka Project as a whole, activities to be undertaken in the upcoming quarter, and any M&E issues, problems, and challenges faced, with an aim to their prompt taking-up and resolution.

- That the format and content of all M&E and reporting of results and performance data take into consideration and to the extent feasible and practicable conform to the format and content of USAID Annual PPR reporting with the aim to facilitation of that exercise.

**SUMMARY OF KEY DATA QUALITY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTION (in no particular order of priority):**

ISSUE(S)	RECOMMENDATION(S)
<b>GENERAL OR OVERARCHING:</b>	
<p><b>Quantity of indicators:</b> Nafaka has far too many indicators: seventeen (17) FTF indicators, including 4.5-4: <i>gross margin</i>, which has five data points and, practically speaking, can be considered five (5) indicators. In addition, Nafaka monitors: a) five (5) custom indicators, and, b) Yield, required by USAID/T, for a total of twenty-three (23) indicators; and, c) a disaggregation of indicator 4.5.2-2 on “scalable-technology,” required by Bureau of Food Security (BFS).</p>	<p>Nafaka indicators should be analyzed from the standpoint of meaningfulness and their capacity to demonstrate project performance; and, some of the indicators currently being monitored, mainly those of the “output” type, should be removed from the Nafaka PMP and no longer monitored as soon as practicable.</p>
<p><b>Over-reliance on Project beneficiaries for data collection:</b> FIPS, RUDI, MVIWATA, and CRS/Aol all use beneficiaries to collect primary data; there is scant evidence that beneficiaries have the wherewithal to perform that task in a timely and accurate manner; rather, there is evidence, albeit anecdotal, that they are ill-prepared to perform this task in a consistently thorough manner.</p>	<p>That the collection of primary data be strengthened through a lessening in the use of beneficiaries and increased use of Project staff to perform that task. This can be affected through streamlining and better planning of tasks performed by M&amp;E staff.</p>
<p><b>Lack of precise definition of data-collection methodologies:</b> Nafaka data collection methodologies are not well-defined or sufficiently detailed. That lack of precision is reflected in the verbal explanations by Nafaka staff of the methodologies, which, at times, are vague and confusing. The foregoing creates doubt as to whether the methodologies are fully understood by those charged with monitoring them, and whether the indicators are being properly monitored. For some indicators, e.g. 4.5.2-38 et al, the interpretation of what precisely triggers the counting of a beneficiary or a value is unclear.</p>	<p>The data collection methodology for each indicator should be defined precisely on the PIRS for the indicator and summarized for ready reference on the indicator summary matrix table of the PMP. In addition, there must be surety that the operative word(s) of each indicator are interpreted in the same way by everyone involved in managing the indicator. Once the meaning of the indicator is clearly understood by A/V, follow-up in that regard with relevant partners should be undertaken. (We would add that formalizing data collection methodology is not done because it is called for – it is an exercise through which the IP can arrive at a thorough understanding of the indicator and, hence, the objective of the indicator.) For indicator 4.5.2-38: <i>value of new private sector investment</i>: what does Nafaka consider to be an “investment?” For indicator 4.5.2-5: <i>number of farmers who have applied new technologies or management practices</i>, what constitutes application or adoption?</p>

	The above are the types of questions that need to be asked for each indicator.
<b>Need to strengthen the capacity of key Nafaka M&amp;E staff:</b> Nafaka M&E staff is capable of managing Project M&E, but it does not possess the depth of experience in project management and organization required for the expeditious and efficient collection and collation of results data generated by several different entities using different methodologies over a wide geographic area. The foregoing is aggravated by the apparent lack of M&E capability of A/V sub-contractors/partners.	Nafaka should bring on-board a senior M&E manager to develop a unified Nafaka M&E system, at the same time providing capacity-building for national M&E staff. Nafaka should also review the M&E systems employed by other FTF/T IPs; and, they should research the use of more modern means of data collection and transmittal, including electronic and digital methodologies.
<b>Multiple-counting of beneficiaries:</b> the potential for multiple-counting of Nafaka beneficiaries exists on three (3) fronts or levels: externally, in terms of the multiple-counting of beneficiaries shared by Nafaka and other FTF/T IPs, i.e. TAPP and Tubocha; internally, because Nafaka partners sometimes serve the same beneficiaries at the same time; and, perhaps, within the same sub-contractor, e.g. IFDC has three (3) agents working with the same farmers. We did not discern formal mechanisms aimed at the prevention of multiple-counting for the above situations. (Furthermore, the issue of multiple-counting appears to be a lingering problem.)	A system that precludes multiple-counting for each convergence of partners and beneficiaries must be developed and installed. Possible solutions include: only one organization reporting data for a given indicator, exchange of information regarding beneficiaries, etc. What is critical to the resolution of this issue is that each convergence or instance of potential multiple-counting is treated separately; and the corrective procedure documented and monitored in terms of its application.
<b>Lack of harmonization of effort among partners operating at the same site:</b> the various Nafaka sub-contractor/partners, except, perhaps, for the effort at KPL, appear to be working independently of each other, even when two or more are engaged at the same site with the same beneficiaries. This extends to the use of Project language. At the same site, a farmer/beneficiary identifies him/herself as a Village Based Agricultural Advisor (VBAA) and Lead Farmer, depending on the sub-contractor/ partner with whom s/he is dealing at that particular time.	Each of the sub-activities outlined above should be analyzed in terms of their specific objectives and the means by which each sub-contractor/partner can contribute to those objectives, with the results of said analysis codified in the form of a set of formal objectives, targets, etc. for the particular sub-activity. In other words, each sub-activity, including the effort at KPL, should have its own "mini-Results Framework," if not graphically, at minimum, conceptually; and the specific role of each sub-contractor/partner in reaching the sub-project objective(s) should be clearly defined, including the indicator(s) for which each sub-contractor/partner has been assigned responsibility for monitoring and measurement.
<b>Lack of formal data verification schedule and methodology:</b> Project documentation talks about "data quality checks and verification" and actual verification is reportedly carried out, but formal descriptions of the frequency, content, and methodology of those	A formal data verification system and schedule, including precise definitions of what is to be verified must be defined as part of the M&E system. "Spot-checks" should take the form of "mini-DQAs" requiring a checklist that is formally signed by the appropriate parties as proof of verification of data.

