

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>							
<b>Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project Phase 2</b>							
<b>GOAL</b>	<b>Indicator G 1</b>	<b>Baseline July 2007-June 2008 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone July 2008- June 2009 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone July 2009-June 2010 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone July 2010-June 2011 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target July2011-June 2012 (PY5)</b>	
Livelihoods of poor rural people in Madhya Pradesh sustainably enhanced	Percent of the total population of the state below the poverty line (BPL)	38 % (66 million)		37 %		36 %	
		<b>Sources</b>					
	State BPL survey in 2002 and released in August (2008) National Sample Survey Organisation (2004-5,2009,2014) EoP Evaluation (2012)						
	<b>Indicator G 2</b>	<b>Baseline July 2007-June 2008 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone July 2008- June 2009 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone July 2009-June 2010 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone July 2010-June 2011 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target July2011-June 2012 (PY5)</b>	
	Human Development Index in 9 target Districts	Dhar <b>0.596</b> Mandla <b>0.587</b> Dindori <b>0.565</b> Annappur <b>0.564</b> Shahdol <b>0.564</b> Sheopur <b>0.506</b> Barwani <b>0.426</b> Jhabua <b>0.398</b> Alirajpur <b>0.398</b>	Year on year improvement	Year on year improvement	Year on year improvement	Year on year improvement	
<b>Sources</b>							
MP Human Development Report (2007,2008,2009,2010,2011,2012) EoP Evaluation (2012)							

<b>PURPOSE</b>	<b>Indicator P 1</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
Effective policies, institutions, and programmes that sustainably enhance the livelihoods of poor rural people in tribal districts of	Delivery of State Rural Development programmes which translate into pro-poor budget allocations and	Vertical rural development programmes implemented with weak targeting and limited synergies and	Formal and structured coordination and convergence approach developed with major programmes of	MPRLP converge with atleast two major schemes / programmes for effective delivery of services in project districts	<b>A</b> Vision document for Rural Development for the state of MP developed and endorsed by GoMP clearly	<b>1</b> common sector plan for rural development in the state of MP developed for effective utilization of all human and financial resources	No major external fiscal shock. No major natural disasters.  Political commitment to

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

<b>Madhya Pradesh (MP).</b>	<b>services.</b>	cooperation	RD department		stating ways of collaborating / joint working for different rural development schemes / programmes	(including Externally Aided Projects) and effective delivery	prioritise public expenditure on pro-poor sectors.  GoMP integrates lessons and evidence into rural development policy making.  GoMP continues to support PRIs in terms of their role in decision making, and resource allocations.
	<b>Sources</b>						
	TC-PSU reports (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011) Workshop & conference reports (2009,2010) RD Vision Document (2011) MP Planning Commission (2012) MP Finance Department (2011,2012) & External Aid Project Reports (2011,2012) EoP Evaluation (2012)						
	<b>Indicator P 2</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	
	<b>Volume of funds received by Gram Panchayat / Gram Kosh (GP/GK) as per their plan prepared under various schemes / sub schemes</b>	0	6 crore	20% of total plan budget	30% of total plan budget	40% of total plan budget	
<b>Sources</b>							
TC-PSU reports (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011) Minutes of MPRD meetings (2009) GoMP meeting minutes (2010, 2011) & Policy Brief (2012) MTR (2010) & EoP Evaluation (2012)							
<b>Indicator P 3</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>		
<b>i Percent of population of project target area (PTA) below the poverty line (BPL)</b>	<b>i. 51%</b> (2 million)	<b>i. 48%</b>  <b>ii. a)8%, b)15%</b>	<b>i. N/a</b>  <b>ii. a) 5%, b)10%</b>	<b>i. 36%</b>  <b>ii. a) 3%, b) 5%</b>	<b>i. 31%</b>  <b>ii. a)3%, b) 5%</b>		
<b>ii. Proportion of a) poor and b) poorest households in PTA assessed as critically food</b>	<b>Sources</b>						
MPRLP- TC-PSU reports (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011) MPRLP2 Baseline Survey, Sambodhi (2009) BPL survey report (2010) EoP Evaluation (2012)							

