

CATEGORY	INDICATOR	MEASURED BY	PROV	1	2	3	4	5	IC	IP	CO	IM
OUTREACH	ACCESS	# OF FARMERS ACCESSED	JT	30,000	50,000	100,000	250,000	∞	2	1	1	1
OUTREACH	ACCESS	# OF FARMERS ACCESSED	NTB	9,375	15,625	31,250	78,125	∞				
OUTREACH	ACCESS	# OF FARMERS ACCESSED	NTT	15,000	25,000	50,000	125,000	∞				
OUTREACH	ACCESS	# OF FARMERS ACCESSED	PA	1,500	2,500	5,000	12,500	∞				
OUTREACH	ACCESS	# OF FARMERS ACCESSED	PB	1,500	2,500	5,000	12,500	∞				
OUTREACH	BENEFICIARIES	# OF FARMERS BENEFITING (ALL)	JT	12,000	20,000	40,000	100,000	∞	3	2	3	3
OUTREACH	BENEFICIARIES	# OF FARMERS BENEFITING (ALL)	NTB	3,750	6,250	12,500	31,250	∞				
OUTREACH	BENEFICIARIES	# OF FARMERS BENEFITING (ALL)	NTT	6,000	10,000	20,000	50,000	∞				
OUTREACH	BENEFICIARIES	# OF FARMERS BENEFITING (ALL)	PA	600	1,000	2,000	5,000	∞				
OUTREACH	BENEFICIARIES	# OF FARMERS BENEFITING (ALL)	PB	600	1,000	2,000	5,000	∞				
OUTREACH	ACTIVITY QUALITY	BENEFICIARIES ÷ ACCESS	ALL	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%		1		
BENEFIT	NAIC	% FARMER INCOME CHANGE	ALL	10%	30%	50%	100%	∞	2	2	1	1
RATIONALE	CONSTRAINT TREE	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Weak analysis of constraint ● Depth & Breadth only address visible symptoms not underlying causes	WEAK ● Moderate analysis of constraints ● Depth is up to underlying causes of symptoms but not up to service provider level ● Weak causal links	MODERATE ● Acceptable analysis of constraints ● Covers service provider level ● Does not look into interconnected markets/potential partners ● Good causal links	GOOD ● Good analysis of constraints ● Covers service provider level & scope of interconnected markets constraints ● Strong causal links	VERY GOOD ● Strong analysis of constraints ● Covers service provider levels & interconnected markets ● Identifies weakness/latent opportunities/demand ● Strong causal links	1	1		1
RATIONALE	CONSTRAINT TREE	ASSESSOR 2 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Incomplete results chain ● Weak causal relationship with logic gaps/jumps	WEAK ● Complete results chain ● Weak causal relationship with some logic gaps/jumps	MODERATE ● Complete results chain ● Acceptable causal relationship	GOOD ● Well defined results chain ● Most of the causal relationship are strong	VERY GOOD ● Well defined results chain ● Exhibiting strong & evident causal relationship	1	1		1
RATIONALE	RESULT CHAIN	RM PERSONNEL OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Incomplete results chain ● Weak causal relationship with logic gaps/jumps	WEAK ● Complete results chain ● Weak causal relationship with some logic gaps/jumps	MODERATE ● Complete results chain ● Acceptable causal relationship	GOOD ● Well defined results chain ● Most of the causal relationship are strong	VERY GOOD ● Well defined results chain ● Exhibiting strong & evident causal relationship	1	1		1
VALUE FOR MONEY	RETURN ON INVESTMENT	NAIC (ALL) ÷ DIRECT COST	ALL	4	8	16	32	∞		1.5	1.5	1
VALUE FOR MONEY	INVESTMENT/FARMER	DIRECT COST ÷ BENEFICIARIES	ALL	2,000,000	1,000,000	600,000	300,000	0		1.5	1.5	1
VALUE FOR MONEY	PARTNER CONTRIBUTION	PARTNER CONTRIBUTION ÷ TOTAL COST	ALL	40%	50%	60%	75%	100%			2	1
QTY. OF DEAL/COLLABORATION	WHO DOES WHO PAYS	TEAM LEADER/HOP OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Prisma pays for majority of the permanent functions ● Transition plan missing	WEAK ● Prisma pays for some of the permanent functions ● Transition plan unclear	MODERATE ● Prisma pays for majority of the temporary functions ● Transition plan is developed	GOOD ● Prisma pays for some of the temporary functions ● Transition plan is developed	VERY GOOD ● Prisma supports facilitative functions			2	
QTY. OF DEAL/COLLABORATION	WHO DOES WHO PAYS	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Prisma pays for majority of the permanent functions ● Transition plan missing	WEAK ● Prisma pays for some of the permanent functions ● Transition plan unclear	MODERATE ● Prisma pays for majority of the temporary functions ● Transition plan is developed	GOOD ● Prisma pays for some of the temporary functions ● Transition plan is developed	VERY GOOD ● Prisma supports facilitative functions				2
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	SECTOR POTENTIAL	BENEFICIARIES (RATE 3) ÷ FARMERS IN SUB-SECTOR	ALL	30%	20%	10%	4%	0%	2	1	1	1
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS MODEL	TEAM OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business model unclear ● Incentives for actors unclear	WEAK ● Business model viability is low ● Incentives for major actors are low	MODERATE ● Business model is viable ● Incentives for major actors are moderate	GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious	VERY GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious	1	0.3	0.4	0.4
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS MODEL	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business model unclear ● Incentives for actors unclear	WEAK ● Business model viability is low ● Incentives for major actors are low	MODERATE ● Business model is viable ● Incentives for major actors are moderate	GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious	VERY GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious		0.35		0.6
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS MODEL	ASSESSOR 2 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business model unclear ● Incentives for actors unclear	WEAK ● Business model viability is low ● Incentives for major actors are low	MODERATE ● Business model is viable ● Incentives for major actors are moderate	GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious	VERY GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious		0.35		0.6
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS MODEL	TEAM LEADER/HOP OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business model unclear ● Incentives for actors unclear	WEAK ● Business model viability is low ● Incentives for major actors are low	MODERATE ● Business model is viable ● Incentives for major actors are moderate	GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious	VERY GOOD ● Business model is attractive ● Incentives for major actors are obvious			0.6	
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS CALCULATION	TEAM OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business calculations unclear	WEAK ● Business calculations shows low profitability	MODERATE ● Business calculations shows stable profitability	GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth	VERY GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS CALCULATION	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business calculations unclear	WEAK ● Business calculations shows low profitability	MODERATE ● Business calculations shows stable profitability	GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth	VERY GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth		0.35		0.6
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS CALCULATION	ASSESSOR 2 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business calculations unclear	WEAK ● Business calculations shows low profitability	MODERATE ● Business calculations shows stable profitability	GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth	VERY GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth		0.35		0.6