<p>checks and verification are not available. In other words, Nafaka staff says they verify the data, but they were unable to specify who is responsible for verification of which data and the frequency of site visitation, etc.; and, formal proof of verification is not available.</p>	
<p><b>Lack of formal deadlines and a formal hierarchy of reporting:</b> we could not discern a formal schedule of submission deadlines for results data generated by Nafaka sub-contractors/partners and by the various M&amp;E personnel and entities operating within A/V, including the M&amp;E team itself; and it is unclear to whom results data is to be given and when, i.e. the flow of data is not fixed and appears to change in accord with whoever generates it, the sub-activity that generated the data, the indicator and type of data, etc.</p>	<p>As part of the new M&amp;E system, lines of communication and authority for M&amp;E must be clearly spelled out and codified in job descriptions of M&amp;E staff and any other person who handles results data. And the foregoing should be graphically depicted in organizational and data flow charts, including for each of the sub-contractors/partners and sub-activity.</p>
<p><b>Inappropriate indicator being monitored:</b> 4.5.2-39 <i>Number of technologies or management practices in one of three phases of development</i>, etc.: this indicator does not have applicability to Nafaka activities because it deals with technologies and management practices “under development,” while Nafaka promotes technologies and practices that have already been “developed,” i.e. researched and field tested, i.e. are “developed” and not, therefore, any longer “under development.”</p>	<p>FTF Indicator 4.5.2-39 should be removed from the Nafaka PMP and no longer monitored. Results demonstrating the adoption of new technologies and management practices by Nafaka beneficiaries should be reported under indicators 4.5.2-2, 4.5.2-5, and 4.5.2-28, as appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Excessive number of data collection tools, i.e. reporting forms:</b> Nafaka employs eighteen (18) different forms for the normal, on-going reporting of results data. Those forms, plus the IPRS, the FTFMS data collection template, the Annual Outcome Survey, and additional M&amp;E forms used by Nafaka partners results in a dizzying array of reporting forms and templates that call for a combined total of over twenty (20) different primary data collection agents. The eighteen (18) Nafaka forms had only recently been put into use at the time of the DQA; the instructions for their execution lack precision; and, we saw no evidence regarding pre-testing or that formal guidance and training in their use had been provided. The value of some of the data to be collected appears questionable in terms of its ability to demonstrate progress toward Project objectives. Last, we found no evidence of a systematic approach to the</p>	<p>An assessment of all data collection tools by all partners needs to be undertaken; and an alternative to eighteen (18) forms should be sought. One recommendation for consideration would be to rethink and redesign the forms, not in accordance with individual indicators only, but, instead, according to the partner and the indicators for which the partner has been assigned monitoring and reporting responsibility.</p>

<p>collation, recording, and entry of the data that the forms are intended to capture. One of the forms is purportedly used to record data on each individual beneficiary, which means that if Nafaka has, as they claim, roughly 18,000 beneficiaries, there must be 18,000 names recorded on innumerable pieces of paper; and, that creates questions as to who stores that data, where it is stored, how it is stored, and, very important, how it is accessed; and, last, and most important, how the data is used to advance reporting and demonstrate Project accomplishment and progress.</p>	
<p><b>Adequacy of Project field coverage, with specific regard to data collection and verification, and M&amp;E in general:</b> while no specific tests or formal comparisons were conducted, we came away with the impression that the SRI sub-activity at KPL operates more efficiently than the other sub-activities. Several factors may contribute to that impression, but one that deserves consideration is the higher number of agents relative to number of beneficiaries employed on the SRI/KPL activity. By way of explanation, the SRI effort at KPL employs six (6) agronomists while all the other sub-activities combined have (7) agronomists. FIPS, for example, has one (1) District Coordinator (DCO) per district in which they operate. He supervises more than thirty (30) VBAs, each of which serves over one-hundred (100) individual farmers. FIPS has been assigned the routine monitoring of seven (7) indicators. We have difficulty understanding how one DCO can collect accurate data generated by 7 indicators for what amounts to 3,000 + farmers, particularly given the relative complexity of some of the indicators, the harsh terrain, the inadequacy of record-keeping, etc.</p>	<p>As part of the design, development, and installation of a revised Nafaka M&amp;E system, a thorough and detailed review of the duties and responsibilities of all M&amp;E staff should be performed, with an aim, first, to the formation of an M&amp;E team adequate for the timely collection and reporting of accurate Project results data, and, secondly, with a view to increasing the efficiency of primary data collection and data verification at the primary level(s).</p>
<p><b>Inclusion of indicators absent supporting activities:</b> Nafaka demonstrates a tendency to include an indicator in the PMP in the absence of activities to produce the results measured by the indicator; and, then, to not report on the indicator because no activity took place. This is apparently done with the hope or expectation that results for the indicator will be generated at a future date.</p>	<p>All Nafaka indicators, including custom indicators, should be reviewed in terms of: a) their in-depth understanding by all Nafaka partners and M&amp;E staff, i.e. what precisely is being monitored and measured; b) the existence of on-going activities to generate results for the indicator during the subject reporting period; and, c) the existence of a clear explanation and concomitant understanding of the methodologies employed in the collection and analysis of results data for the indicator. (We would</p>

