1. Logframe Narrative

As of 12 June 2014, the following standard numbers and percentages apply:

3.89 people per HH
Percentage female:　50.03%
Percentage male:　49.97%

June 30, 2014: Targets for all indicators now reflect 77000 CPHH (Changed from 67000).

2014-08-21: Targets for all indicators now reflect 78,000 CPHH (changed from the 77,000 noted above, 30 June).

2015-06-24: Updated the third worksheet to reflect the number of CPHHs for Cohort 2.6 i.e. from 13,564 to 13,590.
.

Cohort Number	Cohort Administrative Start Date	Cohort Assistance Start Date*	Cohort End Date	Administrative Cohort Length	Assistance Cohort Length	Number of CPHHs
2.1	4/1/2010	5/15/2010	12/31/2011	21.01	19.56	5,004
2.2	7/1/2010	9/30/2010	6/30/2012	24.00	21.01	12,109
2.3	7/1/2011	9/30/2011	6/30/2013	24.00	21.01	17,435
2.4	7/1/2012	9/30/2012	6/30/2014	23.97	20.98	16,309
2.5	7/1/2013	9/15/2013	6/30/2015	23.97	21.47	13,579
2.6	7/1/2014	9/1/2014	2/29/2016	19.99	17.95	13,590
						78,026

* All assistance projects do not start at the same time. Usually the group formation and weekly group meetings start first followed by livelihood orientation. Some activities (homestead gardening, asset purchase, IEP work, etc.) start immediately after that while some activities (VSL, market development, etc.) start after couple of months or even later. Moeover, start date largely depends on the completion of baseline survey and therefore varies from IMO to IMO.

1.1 Outcome 1 – Graduation

Milestone 4 will not change at this point. Graduation is judged within three months of the end of the cohort, meaning that Cohort 2.5 will not have completed. If graduation is judged early for Cohort 2.5 (i.e. during January rather than after June) then the number becomes 54,726; for Milestone 6, we assume that Graduation will be judged early.

Milestone 6 becomes 65,450 from 56,950 based on 85% of 77000 CPHHs graduated.

Until 12 June 2014, CLP's Graduation Criteria were as follows:

Criteria domain	Indicator
Income/ expenditure/ consumption	1. Household has had more than one source of income during the last 30 days
	2. Household achieves 'acceptable' food consumption score
Nutrition	3. Household has access to improved water
	4. Household has access to a sanitary latrine
	5. Presence of ash/ soap near to water point or latrine
Asset base	6. Productive assets worth more than Tk 30,000
Status of females	7. Participant is able to influence household decisions regarding sale/ purchase of large investments e.g. cattle
Vulnerability	8. Homestead is above known flood level
	9. Household has cash savings of more than Tk 3,000
Access to services	10. Household has membership of social group

During January 2014, a Graduation Discussion Note was circulated by CLP (see Annex below) that made four recommendations:

1. The Savings and Assets indicators should be merged.
2. Graduation should be judged by the HH achieving five of the nine remaining indicators (rather than 6 of 10)
3. The Acceptable Food Consumption Score (AFCS) should be replaced by "Three Meals A Day (3MD)".
4. The definition of a "sanitary latrine" should not take account of whether or not it has an intact water seal.

These issues were considered by the Annual Review of Feb 2014, which recommended:

1. Rejection of the merging of Savings and Assets.
2. Rejection of using 5 of 9.
3. Acceptance of using 3MD instead of AFCS.
4. DFID to consider and advise on the definition of 'sanitary latrine.'

Further discussions on Graduation occurred between DFID and CLP during and after the Annual Review. DFID asked CLP to suggest a replacement for the indicator on women's empowerment. DFID also requested a revisit of the AFCS vs 3MD recommendation, based on concerns that the 3MD indicator did not adequately report on the quality of food eaten in these three meals.

CLP recommended that the Women's Empowerment Scorecard data be used to replace the indicator for Output 4.1 – see the information below.

On assessing the differences between AFCS, 3MD and 3MD PLUS HH consuming 5 or more food groups in the previous week (known as 3MD+5FG), the recommendation to use the 3MD+5FG indicator for graduation was accepted.

After investigations, DFID provided CLP with guidance on the sanitary latrines indicator. This guidance was mixed, showing that some DFID advisers recommended that the sanitary standard should remain high, while others felt that the condition of the water seal was less important. On taking soundings from senior WASH and health specialists on CLP, the recommendation was made that the higher standard should remain – i.e. the water seal should remain unbroken for the HH to achieve graduation in this indicator.

As of 12 June 2014, the CLP graduation indicators are as follows, and a household is judged to have 'graduated' should it achieve pass marks in six of the ten indicators.

In addition, the data on graduation will be collected within three months of the completion of CLP assistance from each cohort. These graduation figures will then be finalised for each cohort, allowing a running average to accumulate over Cohorts 2.4 to 2.6. Efforts will be made to extrapolate graduation rates back to Cohorts 2.1 to 2.3.

CLP will continue to track and report on the resilience / sustainability of these indicators using its graduation panel sample, which goes back to CLP1.

Criteria domain	Indicator
Income/ expenditure/ consumption	1. Household has had more than one source of income during the last 30 days
	2. Household eats three meals a day AND consumes five or more food groups in the past week
Nutrition	3. Household has access to improved water
	4. Household has access to a sanitary latrine with an unbroken water seal
	5. Presence of ash/ soap near to water point or latrine
Asset base	6. Productive assets worth more than Tk 30,000
Status of females	7. Participant is able to influence household decisions regarding sale/ purchase of large investments e.g. cattle
Vulnerability	8. Homestead is above known flood level
	9. Household has cash savings of more than Tk 3,000
Access to services	10. Household has membership of social group

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 4 updated: from 43,465 HHs graduating to 43,228 HHs and target (Jan '16) updated from 65,450 HHs graduating to 66,300 HHs based on 85% of graduation.

Achievement: Milestone 4 January 2015

43,156 households have graduated (167,876 people)

Cohort Number	# of CPHHs	% graduating	# graduating
2.1	5,004	66.7	3,338
2.2	12,109	81.3	9,845
2.3	17,435	86.7	15,116
2.4	16,309	91.1	14,857
		Total	**43,156**

1.2 Outcome 2 - Extent of measurable and sustained changes in household income and expenditure

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Overall target (Jan '16) updated from 254,600 people to 257,907 HHs based on 85% of graduation.