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

	deficient				
<b>INPUTS (£)</b>	<b>DFID (£)</b>	<b>Govt (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>
	£42,000,000.- FA £ 3,000,000.- TC	£120,000.-	-	£45,120,000.-	99.7%
<b>INPUTS (HR)</b>	<b>DFID (FTEs)</b>				
	40% Rural Livelihoods/Environment Adviser 15% Governance Adviser 10% Social Development Adviser 20% Project Officer				

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

OUTPUT 1	Indicator O 1.1	Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)	Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)	Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)	Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)	Target 2011-12 (PY5)	Assumptions
Enhanced capacities of Gram Sabha to plan and manage resources in a transparent, effective and accountable manner in response to community driven demands.	Proportion of Gram Sabhas (GS) carrying out annual reviews of microplans and updates	0	15%	40%	70%	70%	Broader capacity initiatives within PRIs continues through other central/state programmes.  Decentralisation is able to promote increased accountability and transparency in the use of funds at village levels.
	<b>Sources</b>						
	Primary assessment against project approved standards by independent agency (2009, 2010, 2011,2012)						
	Indicator O 1.2	Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)	Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)	Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)	Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)	Target 2011-12 (PY5)	
	Percentage of Gram Sabhas' (GS) <u>meeting the financial benchmarking criteria:</u> i) financial management systems ii) audit iii) voluntary disclosures	i) 0  ii) 0  iii) 0	i) 25% (1000) of GS established financial management systems.  ii) 25% (1000) of GS have undertaken audit  iii) 25% (1000) of GS practicing voluntary disclosure of income and expenditure information on a quarterly basis to respective communities.	i) 50% (2000) of GS established financial management systems.  ii) 40% (1600) of GS have undertaken audit  iii) 50% (2000) of GS practicing voluntary disclosure of income and expenditure information on a quarterly basis to respective communities.	i) 70% (2800) of GS established financial management systems.  ii) 55% (2750) of GS have undertaken audit  iii) 70% (2800) of GS practicing voluntary disclosure of income and expenditure information on a quarterly basis to respective communities.	i) 70% (2800) of GS established financial management systems.  ii) 70% (2800) of GS have undertaken audit  iii) 70% (2800) of GS practicing voluntary disclosure of income and expenditure information on a quarterly basis to respective communities.	
<b>Sources</b>							
MPRLP2 Baseline Survey, Sambodhi (2009) GS Financial Audits (quarterly 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) Project MIS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) Social Audit (2010,2011)							
Indicator O 1.3	Baseline 2007-08	Milestone 2008-	Milestone 2009-	Milestone 2010-	Target 2011-12		

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

		(PY1)	09 (PY2)	10 (PY3)	11 (PY4)	(PY5)	
	Proportion of GK funds utilized for i) the poor and poorest (C and D) and ii) women	i) 0 ii) 0	i) 62% ii) 15%	i) 70 ii) 35%	i) 70% ii) 50%	i) 70% ii) 50%	
		<b>Sources</b> Project MIS (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) MTR (2010) Independent Social Protection Qualitative Assessment (2010) Annual Gender Audit (2010,2011)					
<b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>							<b>RISK RATING</b>
18%							Medium
<b>INPUTS (£)</b> (12% of £42m allocation)	<b>DFID (£)</b>	<b>Govt (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>		
	£5,040,000.-				100%		

OUTPUT 2	Indicator O 2.1	Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)	Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)	Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)	Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)	Target 2011-12 (PY5)	Assumptions
Improved access to assets, employment and services that support the livelihoods of the rural poor	Number of people in the project area directly assisted by food security programmes (GK grants, loans and other project activities)	235 000	300 000	600 000	1 million	1 million	
		<b>Sources</b> Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) MPRLP Annual OPRs (2010,2011) MTR (2010)					
	<b>Indicator O 2.2</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	
	Number of men and women adopting project promoted practices, both i) farm and ii) /non-farm	i) 0 ii) 0	i) 40,000 20% women ii) 25,000 (50% women)	i) 60,000 20% women ii) 30,000 (50% women)	i) 80,000 20% women ii) 40,000 (50% women)	i) 80,000 20% women ii) 40,000 (50% women)	
	<b>Sources</b> Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) Environment & NRM Study (2010) Annual Gender Audit (2010,2011)						