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS CALCULATION	TEAM LEADER/HOP OPINION	ALL	POOR ● Business calculations unclear	WEAK ● Business calculations shows low profitability	MODERATE ● Business calculations shows stable profitability	GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth	VERY GOOD ● Business calculations shows profitability with growth			0.6	
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	AAER	TEAM OPINION	ALL	POOR ● AAER unclear	WEAK ● Low systemic change potential: adopt is viable but adapt, expand, & respond options are limited/unclear	MODERATE ● Moderate systemic change potential: adopt & adapt are probable, but expand & respond options are limited/unclear	GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected	VERY GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected in 2 to 3 years	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	AAER	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● AAER unclear	WEAK ● Low systemic change potential: adopt is viable but adapt, expand, & respond options are limited/unclear	MODERATE ● Moderate systemic change potential: adopt & adapt are probable, but expand & respond options are limited/unclear	GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected	VERY GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected in 2 to 3 years		0.35		0.6
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	AAER	ASSESSOR 2 OPINION	ALL	POOR ● AAER unclear	WEAK ● Low systemic change potential: adopt is viable but adapt, expand, & respond options are limited/unclear	MODERATE ● Moderate systemic change potential: adopt & adapt are probable, but expand & respond options are limited/unclear	GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected	VERY GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected in 2 to 3 years		0.35		0.6
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	AAER	TEAM LEADER/HOP OPINION	ALL	POOR ● AAER unclear	WEAK ● Low systemic change potential: adopt is viable but adapt, expand, & respond options are limited/unclear	MODERATE ● Moderate systemic change potential: adopt & adapt are probable, but expand & respond options are limited/unclear	GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected	VERY GOOD ● High systemic change potential: adopt & adopt are probable, chances exist for expand options, & market response is expected in 2 to 3 years			0.6	
POVERTY	PPI (\$2 PPP)	% POOR FARMERS (\$2 PPP)	ALL	20%	30%	50%	70%	100%	2	1	1	1
GENDER	ACCESSED FEMALE FARMER	% FEMALE FARMERS ACCESSED	ALL	50%	75%	90%	100%	∞				1
GENDER	ROLE-BASED PARTICIPATION	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	VERY LOW ● Women are not accessed or engaged in the business ● More risk in safety & working condition ● More workload & exploitation	LOW ● Improved equality in wage/income structure ● Women are invited to info session but are still left out in business engagement ● No change in risk in safety & working condition ● No change in workload	MODERATE ● Improved equality in wage/income structure is introduced ● Women have no/little difficulties in accessing information but engagement in business needs to be improved ● No change in risk in safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	HIGH ● Improved equality in wage/income structure is introduced ● Women have no/little difficulties in accessing information but engagement in business needs to be improved ● Improved safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	VERY HIGH ● Equal wage/income structure is introduced ● Women are developed to be more advanced & engaged in business ● Improved safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	2	1		1
GENDER	ROLE-BASED PARTICIPATION	ASSESSOR 2 OPINION	ALL	VERY LOW ● Women are not accessed or engaged in the business ● More risk in safety & working condition ● More workload & exploitation	LOW ● Improved equality in wage/income structure ● Women are invited to info session but are still left out in business engagement ● No change in risk in safety & working condition ● No change in workload	MODERATE ● Improved equality in wage/income structure is introduced ● Women have no/little difficulties in accessing information but engagement in business needs to be improved ● No change in risk in safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	HIGH ● Improved equality in wage/income structure is introduced ● Women have no/little difficulties in accessing information but engagement in business needs to be improved ● Improved safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	VERY HIGH ● Equal wage/income structure is introduced ● Women are developed to be more advanced & engaged in business ● Improved safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload		2	1	
GENDER	ROLE-BASED PARTICIPATION	TEAM LEADER/HOP OPINION	ALL	VERY LOW ● Women are not accessed or engaged in the business ● More risk in safety & working condition ● More workload & exploitation	LOW ● Improved equality in wage/income structure ● Women are invited to info session but are still left out in business engagement ● No change in risk in safety & working condition ● No change in workload	MODERATE ● Improved equality in wage/income structure is introduced ● Women have no/little difficulties in accessing information but engagement in business needs to be improved ● No change in risk in safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	HIGH ● Improved equality in wage/income structure is introduced ● Women have no/little difficulties in accessing information but engagement in business needs to be improved ● Improved safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload	VERY HIGH ● Equal wage/income structure is introduced ● Women are developed to be more advanced & engaged in business ● Improved safety & working condition ● Causing more manageable workload			2	
ENVIRONMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL RISK	ASSESSOR 1 OPINION	ALL	HIGH ● High risk of negatively affecting the environment	HIGH TO MODERATE ● High to moderate risk of negatively affecting the environment	MODERATE ● Moderate risk of negatively affecting the environment	MODERATE TO LOW ● Moderate to low risk of negatively affecting the environment	LOW ● Low risk of negatively affecting the environment		0.5		1
ENVIRONMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL RISK	ASSESSOR 2 OPINION	ALL	HIGH ● High risk of negatively affecting the environment	HIGH TO MODERATE ● High to moderate risk of negatively affecting the environment	MODERATE ● Moderate risk of negatively affecting the environment	MODERATE TO LOW ● Moderate to low risk of negatively affecting the environment	LOW ● Low risk of negatively affecting the environment		0.5		1
ENVIRONMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL RISK	TEAM LEADER/HOP OPINION	ALL	HIGH ● High risk of negatively affecting the environment	HIGH TO MODERATE ● High to moderate risk of negatively affecting the environment	MODERATE ● Moderate risk of negatively affecting the environment	MODERATE TO LOW ● Moderate to low risk of negatively affecting the environment	LOW ● Low risk of negatively affecting the environment			1	