Achievement: Milestone 4 January 2015

For 76% of households, income has increased by 50% or more (in real terms)

Cohort Number	# of CPHHs	Income increase 50% in real terms	# of HH
2.1	5,004	49.3	2,467
2.2	12,109	70	8,476
2.3	17,435	83	14,471
2.4	16,309	80.7	13,161
		Total	**38,576**

For 95% of households, expenditure increased by 50% or more (in real terms)

Cohort Number	# of CPHHs	Expenditure increase 50% in real terms	# of HH
2.1	5,004	73	3,653
2.2	12,109	91	11,019
2.3	17,435	98.6	17,191
2.4	16,309	99.2	16,179
		Total	**48,042**

For 99.9% of households, cash savings increased by 50% or more (in real terms)

Cohort Number	# of CPHHs	Savings increase 50% in real terms	# of HH
2.1	5,004	99.3	4,969
2.2	12,109	100	12,109
2.3	17,435	100	17,435
2.4	16,309	100	16,309
		Total	**50,822**

2015-06-24: According to AR '15 LF Recommendation; Outcome 2 Target statement revised:

Previous Statement	Changed Statement
85% of targeted core households (257,907 people) per capita income, expenditure and savings do not drop in real terms	For those who received assets 36 months previously, mean household per capita income, expenditure and cash savings increases by 50% (in real terms) above their baseline on entry for 85 % of targeted core households

1.3 Outcome 3 - Improved nutrition practices among targeted mothers and adolescent girls

All the targets calculated on the basis of following estimation.

Category of Clients	Year-1 (Feb-Dec-13)			Year-2 (Jan to Dec-14)			Year-3 (Jan toMar-16)			Total 3 years
	% found in HH listing survey	New Entrants (2.1-2.4 cohorts)	Cumulative	% found in HH listing survey	New Entrants	Cumulative	% found in HH listing survey	New Entrants	Cumulative	
Total Households	3.78%	30,633	30,633	3.51%	24,395	55,028	3.78%	19,013	74,041	74,041
Pregnant women	0.91%	1,054	1,054	1.42%	1,216	2,270	0.91%	654	2,924	2,924
Breastfeeding women	1.63%	1,887	1,887	1.59%	1,361	3,249	1.63%	1,171	4,420	4,420
Children 0-6 months	1.63%	1,887	1,887	1.59%	1,361	3,249	1.63%	1,171	4,420	4,420
# of Children 7 - 23 months	4.00%	4,632	4,632	4.26%	3,648	8,279	4.00%	2,875	11,154	11,154
# of Children 24-59 months	7.54%	8,731	8,731	7.61%	6,516	15,247	7.54%	5,419	20,666	20,666
# of adolescent girls	6.94%	8,036	8,036	6.39%	5,472	13,508	6.94%	4,988	18,495	18,495
# of Other family members		89,566	89,566		66,052	155,618		55,591	211,209	211,209
Total		**115,793**	**115,793**		**85,626**	**201,419**		**71,869**	**273,288**	**273,288**

Note:

1. Number of new entrants for Year-3 may change depending on the CLP's roll out plan.
2. % of target people for 2.1 - 2.5 phases found from CLP's internal household listing data/survey and Year 1 statistics used to forecast 2.6 phase.

Revised the previous targets on June 30, 2014 for clients in different categories

Category of Clients	Original Targets (As per proposal)	Revised Targets (As per HH Listing)	Difference
Pregnant women	9,014	2,924	(6,090)
Breastfeeding women	9,014	4,420	(4,594)
# of adolescent girls	36,056	18,495	(17,561)
Children 0-6 months	6,911	4,420	(2,491)
# of Children 7 - 23 months	11,088	11,154	66
# of Children 24-59 months	17,727	20,666	2,939
# of Other family members	210,655	211,209	554
Total	**300,465**	**273,288**	**(27,177)**

Notes for variances:
- ➤ In the project proposal total households to be served was 66,770 which is now 75,000 (as per decision of CLP-DFID meeting held on 27 March, 2014).

- ➤ In the project proposal average HH size was estimated to be 4.5 but actual HH size found by CLP survey was 3.78 for 2.1-2.4 cohorts while 3.51 for 2.5 cohort. We took the average HH size of cohort 2.5 for calculating the clients under cohort 2.6 which will start later this year.

- ➤ Average % for target clients of different categories was lower than the national average which was the basis for calculation of project proposal; for example national average for pregnant women is 3% but we found 0.91%.

- ➤ A good numbers of CLP CPHHs are selected from old aged people, widowed and persons with disabilities which reduced the number of target clients.

- ➤ Migration of some CPHHs further reduced the number of target clients.

- ➤ The revised targets include the households of 130 control villages (Livelihoods Only) from October 2015.

1.4 Outcome 4 – Level of measured change in household livelihood assets

12 June 2014, Milestone 6 updated to be 65,450 households out of 77,000; from a total of 71,000.

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 42,450 HHs with assets doubled to 43,228 HHs and target (Jan '16) updated from 65,450 HHs with assets doubled to 66,300 HHs based on 85% of HHs with assets doubled after 18 months.

Achievement: Milestone 5 January 2015

97% of CPHHs, equivalent to 48,330 HHs and 191,894 people (Cohorts 2.1 to 2.4) have seen their assets (productive) double since baseline.

Cohort Number	# of CPHHs	Asset value doubled above baseline (before asset transfer)	# of HH
2.1	5,004	96	4,804
2.2	12,109	100	12,109
2.3	17,435	98	17,086
2.4	16,309	94	15,330
		Total	49,330

61.7% CPHHs equivalent to 31,375 HHs and 122,049 people (Cohorts 2.1 to 2.4) have seen their assets double after receiving their asset.

Cohort Number	# of CPHHs	Asset value doubled after baseline (after asset transfer)	# of HH
2.1	5,004	60	3,002
2.2	12,109	60	7,265
2.3	17,435	64	11,158
2.4	16,309	61	9,948
		Total	31,375

83.3% of CPHHs (Cohorts 2.1 to 2.4) that received a raised plinth continue to reside there

87.7% of CPHHs (Cohorts 2.1 to 2.4) that received a sanitary latrine continue to use the latrine

1.5 Outcome 5 - Number of business group members with increased profit from livestock/ livestock products

The Original indicator for Outcome 5 looked at both profit levels and percentages of members achieving percentages of increase over baseline profits. The original detail for Milestone 5 (Jan 2015) was: 40% of group members showing a minimum 35% profit increase. The original for Milestone 6 (Jan 2016) was: 50% of group members showing a minimum 50% profit increase

The AR of Feb 2014 recommended this be modified in the light of real data showing lower achievements.