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

		Impact study on crops and livestock (2011) MTR (2010)					
	<b>Indicator O 2.3</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	
	<b>Number of SHGs i) accessing financial services from formal banking institutions and MFIs and, ii) loan repayment rate of SHGs to the lending agencies</b>	Not available for PTA  <i>6% in Phase I (different PTA) had access from formal banking institutions</i>	i. [400 SHGs linked to Banks]  ii. 50%	i. [2,000 SHGs linked to Banks, 400 SHGs linked to MFIs]  ii. 70%	i. [3,000 SHGs linked to Banks, 800 SHGs linked to MFIs]  ii. 90%	i. [4,000 SHGs linked to Banks, 1,000 SHGs linked to MFIs]  ii. 90%	
		<b>Sources</b> End-of-Project Evaluation MPRLP Phase I (2008) Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) MTR (2010) MFI Review (2009,2010,2011,2012) Quarterly District Reports on self-help groups (2009, 2010,2011, 2012)					
<b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>							<b>RISK RATING</b>
38%							Medium
<b>INPUTS (£)</b> (56% of £42m allocation)	<b>DFID (£)</b>	<b>Govt (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>		<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>	
	£23,520,000.-					100%	

<b>OUTPUT 3</b>	<b>Indicator O 3.1</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Effective mechanisms for social protection which reduce vulnerability and build assets of the poorest, and reduce constraints to productive activity.</b>	<b>Proportion of poor and very poor (C&amp;D) households with improved productive assets from Enabling Grants.</b>	0	20%	50%	70%	70%	
		<b>Sources</b> Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) Independent Social Protection Qualitative Assessment (2010) MTR (2010) & EoP Evaluation (2012)					
	<b>Indicator O 3.2</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

	<b>Proportion of eligible poor and poorest households (C&amp;D HH) with access to i) &gt; 30 days work under NREGS, ii) full Pensions entitlements and iii) BPL households with access to Government Insurance schemes</b>	Not Available	i)25% ii)20% iii)20%	i)30% ii)40% iii)40%	i)40% ii)60% iii)60%	i)40% ii)60% iii)60%	
		<b>Sources</b>					
		Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) Independent Social Protection Qualitative Assessment (2010) MTR (2010) & EoP Evaluation (2012)					
		<b>Sources</b>					
		MPRLP2 Baseline Survey, Sambodhi (2009) Independent Social Protection Qualitative Assessment (2010) MTR (2010) Food Security Audit (2010,2011, 2012)					
<b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>							<b>RISK RATING</b>
15%							Medium
<b>INPUTS (£)</b> (12% of £42m allocation)	<b>DFID (£)</b>	<b>Govt (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>		
	£5,040,000.-				100%		

<b>OUTPUT 4</b>	<b>Indicator O 4.1</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Women and men have equitable access to and benefit from resources, decision-making and opportunities to enhance livelihoods.</b>	i) Proportion of participants in gram sabha committees who are female and ii) proportion of women in Gram Sabha committees with leadership roles.	Not Available	i) 33% ii)10%	i)33% ii)20%	i)33% ii)33%	i)33% ii)33%	
		<b>Sources</b>					
	Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) Annual Gender Audit (2010,2011,2012)						
	<b>Sources</b>						
		Primary assessment against project approved standards by independent agency (2009, 2010,2011,2012) Annual Gender Audit (2010,2011,2012)					
	<b>Indicator O 4.2</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>	

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

	<b>Proportion of the MPRLP programme costs allocated for interventions / activities targeting women</b>	Not Available	15%	20%	30%	33%	
		<b>Sources</b>					
		Expenditure analysis of Gender Responsive Budgeting in Project MIS (2009,2010,2011,2012) MTR (2010) Annual Gender Audit (2010,2011,2012)					
<b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>							<b>RISK RATING</b>
14%							Medium
<b>INPUTS (£)</b> (4% of £42m allocation)	<b>DFID (£)</b>	<b>Govt (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>		
	£1,680,000.-				100%		