	note that adding an indicator to the PMP is much simpler than removing one, given the implications for reporting when removing an indicator.)
<p><b>Job descriptions of M&amp;E staff:</b> The job descriptions for key Nafaka M&amp;E personnel, while comprehensive and detailed in their description of overarching duties and responsibilities, are not specific and sufficiently detailed in terms of their duties to be performed on a daily basis (refer to data flow below). Moreover, there is little difference between the job descriptions of key M&amp;E staff-persons, i.e. the M&amp;E Manager and M&amp;E Assistant, and that blurs their roles and results in confusion as to precisely who is supposed to do what and when. We have additional concerns regarding the posting of the M&amp;E Manager in Dar es Salaam, when the center of project activity is clearly Morogoro. In sum: it appears that Nafaka M&amp;E is “managed,” not by the Manager, but by his nominal assistant, the M&amp;E Specialist, with the Manager’s job having evolved into something larger or more supervisory in nature.</p>	<p>Job descriptions for Nafaka M&amp;E personnel should be reformulated in accordance with the specific duties and responsibilities of M&amp;E team personnel as determined by the requirements of the new M&amp;E system, e.g. with whom each team member is to liaise, to whom each team member reports, their specific tasks and responsibilities, etc. Other Nafaka staff not officially designated as members of the M&amp;E team but required to manage results data should have those results-related tasks detailed in their job description(s). The revised job descriptions should conform, in general, to the tasks outlined in the overall Project M&amp;E Plan and PMP; and, an organizational chart of the M&amp;E team should form part of the system design. Last, the posts of the M&amp;E Manager and M&amp;E Specialist should be reviewed in terms of their proximity to actual M&amp;E challenges and requirements; and, the job descriptions for those two positions should be thoroughly reviewed and, among other things, reformulated to conform with reality, if and where appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Quantity and type of data collected and stored:</b> the amount and type(s) of “data” being collected and stored by A/V is excessive; the usefulness of much of it in measuring Project performance is questionable; and, its collection and entry consumes a huge and inordinate amount of staff time. Results data for several indicators is collected monthly, tripling the work-load if the data were collected quarterly. FIPS claims they collect data on a weekly basis, which, in our opinion, is excessive, unrealistic, and, frankly, impossible. The effect of much of the data collected and stored by Nafaka on Project reporting and planning can be likened to cholesterol in humans – it clogs the system and prevents it from functioning efficiently.</p>	<p>Data should be collected quarterly for output indicators. Data for other indicators should be collected annually or at an appropriate time, e.g. production data at the time of planting, etc. (The argument that monthly data collection insures accuracy or timeliness because data collection is tardy is, in our opinion, specious, because there is nothing proposed to prevent the tardiness of the reporting of the 3<sup>rd</sup> or last month of the quarter, and if the collection of the data for that last month is delayed, which is likely, then the data for the previous two months is not utilizable.) Monitoring should be on-going throughout the month to ensure that data will be ready for collection in the prescribed format(s) at the time of the quarterly submission date.</p>
<p><b>Excessive number of databases:</b> Several Nafaka M&amp;E and non-M&amp;E staff maintain results data on their individual computers. Nafaka has, in addition, two or three results databases in varying degrees of completion and operation: one designed by Kimetrica that reportedly is not operational; one using MS</p>	<p>We recommend the use of one database for the storage of Project results data; and, access to that database should be restricted to certain levels for key persons only.</p>