The following was suggested at meeting on 5 June 2014

Milestone 5 – Jan 2015
Milk Group: 15% of members show a 25% profit increase over baseline;
Meat Group: 40% of members show a 35% profit increase over baseline;
Fodder Group: 12% of members show a 25% profit increase over baseline.

Milestone 6 – Jan 2016
Milk Group: 30% of members show a 30% profit increase over baseline;
Meat Group: 50% of members show a 50% profit increase over baseline;
Fodder Group: 12% of members show a 30% profit increase over baseline.

This was considered too detailed for the logframe and absolute numbers were required.

Revised suggestion (on 8 June 2014).

Milestone 5, January 2015:
Of a total of 8,066 BG members, **1,802** (22.3%) will achieve a profit increase percentage appropriate for the BG area (average of 28.3% increase over baseline, varying by BG area; see Logframe Narrative for details).

Milestone 6, January 2016:
Of a total of 8,066 BG members, **2,523** (30.7%) will achieve a profit increase percentage appropriate for the BG area (average of 36.7% increase over baseline, varying by BG area, see Logframe Narrative for details).

The table below sets out the detailed calculations.

Business Group	Number of pax in the group	Overall Percent for Outcome 5 = 80%	%ages that are to achieve a pre-set profit threshold	Into Numbers	Profit Threshold to be achieved: % rise above baseline profit
Milestone 5 - January 2015					
Milk BG	3,042	2,434	15%	456	25%
Meat BG	2,652	2,122	40%	1,061	35%
Fodder BG	2,372	1,898	12%	285	25%
Totals / Averages	**8,066**	**6,453**	**22.3%**	**1,802**	**28.3%**
Milestone 6 - January 2016					
Milk BG	3,042	2,434	30%	913	30%
Meat BG	2,652	2,122	50%	1,326	50%
Fodder BG	2,372	1,898	12%	285	30%
Totals / Averages	**8,066**	**6,453**	**30.7%**	**2,523**	**36.7%**

Justification for modifying the baseline profit data (on 10 June 2014)

The original milk producer profit calculation used for the baseline survey included two income components which have now been excluded from the recalculated baseline figure and will also be excluded from profit calculations for all other milestones. These are:

1. The present value of calves produced by cows
2. The estimated value of milk consumed by the household

Including these components in the profit calculation is useful in cases where we want to reflect the full picture of benefits which dairy farming generates for a household's livelihood or farming system. However, the primary aim of the milk market development project is to raise producer profits by increasing milk sales volumes and sales prices.

As such, including present value of calves produced by cows in the profit calculation would make it harder to establish whether the profits had increased due to increased sales volumes and sales prices of milk, or due to increases in production of calves. Equally, including the estimated value of milk consumed by the household in the profit calculation makes it difficult to establish whether

farmers have actually sold more milk, increasing their cash income and profits as a result, or whether they have produced more milk and consumed it.

With this in mind, the baseline figure has been recalculated to exclude these income components. Accordingly, the targets for profit increases which are detailed in the Milestones for January 2015 and January 2016 have also been revised in line with this baseline. The agreed targets for increases in profits for these milestones (stated as percentages) have been applied to the re-calculated baseline in order to calculate the BDT values for these milestones. In addition, the profit calculations submitted for Milestone 4 (January 2014) also excluded these income components. As such, all figures for this outcome in the logframe follow the same profit calculation format.

One additional point to note about the recalculation of the baseline figure is that the baseline survey did not collect data about the sales price per litre of milk. As such, it was necessary to estimate this value in order to re-analyse this data. The estimated figure used was the average sales price per litre of milk which was recorded in the December 2013 Milk Market Development survey. This figure is 42 BDT/litre.

1.6 Outcome 6 - Enhanced status of women and girls

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Overall targets modified from 31,414 participants to 32,154 participants. Also 2.6 cohorts target modified from 9297 participants to 10037 participants. Updates made to incorporate additional 1000 core participant HHs.

1.7 Output 1.1 – Number of HHs raised on plinths

12 June 2014: Milestone 6 updated: from 71,500 HHs to the grand total of 76,947; total numbers and women / men numbers also updated using the standard figures.

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 61000 HHs to 62336 HHs, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 12716 HHs to 14052 HHs and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 updated from 10500 HHs to 14664 HHs. Updates made to incorporate additional 1000 core participant HHs.

Although the total target for CLP support is 78,000, it is unlikely that all CPs will be raised on plinths due to unavailability of land and landlords sometimes being unwilling to sacrifice agricultural topsoil and land for plinth-raising purposes.

1.8 Output 1.3 – Number of IEP person days during the lean season

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 1659548 person days to 1688548 person days, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 220,000 person days to 249,000 person days and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 updated from 92,000 person days to 339,452. Targets has been modified from 1751550 to 2028,000.

02 September 2014 (change to LF dated 21.08.2014): Weighting changed from 30% to 25% in line with Annual Review recommendations.

1.9   Output 2.1 - Number of households receiving productive assets

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 67,000 CPHHs to 75,000 CPHHs, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 15000 CPHHS to 17,791 CPHHs and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 updated from 4000 to 3000. Targets has been modified from 77,000 CPHHs to 78,000 CPHHs.

1.10 Output 2.2 - Number of core participants (CPs) ever enrolled in social development (SD) groups

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 74,930 CPs to 78,000 CPs, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 10,370 CPs to 13,564 CPs and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 will be 0 i.e. no new group will form this period. Targets has been modified from 77,000 CPHHs to 78,000 CPHHs.

1.11 Output 2.3 - Number of HHs receiving homestead gardening inputs and advice

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 63,487 HHs to 63,127 HHs, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 13,000 HHs to 12,640 CPs and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 updated from 13,460 to 12,873. Targets has been modified from 77,000 CPHHs to 76,000 CPHHs.

Not all CPHHs will receive the full package of support (training + inputs) e.g. because land is unavailable; some will migrate before completing the training; and other reasons. 76,000 HHs are those that are expected to receive the full package of support.

1.12 Output 2.4 - Number of Village Development Committees (VDC) established and operational

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 440 VDCs to 465 VDCs, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 46 VDCs to 71 VDCs and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 will be 0 i.e. no new group will form this period. Targets has been modified from 440 VDCs to 465 VDCs.