<b>OUTPUT 5</b>	<b>Indicator O 5.1</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>		
<b>Programme results, methodologies and structures inform State and Central level programmes and policies.</b>	<b>GoMP adopts micro planning as a tool for implementing local development plans</b>	Not available	MPRLP uses micro planning tool in all 4000 villages	GoMP Planning Commission recognise micro planning process and adopts for implementation of other programmes / schemes	DPMC uses micro plans as a basis to allocate budgets at the village level.	Line departments implements their respective schemes and programmes on the basis of consolidated micro plans at the district level.	Policy and decision makers maintain space for engagement of MPRLP and stakeholders in policy design and formulation.	
		<b>Sources</b>						Policy makers and officials have incentives to use the outputs from the Livelihoods Forum.
		Field Study reports & Project Back to office field trip reports (2009,2010,2011) State Learning Forum Reports (2010,2011,2012) MTR (2010) GoMP Circulars (2011,2012)						Useful lessons and evidence can be generated and applied in the given time scale.
	<b>Indicator O 5.2</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>		Mechanism for sharing RD best practices are
	0	1scheme / programme	1 schemes / programmes	2 schemes / programmes	2 schemes / programmes			
	<b>GoMP adopts programmes / schemes implementing the PFT model as an enhanced delivery</b>	<b>Sources</b>						
		Document on Project Delivery Mechanisms (2009)						

**MPRLP Phase II LFA final on 10 July 2009**

	<b>mechanisms</b>	MTR (2010) & Project Dissemination workshop report (2010) GoMP Rural Development reports (2010,2011) & GoMP Government circulars (2012) GoMP Rural Development finance reports (2012)				institutionalized within PR&RD department.
	<b>Indicator O 5.3</b>	<b>Baseline 2007-08 (PY1)</b>	<b>Milestone 2008-09 (PY2)</b>	<b>Milestone 2009-10 (PY3)</b>	<b>Milestone 2010-11 (PY4)</b>	<b>Target 2011-12 (PY5)</b>
	<b>Formal institutional set up at state and district level for sharing experiences, use of financial and human resources and collaborative working</b>	Vertical rural development programmes implemented with limited synergies.	Key Government schemes like NREGA, BRGF and TSC, and line agencies like NVDA use MPRLP as an implementing agency.	Vision document prepared that explains collaborative approach and institutional mechanisms for joint working	Collaborative working piloted in 3 project districts	<b>State level apex body formed and activated for sharing project experiences, joint planning and use of resources.</b>
		<b>Sources</b> Project Seminar & workshop reports (2009) MTR (2010) & Project Seminar reports (2010) SPC reports (2011,2012) & GoMP Rural Development finance reports (2011,2012) GoMP Circulars (2012)				
<b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>						<b>RISK RATING</b>
15%						Medium
<b>INPUTS (£)</b> (4% of £42m allocation)	<b>DFID (£)</b>	<b>Govt (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>	
	£1,680,000.-				100%	

**Activities Log**

<b>OUTPUT 1</b>	<b>ACTIVITY 1.1</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>	<b>Risks</b>	<b>Monitoring Officer</b>
	<b>ACTIVITY 1.2</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>		<b>Monitoring Officer</b>
	<b>ACTIVITY 1.3</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>		<b>Monitoring Officer</b>

<b>OUTPUT 2</b>	<b>ACTIVITY 2.1</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>	<b>Risks</b>	<b>Monitoring Officer</b>
	<b>ACTIVITY 2.2</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>		<b>Monitoring Officer</b>
	<b>ACTIVITY 2.3</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>		<b>Monitoring Officer</b>

<b>OUTPUT 3</b>	<b>ACTIVITY 3.1</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>	<b>Risks</b>	<b>Monitoring Officer</b>
	<b>ACTIVITY 3.2</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>		<b>Monitoring Officer</b>
	<b>ACTIVITY 3.3</b>	<b>Milestone 1</b>	<b>Milestone 2</b>	<b>Milestone 3</b>		<b>Monitoring Officer</b>