<p>Access for “some” indicators; and, at least one and maybe more, we’re not certain, for other indicators using Excel. FIPS maintains a database for its data; and, perhaps, other partners do so as well. We could not discern a rationale for all these different databases and couldn’t obtain a clear explanation of which database is used for which indicators and why.</p>	
<p><b>Excessive number of datasets:</b> this issue goes hand-in-hand with the excessive number of databases above. Different staff-members hold different data for the same indicator or item; and, an inordinate amount of staff time and energy is consumed rectifying, correcting, amending, and otherwise attempting to reconcile the different numbers and datasets. One of the two A/V M&amp;E Assistants maintains on his laptop a dataset with the names of members of the UWAWAKUDA Water-Users’ Association in Dakawa, but that dataset does not square with the dataset maintained by the Association itself.</p>	<p>Only one (1) dataset for any given indicator or sub-indicator should be maintained. Such a dataset may be found to be incorrect and/or otherwise lacking, and may, therefore, require correction and revision, but if more than one dataset for a given item is allowed, there might as well be two or three or more, resulting in constant change in the reporting of data, lack of stability, confusion, and, ultimately, the inability to confide in the reliability of the results data reported.</p>
<p><b>ANNUAL OUTCOME SURVEY (AOS):</b>  <b>The value of the AOS:</b> According to Nafaka, the roots of the AOS lie in their lack of confidence in the annual data and results reported for the PPR in November 2012; and, Nafaka’s desire to reconfirm those results. Our review of the questionnaire indicates that it contains questions that do not further an understanding of Project achievement and other questions regarding events long after they have occurred, e.g. the costs of inputs for planting, etc. - questions that should, perhaps, be asked at a time closer to the actual event. Other questions generate data collected previously, which begs the question: which dataset or results are then reported? The AOS consumes a considerable amount of staff time and resources. Finally, our sense is that Nafaka is committed to the AOS in the absence of a formal assessment and determination of its practicality and, ultimately, its usefulness in contributing to the measurement of progress toward key Project objectives.</p>	<p>The AOS should be thoroughly assessed with an aim to determining its usefulness; and, its execution or conduct should be continued wholly or in part in accordance with the findings of that assessment.</p>

<p><b>Conflation of indicators:</b> the AOS conflates indicators 4.5.2-5 and 4.5.2-28 (<i>application of improved technologies and management practices by individual farmers and private enterprises</i>), therefore, the data collected by the AOS for those indicators is not, therefore, transferrable to the FTFMS and can't be used for PPR reporting.</p>	<p>AOS questions on indicators 4.5.2-5 and 4.5.2-28 should be separated to take into account the different beneficiaries addressed.</p>
<p><b>Redundancy of data collection:</b> results for a given data point are, in certain circumstances, collected more than once “for comparison purposes.” What is the rationale for such comparison? Presumably, the two data sets are compared; so, what information or knowledge is gained by that procedure? Since it is highly unlikely that the two datasets are the same, which dataset is reported? We found, in addition, that the outcome indicators monitored by the AOS are at the same time routinely monitored by FIPS, RUDI, and MVIWATA; and, that raises questions: which of the multiple sets of data generated is reported, if any?; if the data is not reported, why is it collected?; what specific purpose does this abundance of data serve?; and, how does the data contribute to the measurement of Nafaka key objectives?</p>	<p>Refer to recommendation above on the AOS.</p>
<p><b>NAFKA CUSTOM INDICATOR(S):</b></p>	
<p><b>Definition of custom indicator:</b> The indicator: <i>number and value of buyer agreements</i>, included in the DQA, is insufficiently defined and may prove difficult to measure as written.</p>	<p>This indicator should be reformulated into two indicators and clarified in terms of the precise nature of a “buyer agreement;” and, that information should be codified on the PIRS for the indicator.</p>
<p><b>ISSUES SPECIFIC TO PARTNERS:</b></p>	
<p><b>CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES (CRS)/SILC:</b></p>	
<p><b>Clarification of role of sub-contractor:</b> the SILC sub-activity is not managed by CRS but by the Archdiocese of Ifakara (AOI), a sub-contractor of CRS. There is nothing inherently wrong with that, however, it is unclear whether an assessment was made as to the capability of the latter organization to provide timely and accurate results reporting.</p>	<p>An assessment of the capability of the Aol should be undertaken, with a focus on staffing and its capability to provide accurate results data and reporting in a timely manner to A/V; the data collection and reporting for SILC must be built into the new Nafaka M&amp;E system; and, procedures for the formal verification of SILC data and results should be established.</p>
<p><b>Definition of vulnerability:</b> all households in the SILC operating area are eligible to participate in the SILC sub-project – a formal definition of “vulnerability” is not applied to potential beneficiaries. We learned that prior to</p>	<p>A formal Project-related definition of vulnerable households should be formulated and applied until such time as USAID/T adopts a definition to be used throughout the FTF/T initiative (see Other Findings and Recommendations below).</p>