02 September 2014 (change to LF dated 21.08.2014): weighting changed from 30% to 25% it partially in line with Annual Review recommendations but AR recommendation did not add up to 100%.

1.13 Output 3.1 - Improved knowledge among farmers and other market actors within common interest business groups (milk and meat)

1.13.1 Milestone 5

This milestone is broken into the three BGs. Each BG is expected to have an overall participation rate of 80%; the number of participants is therefore 80% of the total.

Suggested indicator as of **5 June 2014:**

Milk: 2,434 participants receive 1 x day training AND attend at least 5 yard meetings/training sessions.
Meat: 2,122 participants attend at least 2 x training workshops.
Fodder: 1,898 participants receive fodder productivity training.

This was considered too detailed in the 5 June 2014 meeting. Revised suggested indicators as of **8 June 2014:**

Milk: 2,434 BG participants trained.
Meat: 2,122 BG participants trained.
Fodder: 1,898 BG participants trained.

Definitions of 8 June 2014 indicators:

1. BG means "business group".
2. The absolute numbers are based on 80% of the total BG members for each group.
3. For **Milk**, "Trained" is defined as having received 1 x day of training AND having attended at least 5 yard meetings / training sessions. The absolute numbers are based on 80% of the total.
4. For **Meat**, "trained" means they have attended at least 2 x training workshops.
5. For **Fodder**, it means that they have received at least 1 x fodder productivity training session.

No details about service providers are required (decision of 5 June 2014).

1.13.2 Milestone 6

Definitions of 8 June 2014 indicators:

1. **Milk**- 80% (2,434) participants received 1 day refresher training and attended at least 5 yard meetings.
2. **Meat**- 80% (2,122) participants received at least 1 day refresher on cattle rearing and attended at least 2 linkage workshop and 1 PSPM.
3. **Fodder**- 80% (1,898) participants received 1 day fodder production refresher and attended in at least 1 linkage workshop and 1 PSPM.

1.14 Output 3.2 - Increased access to relevant financial services for households investing in animal health, productivity and production quality

Milestone 4 of Output 3.2: 400 households in business groups have loans for milk, meat or fodder production

The achievement figure is changed from 388 to 559. New data was received during the Annual Review (Feb 2014) which indicated this figure should have been 487. The figure of 487 was given to the Annual Review team but the logframe was not updated with it. A recent analysis (June 2014) showed that there had been some mis-coding in the Sept 2013 Milk Survey, and the revised figure is now 559 BG members having taken loans by January 2014.

The change all relates to the figures for VSL loans taken by milk business group members. Specifically:
- The original data submitted about the VSL pilot groups stated that 99 MBG members had taken loans. As part of our VSL pilot group research, we recently collected accurate data directly from the record books of the pilot group members. This research found that 119 MBG members within these pilot groups had taken loans
- There were several VSL loans which were incorrectly coded in the September 2013 Milk producer survey database. As such, these were missed from the original analysis.

Sector	Total
# Milk business group members taking loans for milk production	209
# Meat business group members taking loans for meat production	342
# Fodder business group members taking loans for fodder production	8
TOTAL	**559**

The number in 'achievement' is the number of BG members that have taken one or more loans; it does NOT count multiple loans. So if one BG member took 12 loans in the year, this is still counted only once.

1.14.1 Milestone 5 – Cumulative Target

This milestone is measuring the numbers of BG members that have taken loans. Therefore if one BG member takes 12 loans during the year, this is counted only once, because it is the same BG member.

At the meeting of 5 June 2014, the cumulative target: "800 loans taken by BG members for milk, meat or fodder production" was deleted. The Annual Target is to remain, but also is to become cumulative.

The Annual unique individuals also becomes a cumulative target.

1.14.2 Milestone 5 – Annual Target

This annual target is measuring the number of unique NEW individuals to take a NEW loan during the year. If an individual has a loan that has carried on from the previous year, they should not be counted. If one individual takes several loans in the year, they should be counted only ONCE, because it is the presence of the individual taking at least ONE NEW loan that is being counted. If they were counted during Milestone 4 (i.e. they took a new loan during the last year) they should NOT be counted here; each individual BG member can be counted only once against these indicators.

1.14.3 Milestone 6 – Cumulative Target

"1200 loans taken by BG members for milk, meat or fodder production." This indicator was deleted during the meeting of 5 June 2014. It will be replaced with the cumulative total of unique new users, as per the accumulation of the Annual Target.

1.14.4 Milestone 6 – Annual Target

This milestone should measure the number of unique NEW individuals to take a NEW loan during the year. If they were counted during Milestones 4 or 5 they should NOT be counted here; each individual BG member can be counted only once against these indicators.

1.15 Output Indicator 3.3 - Relationships established between business groups, buyers (meat & milk products) and input suppliers

The original indicator for Milestone 5 was: "90% of CBCs meet at least 10 times per year with meetings attended by at least: 1 x input dealer AND 1 x buyer AND 1 x BG member (any type)."

This was considered too detailed by the meeting of 5 June 2014. It was therefore modified as follows:

"90% of CBCs meet attendance criteria."

The attendance criteria is defined as "meeting 10 times per year AND meetings must be attended by at least: 1 x input dealer AND 1 x buyer AND 1 x BG member (any type)."

For **Milestone 6**, the indicator is:

"70% of CBCs meet attendance criteria."

The attendance criteria is defined as "meeting 8 times per year AND meetings must be attended by at least: 1 x input dealer AND 1 x buyer AND 1 x BG member (any type)."

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 1,625 linkage meeting to 1,650 linkage meeting, Annual target Feb '14 to Jan '15 updated from 668 linkage meeting to 693 linkage meeting and annual target Feb '15 to Jan '16 updated from 287 to 200. Targets has been modified from 1,912 linkage meeting to 1,850 linkage meeting.

02 September 2014 (change to LF dated 21.08.2014): weighting changed from 10% to 15% in line with Annual Review recommendations.

1.16 Output 4: Enhanced status of women and girls

2015-06-24: According to the Annual Review (AR) LF Recommendation; Output 4 statement changed that reflect the indicators.

Change from	Change to
Enhanced status of women and girls	Awareness raising and skill development for adolescents and couples

1.17 Output 4.1 – Percentage of CLP CPs that report being 'empowered' using the Women's Empowerment Scorecard

Original indicator: Increase in % of women and girls expressing self-confidence. Milestones: 10% increase in proportion of CPs completing CLP cycle reporting selected household decisions are made jointly.