QMT Quality Monitoring Tool

LEVEL OF ASSESSMENT	
REVIEW PERIOD	

INFO - INTERVENTION	
INTERVENTION NAME	
INTERVENTION CODE	
SECTOR	
PORTFOLIO	

INFO - PERSONNEL & IMPLEMENTER	
ASSESSOR 1	
ASSESSOR 2	
TASK LEADER	
INTERVENTION LEADER 1	
INTERVENTION LEADER 2	
CO-FACILITATOR	
RC REVIEWER (RM PERSONNEL)	

OUTREACH & IMPACT	
# OF FARMERS IN THE SUB-SECTOR	
ACCESS	
BENEFICIARIES	
PPI (\$2 PPP) - %	
NAIC - %	
BENEFICIARIES (FEMALE) - %	
ACCESS (FEMALE) - %	

KEY BUSINESS INDICATOR	
NAIC (ALL BENEFICIARIES)	
DIRECT COST	
PARTNER CONTRIBUTION	

CRITERIA	ASSESSOR 1	ASSESSOR 2	TEAM
BUSINESS MODEL			
BUSINESS CALCULATION			
SYSTEMIC CHANGE (AAER)			
GENDER ROLE-BASED PARTICIPATION			
ENVIRONMENTAL RISK			
CONSTRAINT TREE			
WHO DOES WHO PAYS			
CRITERIA	RM		
RESULT CHAIN			

ACTIVITY QUALITY
RETURN ON INVESTMENT
INVESTMENT/FARMER
% PARTNER CONTRIBUTION
SECTOR POTENTIAL
FEMALE FARMER ACCESSED

CATEGORY	INDICATOR	RATING	WEIGHT	SCORE
OUTREACH	ACCESS			
OUTREACH	BENEFICIARIES			
OUTREACH	ACTIVITY QUALITY			
BENEFIT	NAIC			
RATIONALE	CONSTRAINT TREE			
RATIONALE	RESULT CHAIN			
VALUE FOR MONEY	RETURN ON INVESTMENT			
VALUE FOR MONEY	INVESTMENT/FARMER			
VALUE FOR MONEY	PARTNER CONTRIBUTION			
QTY. OF DEAL/COLLABORATION	WHO DOES WHO PAYS			
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	SECTOR POTENTIAL			
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS MODEL			
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	BUSINESS CALCULATION			
SYST. CHANGE POTENTIAL	AAER			
POVERTY INCIDENCE	PPI (\$2 PPP)			
GENDER	ACCESSED FEMALE FARMER			
GENDER	ROLE-BASED PARTICIPATION			
ENVIRONMENTAL RISK	ENVIRONMENTAL RISK			
TOTAL				

APPROVAL

APPROVAL