<p>the recent conduct of a vulnerability assessment, the number of households reached reported by SILC was an “estimate.” Moreover, the aforesaid assessment will allow CRS/Aol to calculate the percentage of the beneficiary population qualifying as vulnerable; and, a supposedly more accurate figure of vulnerable households reached will be reported beginning in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of FY 2013.</p>	
<p><b>FIPS:</b></p>	
<p>While there is a need to streamline the collection, collation and reporting of FIPS data (see below), there exist fundamental underlying problems that require resolution before that can take place. Those problems concern the reliability of the data collected by FIPS primary data collection agents, referred to as “Village Based Agricultural Advisors” (VBAs), in actuality the farmer/beneficiaries of FIPS activities. Our understanding is that FIPS believes the VBAs should not be tasked with reporting. This and other issues, e.g. interpretation of indicators, determination of what triggers the counting of a beneficiary, and the potential for multiple-counting, etc. have resulted in A/V’s inability to confide in the beneficiary figures reported by FIPS. We were informed that out of over 2,200 beneficiaries reported by FIPS for the FY 2012 PPR, Nafaka accepted and reported only eighty-seven (87). That tells us that either: a) there exists significant under-reporting of FIPS results; or, b) FIPS’ efforts do not contribute to FTF/T objectives. Furthermore, this apparently on-going, lingering problem not only negatively affects the results Nafaka is able to report but consumes Nafaka M&amp;E staff time in quantities in excess of what should be required, and detracts from the quality and effectiveness of overall Project reporting.</p>	<p>The situation with FIPS concerning the reporting of beneficiaries must be isolated and resolved immediately. How that is done is not within our purview, but it should be addressed expeditiously and at the executive level. Moreover, however, it is resolved, a primary characteristic of the solution must be that FIPS follows the dictates of A/V and complies with the M&amp;E and reporting requirements mandated by USAID and A/V. Bottom line: FIPS must monitor and report on performance, including the collection of results data; and they need to do so according to and in compliance with the system for data collection and reporting designed and mandated by A/V.</p>
<p><b>Interpretation of indicator(s):</b> we are uncertain if FIPS and A/V interpret the indicators monitored by FIPS, in the same way, particularly in terms of what constitutes “adoption” of a new technology and counting of a beneficiary; and, there is evidence that they do not, given Nafaka’s decision not to report much of the results data generated by FIPS.</p>	<p>The role of FIPS in Project M&amp;E must be clearly defined, including the data collection methodology they employ. That role should be proscribed and should conform to new M&amp;E system data-collection, analysis, storage, transmittal, and dissemination procedures as required and outlined by A/V; and, the execution of the aforementioned procedures should be closely monitored.</p>

<p><b>Indicators monitored by FIPS:</b> FIPS is monitoring seven (7) FTF indicators, including 4.5-4: <i>gross margin</i>, and 4.5.2-23: <i>incremental sales</i>; this, in our view, is excessive, particularly given FIPS unproven M&amp;E capability. We are also concerned about: a) FIPS understanding of the indicators; b) the methodologies used by FIPS in their collection and calculations; c) the fact that the indicators are monitored both by FIPS and the AOS; and, finally, d) the use and value of the data generated by FIPS.</p>	<p>Refer to recommendation above.</p>
<p><b>IFDC:</b></p>	
<p><b>IFDC monitoring:</b> we were unable to arrive at a clear understanding of whether IFDC is assigned indicators to monitor and whether or not they collect and report results data. Our cursory understanding of the work of IFDC would indicate that their efforts more closely align with Nafaka indicators than do those of other sub-contractor/partners.</p>	<p>The activities of IFDC should be assessed in terms of what would seem to be the important contribution they make to Nafaka results, particularly concerning the adoption of improved agricultural technologies and management practices; and, indicators should be assigned and data collected and reported by IFDC in accordance with the results of the aforementioned assessment.</p>
<p><b>MVIWATA:</b></p>	
<p><b>Primary data collection:</b> MVIWATA, like FIPS and RUDI uses beneficiaries, i.e. “Lead Farmers”, twenty-eight (28) in number, from the fourteen (14) villages in which they are working to collect primary data.</p>	<p>In line with the recommendation above concerning the use of beneficiaries as primary data collection agents, Nafaka should conduct an assessment of the efficacy of that practice. In addition to their unproven capability, the DQA team found that many association leaders and Lead Farmers, the beneficiaries charged with primary data collection, do not keep proper records.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring of indicators:</b> MVIWATA has been assigned responsibility for the monitoring of fourteen (14) indicators, including the outcome indicators monitored by the AOS. Our concerns are, essentially, the same as those for FIPS and RUDI: the number of indicators is excessive; the duplication of effort caused by routine data collection and AOS data collection; and, finally, what are the purpose and use of the data collected.</p>	<p>MVIWATA data collection and reporting system(s) should be dictated by the needs of Nafaka, i.e. quarterly reporting through the IPRS and annual reporting in fulfillment of the PPR through the FTFMS, and integrated into the overall Nafaka results-reporting system to be designed</p>
<p><b>RUDI:</b></p>	
<p><b>Primary data collection:</b> RUDI uses beneficiaries, i.e. “Lead Farmers,” from the villages in which they are working to collect primary data.</p>	<p>Recommendations for RUDI are, essentially, the same as those for FIPS and MVIWATA.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring of indicators:</b> RUDI has been assigned responsibility for the monitoring of</p>	<p>See above.</p>

fourteen (14) indicators, including the outcome indicators monitored by the AOS. Our concerns are, essentially, the same as those for FIPS and MVIWATA (refer to above). RUDI has assigned one (1) field staff-person to each of the three areas in which they are operating, and we question the ability of that small number of persons to collect the data generated by fourteen (14) indicators, for all the reasons already discussed above, and, in addition, given the primary responsibility of those persons – association development – generally considered to be an extremely hands-on and labor-intensive undertaking.	
---	--