See the file "2014-04-23 Recommendations and Discussions on Various Indicators, Draft 02.docx" for recommendations made to DFID during the Annual Review process on this indicator.

Note 7: for completing cohorts, data is to be collected within plus or minus three months of their completion date. For cohorts still under implementation, data will be collected as close to January as possible.

Milestone 3 for January 2013 was consist of the following: "At least 74% of Cohort 2.2 (8960 of 12,109 CPHHs) reporting selected household decisions are made jointly."

Milestone 4 for January 2014 was consist of the following: "At least 74% of Cohort 2.3 (12,901 of 17435 CPHHs) reporting selected household decisions are made jointly."

Milestone 5 for January 2015 should consist of the following: "At least 74% of Cohort 2.4 (12,109 of 16,363 CPHHs) and Cohort 2.5 CPs (9,969 of 13,472) report being empowered, for a total of 22,102 out of 29,868 participants."

Milestone 6 for January 2016 should consist of the following: "(a) At least 74% of Cohort 2.6 (7,817 of 10,564) report being empowered. (b) Using historical data, an overall average of 74% of Cohorts 2.4 to 2.6 report being empowered (29,864 of 40,399 participants).

1.18 Output 4.2 – Percentage of targeted girls that regularly attend training activities

Should the activity to provide additional training to adolescent groups go ahead, CLP should track the outputs and, preferably, outcomes from the training.

The following indicators and milestones are suggested (all to be gender disaggregated – data will be collected on girls and boys, but the girls are being highlighted here):

Output Indicator: Number of targeted girls and boys trained.

"Trained" is defined as the boy or girl completing at least 70% of the training sessions.

Milestone 5 January 2015, Modified 12 June 2014 to: 160 of 200 girls and boys trained.

(Pre-12 June 2014: 80% of targeted (160 out of 200) girls and boys attend at least 70% of training sessions.)

Milestone 6 January 2016, Modified 12 June 2014: **Cumulative target:** 240 of 300 girls and boys trained. **Annual target:** 80 of 100 boys and girls trained.

(Pre-12 June 2014: This year additional 100 girls and boys will trained vocational training. So 80% of targeted (240 out of 300) girls and boys attend at least 70% of training sessions.)

Outcomes indicators and milestones will need to be crafted once the content of training / education sessions are finalised.

1.19 Output 5.1. Monitoring, evaluation (M&E) & communication leads to learning and knowledge of best practice amongst all stakeholders

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 5 updated: from 40 evidence based studies to 65 evidence based studies. Overall target has been modified from 50 evidence based studies to 75 evidence based studies. The reasons for changes are arithmetic i.e. annual + cumulative targets didn't add up.

1.20 Output 6: Improved nutrition practices among targeted mothers and adolescent girls

Output indicator 6.4: This indicator is the sum of pregnant women, breast feeding mothers and adolescent girls.

Output indicator 6.5: this indicator includes children 12-59 months and other family members.

21 August 2014 (change to LF dated 30.06.2014): Milestone 2 and targets are updated

Output indicator 6.1: Milestone 2 - 90% of targeted (3,019 out of 3,354 expected participants, see Note 8) lactating mothers receive counselling on EBF. Cumulative target: 95% of targeted (4,230 out of 4,453 expected participants) lactating mothers receive counselling on EBF.

Output indicator 6.2: Milestone 2 - 90% of targeted (7,706 out of 8,562) lactating mothers receive training on ACF. Cumulative target: 95% of targeted (10,930 out of 11,506) lactating mothers receive training on ACF.

Output indicator 6.3: Milestone 2 - 75% of targeted (6,422 out of 8,562) children receive MNPs. Cumulative target: 95% of targeted (10,931 out of 11,506) children receive MNPs.

Output indicator 6.4: Milestone 2 - 85% of targeted (16,703 out of 19,650) mothers and adolescent girls receive iron and folic acid (IFA). Cumulative target: 95% of targeted (24,838 out of 26,145) mothers and adolescent girls receive iron and folic acid (IFA).

Output indicator 6.5: Deleted from Logframe after the number of Nutrition outputs (5) were queried by DFID. This one was felt to be of lesser importance.

Category of Clients	Year-1 (Feb-Dec-13)			Year-2 (Jan to Dec-14)			Year-3 (Jan toMar-16)			Total 3 years
	% found in HH listing survey	New Entrants (2.1-2.4 cohorts)	Cumulative	% found in HH listing survey	New Entrants	Cumulative	% found in HH listing survey	New Entrants	Cumulative	
Total Households	3.78%	30,633	30,633	3.51%	24,395	55,028	3.78%	19,013	74,041	74,041
Pregnant women	0.91%	1,054	1,054	1.42%	1,216	2,270	0.91%	654	2,924	2,924
Breastfeeding women	1.63%	1,887	1,887	1.59%	1,361	3,249	1.63%	1,171	4,420	4,420
Children 0-6 months	1.63%	1,887	1,887	1.59%	1,361	3,249	1.63%	1,171	4,420	4,420
# of Children 7 - 23 months	4.00%	4,632	4,632	4.26%	3,648	8,279	4.00%	2,875	11,154	11,154
# of Children 24-59 months	7.54%	8,731	8,731	7.61%	6,516	15,247	7.54%	5,419	20,666	20,666
# of adolescent girls	6.94%	8,036	8,036	6.39%	5,472	13,508	6.94%	4,988	18,495	18,495
# of Other family members		89,566	89,566		66,052	155,618		55,591	211,209	211,209
Total		**115,793**	**115,793**		**85,626**	**201,419**		**71,869**	**273,288**	**273,288**

Note:

1. Number of new entrants for Year-3 may change depending on the CLP's roll out plan.
2. % of target people for 2.1 - 2.5 phases found from CLP's internal household listing data/survey and Year 1 statistics used to forecast 2.6 phase.

Revised the previous targets on June 30, 2014 for clients in different categories

Category of Clients	Original Targets (As per proposal)	Revised Targets (As per HH Listing)	Difference
Pregnant women	9,014	2,924	(6,090)
Breastfeeding women	9,014	4,420	(4,594)
# of adolescent girls	36,056	18,495	(17,561)
Children 0-6 months	6,911	4,420	(2,491)
# of Children 7 - 23 months	11,088	11,154	66
# of Children 24-59 months	17,727	20,666	2,939
# of Other family members	210,655	211,209	554
Total	**300,465**	**273,288**	**(27,177)**

Notes for variances:

➢ In the project proposal total households to be served was 66,770 which is now 75,000 (as per decision of CLP-DFID meeting held on 27 March, 2014).