#### OTHER FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **SRI Effort at KPL:** we found the office of the SRI sub-activity at KPL better organized and the personnel more responsive and knowledgeable than those at other Nafaka sites; and we recommend that effort be assessed for “lessons learned” for application to other sub-activities.
- **Custom Indicators:** Given the imprecise wording of the custom indicator - *number and value of buyer agreements (informal or formal)* - it might be beneficial to review all Nafaka custom indicators to ensure their clarity and efficient monitoring. In addition, the data collection and analysis methodologies for the custom indicators should be clearly defined in the same manner as recommended for FTF indicators.
- **Knowledge by staff of the overarching FTF/T Results Framework and Intermediate Results:** Installation of the new M&E system should include, in addition to training and orientation in the elements and procedures of the system itself, training in the FTF/T Results Framework and the place and role of all staff, including sub-contractor/partners, in that Framework.
- **Groups for Special Studies:** Nafaka is working with two or three specific groups of beneficiaries - the UWAWAKUDA Water-Users’ Association, the out-growers of KPL, and the villagers associated with KVTC – that, due to their geographic isolation and the concentration of efforts focused on them by Nafaka and other IPs, particularly UWAWAKUDA, should be considered candidates for future special studies concerning FTF/T programming.
- **Lack of a USAID/T definition of vulnerability and vulnerable households:** Both the TAPP and Nafaka Projects are monitoring indicator 4.5.2-14: *Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG interventions*, yet a formal definition of “vulnerability” in the FTF/T ZOI has not been put forth by USAID/T. Each organization is using its own standard or definition of vulnerability, and that has negative implications for the reporting of results of the FTF/T initiative as a whole. Furthermore, the absence of a USAID/T definition of vulnerability precludes the design and implementation of activities that would address and result in the achievement of FTF/T IR4: Increased Resilience of Vulnerable Communities and Households.

## **DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGIES EMPLOYED BY NAFKA:**

The bulk of the data reported by Nafaka is generated by the Project beneficiaries themselves and collected and collated for onward transmittal to the Nafaka office in Morogoro by a variety of field personnel, e.g association development officers (ADOs) agronomists, and other field officers and agents employed by A/V, RUDI, and MVIWATA. The exact sequence or combination of personnel involved in data collection changes in accordance with the partner and sub-activity; and, the lack of detailed explanations of those collection and transmittal methodologies prevented our ability to characterize Nafaka data collection in a general way. Suffice it to say that Nafaka employs a variety of different data collection methodologies.

- ***4.5-4: Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country) (RiA)***
- ***4.5.2-23: Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)***

Nafaka measured FY '12 *gross margin* and *incremental sales* through different methodologies and reported the figures generated by the Annual Outcome Survey (AOS) for these two high-level indicators. We have no formal recommendation with regard to the calculation of these indicators pending the results of a study to be published in the form of a manual or guide for the collection and management of data for these (plus two other agricultural indicators) currently being conducted by Tango International under contract to BFS. Our concerns at the moment are: a) for both indicators: the reliability of the “records” purportedly being maintained by smallholder farmers used as the source of the data; b) the size of the sample; and, c) for gross margin: the extended period of time between the events for which the data is being collected, i.e. planting, and the implementation of the AOS.

- ***4.5.2-2: Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)***
- ***4.5.2-5: Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)***
- ***4.5.2-28: Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA)***

The data collection methodology for the three (3) above indicators is similar: Nafaka agronomists count the number of individual farmers, the number of farmer associations, and the number of hectares cultivated under new technologies in accordance with technologies disseminated through demonstration plots. That data is submitted to the head of the Project Productivity Component, i.e. the Component Lead, who collates and reviews the data from the different clusters and submits it to the M&E Specialist. (Indicators 4.2.2-2 and 4.2.2-5 are the other two indicators included in the study by Tango International mentioned above; and, therefore, revised collection and related methodologies for those indicators might best be put on hold until that study is completed and the results published.)

Our concerns regarding the data collection methodology employed for these indicators are: a) definition of “adoption:” is what constitutes “adoption” of an improved technology and/or management practice interpreted, understood, and applied in the same manner by all relevant parties?; and, b) we question the practice of directly involving the Component Lead in the management of results data. It would seem to us that the Component Lead would be presented with the data after it has been verified for review, analysis, and strategic planning purposes.

- **4.5.2-7: Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA)(WOG)**

This indicator monitors the number of individuals attending on- and off-farm training sessions put on my Nafaka. The names and relevant details of persons attending training sessions in agribusiness and related topics are entered into attendance registers or sheets and collected by association development officers (ADOs) immediately upon completion of the training. Those persons attending on-farm training in the form of Demonstration Plots and Farmers’ Field Days are registered (by Lead Farmers in the case of MVIWATA and VBAs in the case of FIPS), and the figures are handed over to the ADOs who submit them to the Component Lead for Productivity and, finally, forwarded to the M&E Specialist.

Concerns regarding the monitoring of this indicator are the same as for many others: a) the use of beneficiaries to collect the data and the reliability of the data; and, b) the understanding of the indicator by all parties involved in the collection of the data in terms of what precisely constitutes a beneficiary and triggers their recording.

- **4.5-10: Total increase in installed storage capacity (S)**

This indicator is not being monitored. Moreover, its data collection methodology is not formal and is unclear. We are concerned that data for this indicator will not be available during the FY’13 programming and reporting cycle and that it is one more example of an indicator prematurely included in the Nafaka PMP. In addition, we have been led to believe that the activities undertaken by Nafaka concerning warehousing might not result in an increase in storage capacity because the Project will refurbish warehouses. That would qualify for reporting under the PIRS definition for the indicator, except that the warehouses to be refurbished are reportedly already being used and, therefore, increased capacity may not be, strictly speaking, realizable. We recommend clarification be sought from BFS in terms of reporting on this indicator: if the response is positive, the indicator should be retained; if negative, the indicator should be dropped and a custom indicator developed to measure the result of Nafaka warehouse-related activities.

- **4.5.2-11: Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)**

Association development officers (ADOs) and agronomists employed by A/V, MVIWATA, and RUDI count the number of farmers’ associations served by the project on a monthly basis and forward that data to the Association Development Specialist (ADS). The ADS reportedly collates, assesses and verifies the data and submits it to the M&E specialist for further analysis. That said, we remain unclear as to the exact nature of the “collation, assessment, verification and analysis” ascribed to the aforementioned parties. In a number of Nafaka M&E-related statements and

internal guidance, results data is said to be “compiled, verified, analyzed” et al, but we found no formal definitions or methodologies for those actions and procedures.

- **4.5.2-12: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)**

Data for this indicator is developed at the management and not field level by the Nafaka TARIPA Coordinator (TARIPA – the Tanzania Rice Partnership - a Project sub-component dedicated to the fostering of public-private partnerships) and provided to the M&E Specialist. We were unable to discern a clear, formal definition of the result which this indicator intends to measure, i.e. the precise nature of the partnerships being counted; our review of the Nafaka FY'12 PPR submission causes some concern regarding the partnerships reported; and, we recommend that Nafaka examine closely the definition for the indicator provided on the PIRS in the FTF Indicator Handbook, and count only those partnerships that strictly conform to that definition.

- **4.5.2-13: Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)**

The source of data for this indicator is the registration books or ledgers maintained by the farmer leaders of the associations serviced by Nafaka. Farmer-association members are classified by household during registration; and, that data is collected by association development officers (ADOs) from RUDI and MVIWATA, depending on the sub-activity, and submitted to the M&E Specialist on a monthly basis.

- **4.5.2-14: Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)**

Data for this indicator reflects the results of the Nafaka SILC sub-activity managed by the Archdiocese of Ifakara (Aoi) under contract to CRS. The primary data collection agents are SILC Field Agents (FAs), farmers trained in the SILC methodology that receive a monthly stipend of TSh 30,000 (US\$18.75/TSh1,600 = US\$1.00) to train villagers in SILC, and who fill out and submit a monthly data collection report. There are twenty-one (21) FAs currently employed on the sub-activity, the expansion of which to an additional district is being planned. The FAs report to three (3) Supervisors employed by the Archdiocese, who, in turn, report to the CRS Component Lead based at the Nafaka office in Morogoro. The Component Lead submits the data to the A/V M&E Specialist for review and data entry.

- **4.5.1-27 and CBLD-5: Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)**

This indicator is not being monitored and there isn't any data to assess. Nafaka claims to have a mandate to build the capacity of the sub-contractor/partners MVIWATA and RUDI, however, to the best of our knowledge, needs assessments of the aforementioned organizations have not been undertaken and capacity-building activities have not yet been initiated. Our concern is that this indicator has been included prematurely in the Nafaka PMP.

- **4.5.2-29: Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA)(WOG)**

Loans are provided only to members of farmer associations and not to individual farmers. Loan recipients are recorded in association records by the association leader; and that data is collected by Nafaka association development officers employed by the various sub-contractor/partners. The

number of loan recipients is reportedly verified against loan documentation provided by the lending institution to the association. That data is collated and forwarded to the A/V Association Development Specialist (ADS), who reportedly reviews the data and matches it with loan documentation from the lending institution. The data is then forwarded to the M&E Specialist for verification and entry into the Project database. The verification processes discussed above are not entirely clear to us; there exists the possibility of double verification; and, therefore, the process should be reviewed and developed in detail for inclusion in the Project PMP.

- **4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)**

Nafaka provides technical assistance and training to farmers to access finance (see indicator 4.5.2-37 for business development services below) and by providing a link between the farmers and the lending institutions. The number of farmers who received Project assistance to access finance is recorded in association registers. Association development officers confirm the number of farmers who received assistance which resulted in a loan; submit the data to the ADS, who reviews the data against loan documentation from financial institutions; and, in turn, submits it to the M&E Specialist.

- **4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG-assisted sources (S)**

The data collection methodology for this indicator is unclear and should be more precisely defined and included in the PMP. The methodology, as we understand it, is very similar to that for indicators 4.5.2-29 and 4.5.2-30 above.

- **4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)**

We were unable to establish a clear picture of how Nafaka interprets this indicator in terms of what precisely constitutes an investment. The data reported for this indicator in the FY'12 PPR reportedly represents the value of the investment made by KPL in the SRI project, but the method employed in capturing that data is unclear, as is whether other investments are being made that can be attributed to the Project and FTF/T. We believe this indicator, like the others, merits discussion and analysis with an aim to developing a more detailed collection methodology.

- **4.5.2-39 Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development:**
  - ...in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance**
  - ...in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance**
  - ...in Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)**

Refer to ISSUES and related comments above; this indicator appears to be inappropriate to Nafaka; and, therefore, we recommend it be removed as soon as possible from the Nafaka PMP and no longer monitored.