➢ In the project proposal average HH size was estimated to be 4.5 but actual HH size found by CLP survey was 3.78 for 2.1-2.4 cohorts while 3.51 for 2.5 cohort. We took the average HH size of cohort 2.5 for calculating the clients under cohort 2.6 which will start later this year.

➢ Average % for target clients of different categories was lower than the national average which was the basis for calculation of project proposal; for example national average for pregnant women is 3% but we found 0.91%.

➢ A good numbers of CLP CPHHs are selected from old aged people, widowed and persons with disabilities which reduced the number of target clients.

➢ Migration of some CPHHs further reduced the number of target clients.

➢ The revised targets include the households of 130 control villages (Livelihoods Only) from October 2015.

June 30, 2014 changed Baseline values TBC to Zero Output Indicators 6.1 to 6.5.

Graduation – Discussion Note

Summary

CLP's graduation criteria are reviewed in light of experience from the field; DFID reporting standards; and questions raised by CLP and DFID staff members.

Four indicators are assessed: the overall requirement to meet six of 10 graduation criteria; the nutrition indicator of 'acceptable' food consumption score; the 'asset values' and 'savings' indicators; and the sanitary latrine indicator.

CLP recommends that: the two separate criteria of 'asset values' and 'savings' be merged into one with a higher threshold (Tk33,000); that the Acceptable Food Standard Score be modified in favour of the more community-accepted food security standard of "Three Meals Per Day"; that the sanitary latrine indicator be brought in line with DFID reporting (i.e. irrespective of the condition of the water seal); and that the overall 'graduated' status be reached on a household achieving five of the nine graduation criteria (55.6%).

This will create a new baseline, minimum standard for graduation which will be more in line with DFID standards and the approach of other livelihoods / social protection practitioners. The original AFCS and latrine indicators can be tracked as sustainability and behaviour change indicators using information that is currently collected.

Accepting all of these will modify the overall graduation rate to **86.1%** for CLP1 and Cohorts 2.1 and 2.2.

This analysis was based on October 2012 data, and will be updated during February 2014 once the 2013 data (collected Nov/Dec 2013) becomes available for analysis.

A CLP participant and her healthy bull

CLP-2 (2010-2016) aims to lift 67,000 households (approximately 270,000 people) out of extreme poverty.

Historically, the CLP has defined "movement out of poverty" using income/expenditure measures: whether incomes and expenditures have been raised above Tk 18 per person per day (pppd). The independent impact assessment of CLP-1 concluded that between 12,500 and 29,300 households had been moved out of extreme poverty as they were above this threshold.[1]

Using only an income/expenditure measure has constraints, however. Households living on the chars are largely reliant for income on agricultural wage labour, even after they receive their CLP asset. The fluctuations in this labour – both its availability depending on the agricultural season, and the household's ability to access it, i.e. if there is illness in the household – mean that a household's income can fluctuate above and below the poverty line. If data is collected during a period when the household is not earning so much, it may paint a very different picture to data collected at a different time.

Income measures of poverty are "simplistic" and do not yield a true understanding of a household's real welfare. Thus a household may have: a secure home; good quality water, sanitation and drainage; children at school; access to health care; and diversity and security of access to good, nutritious food. However, using the income-only indicator, this household may be considered

---

[1] HTSPE; August 2011; Independent Impact Assessment of the Chars Livelihoods Programme, Phase 1; Final Report

just as poor as a low-income household with none of these.[2] The CLP has data to illustrate this point[3].

The CLP recognises the importance of income, expenditure and consumption data and continues to collect and analyse this data. However, the programme has also begun to judge movement out of poverty based on a broader set of criteria. These are called 'graduation criteria', and they are set out below.

Table 1:   CLP Graduation Criteria

Criteria domain	Indicator
Income/ expenditure/ consumption	1. Household has had more than one source of income during the last 30 days
	2. Household achieves 'acceptable' food consumption score
Nutrition	3. Household has access to improved water
	4. Household has access to a sanitary latrine
	5. Presence of ash/ soap near to water point or latrine
Asset base	6. Productive assets worth more than Tk 30,000
Status of females	7. Participant is able to influence household decisions regarding sale/ purchase of large investments e.g. cattle
Vulnerability	8. Homestead is above known flood level
	9. Household has cash savings of more than Tk 3,000
Access to services	10. Household has membership of social group

A household is said to have graduated (or moved out of extreme poverty) if they achieve **any six of these 10 criteria.**

Recent assessment of the above graduation criteria has taken place, based on learnings from the field and discussions around the purpose of the graduation figure. These focused around the Income / Expenditure / Consumption domain, particularly the Acceptable Food Consumption Score; the Sanitary Latrine indicator under Nutrition; the Productive Assets indicator under Asset Base; and the Cash Savings indicators under Vulnerability. The requirement for six of 10 indicators to be achieved has also been reviewed. These will be considered individually below.

Cash Savings and Productive Assets Indicators

Under the current system, savings and productive assets are considered separate classes of indicator. However, both represent relatively liquid assets that can be used in times of crisis (i.e. to reduce vulnerability) and to increase the asset base. For example, in a flood, a family may choose to sell cattle to finance a boat for moving their possessions and homestead, replace lost items, and so forth. Alternatively, they could draw down from savings. This is particularly true of the chars situation, which usually presents participants with slow-onset crises such as floods, which give people a chance to plan their mitigation measures.

The effect of having two separate indicators for these very similar financial criteria is to exclude people from graduation. A family may just have sold both of their mature cattle and thus have assets of zero, but 'savings' of e.g. Tk 70,000 which they have not yet used to invest in other productive assets. These households, if surveyed at that time, would classify as 'not graduating' under that

[2] http://www.irinnews.org/Report/97058/GLOBAL-Rethinking-urban-poverty
[3] Kenward S. et al; October 2011; Review of the CLP's Selection and Graduation Criteria

criteria, which is an exclusion error. Similarly, a family may have recently drawn down all of its savings to purchase more productive assets. Again, this household would fail on the savings criteria, despite having very healthy levels of productive assets.

To avoid these exclusion errors, CLP recommends combining these indicators into one criteria: household has assets AND savings of Tk 33,000 or more.