## **DQA APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY:**

The approach to the conduct of the DQA was formal. TFtF-M&E reviewed the Nafaka Performance Management Plan (PMP) and the PIRS (Performance Indicator Reference Sheet) for each indicator to be assessed.

Two (2) preliminary planning sessions with the Nafaka team were held on February 8 and 15, the latter primarily to finalize the logistics and timing of site visits to Kilombero by the DQA team. On or about February 26, TFtF-M&E forwarded to Nafaka a list of indicators for assessment (later modified to include indicators inadvertently omitted from the original list), a (preliminary) DQA Action Plan, and an agenda for a DQA kick-off meeting to be held on March 4 at the Nafaka HQ office in Dar.

After the DQA kick-off meeting held on the morning of March 4, the DQA team travelled to Morogoro. The Team was joined at that time by the USAID/T COR for TFtF-M&E. The DQA team met on the morning and early afternoon of March 5 with Nafaka/Morogoro M&E and partners' staff. At that meeting, indicators and related data collection and reporting methodologies were discussed; and preliminary steps were taken in terms of developing an understanding of the Project, its sub-activities, sub-contractors and partners, and operational sites, etc.

On the afternoon of March 5, accompanied by the Nafaka M&E Specialist, the Team proceeded to Ifakara; and, on March 6, interviewed the RUDI Association Development Field Officer at the Nafaka sub-office located at the headquarters of the Kilombero Valley Teak Company (KVTC). The A/V Agronomist assigned to the Ifakara North cluster and the FIPS District Coordinator (DCO) for Ifakara were both present at that meeting. Immediately after the meeting, the team, including the USAID/T COR and the Nafaka M&E Specialist, proceeded to the Kilombero Plantation Limited (KPL) in Mngeta, Kilombero, where the team met briefly with KPL management and engaged in an extended session with SRI staff, including the Project Manager, an employee of KPL, the A/V ADS and Coordinator of the SRI effort, and one agronomist. On Thursday, March 7 and Friday, March 8, the team met with members of farmer associations served by the Project. (Persons interviewed and sites visited are listed in an appendix to this report.)

A meeting to debrief Nafaka management on the field visit to Kilombero was called by the USAID/T COR and held at the Nafaka office in Dar es Salaam on March 14. The meeting was attended by the Nafaka team, the DQA team, and the CORs for TFtF-M&E and Nafaka.

A follow-up trip to the Nafaka/Morogoro office, including visits by TFtF-M&E Specialists to the UWAWAKUDA Water-Users' Association in Dakawa and to sites serviced by A/V, Mviwata, and IFDC in Mvomero was taken during the period February 26-27, 2013. At that time the DQA Team Leader conducted interviews with Nafaka sub-contractors: CRS, IFDC, and FIPS; and the TFtF-M&E Specialists interviewed the A/V Progressive Farmers Specialist and Access to Finance Manager. An additional meeting to discuss the methodologies used to collect data for and calculate *gross margin* (4.5-4) and *incremental sales* (4.5.2-23) was held at the Nafaka HQ Office on May 2.

Several informal exchanges for clarification and data collection purposes occurred during the period outlined above. A draft of the DQA was provided to A/V for review.

## **FLOW OF RESULTS DATA:**

We normally try to produce a diagram or flow chart showing the hierarchy and relationships between the members of the IP M&E team. This proved difficult in the case of Nafaka because it is not at all clear who is responsible for what task at any given point in time (see above). All M&E team members have job descriptions, and all are involved, but there exists, again, what seems to be a certain ad hoc quality to the assignment and execution of M&E tasks, i.e. some data from some sources gets reported to one person while data from another source gets reported to another person, without any specific rationale for the difference. The DCoP appears to play a small role in M&E – not in and of itself a problem – but, then, one learns that she is provided one specific set of results data. The A/V Data-Entry person appears to be more knowledgeable and involved in M&E than others of higher rank and responsibility, which leads us to believe that her role has evolved - informally, unofficially, and undocumented – into something greater than what was originally intended.

(In an attempt to understand the flow of data between the partners and the Nafaka office in Morogoro, which serves as the hub of project activity, we developed flow charts for each of the Nafaka sub-activities. We have not included those charts in the Report because we feel they do not contribute directly to the design and development of a new Nafaka M&E system. That said, the charts are available and will be provided upon request.)

We recommend that the flow of results data between the various partners and A/V be diagrammed as should the flow of data within the various elements of the A/V M&E team, and that those diagrams or flow charts be made an integral part of the new M&E system.

### **PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (PMP):**

The Nafaka PMP, like that of a number of other FTF/T IPs, provides information not required by the PMP guidance and not particularly useful to performance management, at the same time it is lacking in terms of its usefulness as a guide to understanding how the M&E system operates. The PMP should be updated and revised at the appropriate time to more accurately reflect the guidance contained in TIPS Number 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 2010: Preparing a Performance Management Plan. Concerning a future refinement of the PMP, we append a memo dated October 11, 2012 that contains recommendations in that regard.

### **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS USED IN DATA MANAGEMENT:**

Refer to issues and recommendations above.

### **APPENDICES:**

Checklists for Indicators: \*\*\*

List of Sites Visited and Persons Interviewed

Memo of Review of Nafaka PMP by TFtF-M&E dated October 11, 2012