This modification will have the following effects.

Table 2: Current graduation figures for each individual criteria

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg of CLP1 to 2.2	Avg of CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Productive assets worth >=30,000 taka	46.1	55.7	41.9	24.9	0.0	**47.9**	42.1	33.7
HH has cash savings >=3,000 taka	30.1	44.8	68.0	9.5	0.0	**47.6**	38.1	30.5

Table 3: Effect of combining Assets+Savings into one indicator

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg of CLP1 to 2.2	Avg of CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Productive assets worth >=33,000 taka	44.6	51.3	41.3	25.1	0.0	**45.7**	40.6	32.5

Using the Avg of CLP1 to 2.2 column (because this table shows data from when Cohort 2.4 was still the control and / or was in the early days of CLP support, and while Cohort 2.3 had only just completed its support), these two tables indicate that approximately the same proportion of HHs will graduate with the combined indicator as graduate in either of the individual indicators. However, when considering HHs that meet BOTH individual indicators, the effect is apparent:

Table 4: HHs that meet BOTH individual indicators

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg of CLP1 to 2.2	Avg of CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
HHs that meet BOTH individual indicators (assets AND savings)	14.4	25.9	28.4	2.5	0.0	**22.9**	17.8	14.2

Combining these two indicators will thus raise overall graduation rates. However, combining two indicators into one leaves CLP with the issue of what to do with the overall policy of meeting six of 10 criteria, given that the number of criteria will have reduced to nine. Three options exist: (a) add another indicator to return the total to 10; (b) accept nine as the new total; or (c) give the new combined indicator a weighting of two (2), so keeping the overall number of 'points' at 10, while actual indicators remain at nine.

If (a) is the preferred option, the question is: what indicator should be added? Given the history of the graduation considerations under CLP – with many reviews and opinions – it is not recommended to begin the debate anew. Combining two indicators into one still captures the essential elements of the overall graduation domains while also representing more accurately the real-world practical similarity between productive assets (such as cattle) and savings in cash. It is therefore recommended that option (a) be dismissed.

If (b) is the preferred option, the question then becomes: do HHs still need to achieve six of nine indicators, or should the standard be modified, for example to become five of nine indicators to graduate?

Requiring six of 10 indicators is a graduation percentage of 60.0%, while requiring six of nine increases the percentage to 66.7%. Requiring five of nine decreases the overall graduation percentage to 55.6%.

Keeping all other indicators constant, the two tables below show the impact on overall graduation results of these two scenarios ("6 of 9" vs. "5 of 9").

Table 5:   Effect on overall graduation of combined Assets+Savings and requiring five of nine indicators to be met

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Assets+Savings of >= 33,000 and Meets 5 of 9 graduation criteria	78.2	73.8	76.4	62.9	0.2	**76.1**	72.8	58.3

Table 6:   Effect on overall graduation of combined Assets+Savings and requiring six of nine indicators to be met

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
(1) Assets+Savings of >= 33,000 and (2) Meets 6 of 9 graduation criteria	64.4	63.0	63.2	46.3	0.0	**63.5**	59.2	47.4

As the tables show, combining the two criteria and then requiring only "five of nine" criteria to be met raises overall graduation rates considerably – from 60.3% to 76.1% (for CLP1 to 2.2).

Requiring "six of nine" indicators to be met results in only a very small increase in overall graduation rates from the current percentage – from 60.3% to 63.5%.

Reducing the requirement to five of nine does result in an overall percentage reduction (partly explaining the rise in graduation rates), but does not reduce the percentage as much as requiring six of nine would increase the percentage rate.

If option (c) is the preferred option, this raises the question of whether one indicator be weighted in a system which was not designed around weighting and in which all other indicators are equal. The danger here is that, once again, the whole graduation issue would become up for debate, absorbing more resources and, with a potentially new graduation system, making comparisons with previous graduation figures much more difficult or effectively not possible. It is therefore recommended that option (c) be dismissed.

As a result, CLP recommends that the overall graduation criteria be adjusted to require meeting five of nine indicators to classify the household as 'graduated.'

Acceptable Food Consumption Score vs. Three Meals a Day

The current standard for CLP in the Food Security domain is to rate households on whether they achieve an 'Acceptable' Food Consumption Score. This method was developed by the World Food Programme. It is a weighted score based on dietary diversity, food frequency and the nutritional importance of food groups consumed. Data is collected on the number of days in the last seven days a household ate specific food items. The FCS of a household is calculated by multiplying the frequency of foods consumed in the last seven days with the weighting of each food group. The weighting of food groups has been determined by WFP according to the nutrition density of the food group. For example, meat and dairy products have a weight of 4; dark leafy vegetables a weight of 1; oil or sugar a weight of 0.5, and so on.

The sum of the scores is then used to determine the FCS. The maximum FCS has a value of 112 which would be achieved if a household ate each food group every day during the last 7 days. The total scores are then compared to pre-established thresholds. Taking into account the relatively high proportion of oil consumed in Bangladeshi diets, the *char* specific consumption thresholds are therefore:
- Poor food consumption : 0 to 28
- Borderline food consumption : 28.5 to 42
- Acceptable food consumption score (AFCS): Over 42

While this is a scientific and rigorous measure of the nutrition intake of an individual, measured over seven days, it has some drawbacks. It does not consider quantity of food consumed; it does not consider intra-household food distribution; it is a short-term measure that does not consider seasonality effects; and it does not represent the food security criteria commonly used by *chars*-dwellers – that of eating three meals per day.

It also represents an area of social development that many (all?) governments and societies are currently struggling with; that of encouraging healthy eating habits among their citizens. In many developed countries, people's food consumption is skewed towards high-calorie, high-fat and high-sugar items, causing rising rates of obesity and the medical problems that result. This is in countries that have good levels of resources (financial, human and institutional) and have been using them to promote healthy nutritional behaviours for decades. Is it reasonable to expect the CLP to achieve in 18 months and with low levels of resources what developed nations have been tackling for years with mixed results?

In addition, it has a marked impact on the overall graduation scores for CLP – see the tables below.

Table 7: Individual indicator graduation rates using 'Acceptable' Food Consumption Score criteria

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
HHs achieves 'acceptable' food consumption score	40.2	34.5	41.6	36.8	8.2	38.8	38.3	32.3

Table 8: Individual indicator graduation rates using community standard of 'Three Meals a Day'

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All

HHs reports achieving three meals per day	93.6	91.4	89.9	78.6	29.0	91.6	88.4	76.5

Using the previous six of 10 criteria, the overall graduation rates using 'Three Meals' rather than AFCS are as follows:

Table 9: Graduation rates using 'Three Meals a Day' and six of 10 indicators

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Overall Graduation using "3 Meals" and 6 of 10 indicators	69.4	71.0	77.8	48.3	0.0	**72.7**	66.6	53.3

Combining the 'Three Meals' criteria with the combined Assets+Savings and specifying 5 of 9 indicators results in an overall graduation rate as follows:

Table 10: Graduation rates using 'Three Meals a Day', combined Assets+Savings and five of nine indicators

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Overall Graduation using "3 Meals"; Assets+Savings Combined; and 5 of 9 indicators	86.2	82.2	86.8	71.1	0.4	**85.0**	81.6	65.3

The Sanitary Latrine Indicator

CLP's current graduation criteria for Access to a Sanitary Latrine includes the requirement that the water seal of the latrine be unbroken. Anecdotal reports from the chars indicate that, usually after some time, some CPHHs deliberately break the water seal. This is because a broken water seal requires less or no water, thus speeding the process.

However, this standard does not match DFID's own internal reference for graduation or reporting on outputs. Under DFID's criteria, the presence or condition of a water seal is not a criterion. In addition, the graduation criteria should be a reflection of the operational effectiveness of CLP's approach. While it is certainly arguable that maintaining an intact water seal may help prevent some level of infection and unpleasant odours, nevertheless CLP has little direct control over the decision to break it. The absence of an intact water seal does not mean that CLP's approach or effectiveness was low; it is arguably a sustainability indicator of the effectiveness of the behaviour change communications around health and sanitation.

Latrines are sanitary when installed; the presence of the latrine is therefore a more accurate indicator of graduation. If the condition of the water seal is important, it could be used as a proxy indicator for the effectiveness or sustainability of the WASH training. If so, additional indicators and research would need to be added to present a comprehensive picture. This would add complexity and expense. The indicator of a latrine with an intact water seal could thus be considered a sustainability or 'standard of living' indicator, and continue to be tracked to indicate direction of travel and / or the impact of behavioural change activities.

Adjusting the latrine indicator raises he individual latrine indicator graduation rate for CLP1 – 2.2 by around 9% from 57.8% to 66.7%. Adjusting the sanitary latrine criteria would have the following impact on overall graduation rates, using the original six of 10 indicator standard – see Table 11. This individual indicator has a very minor impact on overall graduation rates.

Table 11: Overall graduation rates using Adjusted Sanitary Latrine and six of 10 indicators

Indicator	CLP 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2	Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Overall Graduation using Adjusted Sanitary Latrine and 6 of 10 indicators	59.5	61.0	67.4	39.1	0.0	**62.6**	56.7	45.4

Table 12 below shows the impact on graduation rates of accepting all the modified indicators along with the five of nine overall graduation criteria. Annex 1 below gives a table showing the 'original' and 'recommended' criteria side-by-side.

Table 12: Graduation rates using All Adjusted Indicators and five of nine indicators

Proportion of households achieving criteria, by cohort							Avg CLP1 to 2.3	Avg All
Indicators	CLP1	CLP2.1	CLP2.2	CLP2.3	CLP2.4	Avg CLP1 to 2.2		
HH has had more than one income source	44.1	40.4	32.0	23.4	10.0	**38.8**	35.0	30.0
HHs achieves three meals/day	93.6	91.4	89.9	78.6	29.0	**91.6**	88.4	76.5
HHs has access to improved water	19.8	39.8	29.8	27.1	6.9	**29.8**	29.1	24.7
Access to a latrine (irrespective of water seal condition)	66.1	59.3	74.7	50.2	13.5	**66.7**	62.6	52.8
Presence of ash/soap near to water point or latrine	99.0	98.9	98.3	97.8	23.0	**98.7**	98.5	83.4
HH has total productive asset value >=33,000	44.6	51.3	41.3	25.1	0.0	**45.7**	40.6	32.5
Participant is able to influence HH decisions	70.4	62.7	69.9	63.4	0.0	**67.7**	66.6	53.3
Homestead is on a flood protected plinth	77.2	66.0	74.7	77.4	29.4	**72.7**	73.8	64.9
Household part of committee or social group	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	**100.0**	100.0	80.0
Meets 5 of 9 Criteria	**86.7**	**83.3**	**88.2**	**73.6**	**0.9**	**86.1**	**82.9**	**66.5**

Discussion and Recommendations

While each of the changes above has strong reasons to recommend them individually, the overall impact is one of substantially increasing the headline graduation rate from 60% to over 86%. This may look suspiciously like simply manipulating the data / standards to produce the desired result.

An over-arching justification for these modifications is that it will produce a standardised minimum level of developmental change that can be considered synonymous with 'graduation' – i.e. a household that has moved out of a state of extreme poverty. This minimum will be consistent with DFID indicators AND consistent with elements of *chars*-dwellers' own perceptions of what it means to be in poverty and out of poverty.

It also gives CLP the opportunity to consider the original, more rigorous standards as "sustainability or standard of living" indicators. These can be used to track direction of travel and feed useful

lessons back into operations. For example, the 'Acceptable' Food Consumption Score represents a rigorous way of assessing people's nutritional intake over seven days. However, it clashes with the community's own perception of poverty, which does not focus on nutritional quality, because it is a much harder analysis to do at the community level. It also requires more training and a different mindset to accept it as a 'better' indicator. Thus the "3 meals" indicator can be used as the minimum standard, one that will resonate with chars-dwellers and fit their own mental model. The AFCS can then be used to test the effectiveness of behaviour change activities aimed at improving the nutritional status of households.

A similar logic holds for the 'sanitary latrine' indicator. While it is certainly true that the higher-standard indicator represents the desired ultimate status, it can be considered a sustainability or standard of living indicator. It will thus be easier to plan for, implement and assess efforts to increase the numbers of HHs that choose to maintain the water seal intact.

The CLP recommends that DFID accept the following modifications to the Graduation criteria:

- Combine two individual indicators that track Asset Values and Savings Values into one indicator with a higher threshold based on the monetary values of the two individual indicators. Thus the indicator would be "Household achieves asset values and / or savings of >= Tk 33,000."
- Modify the overall graduation criteria to define 'graduation' as the point at which a household achieves **five of nine** criteria.
- Switch the current 'Acceptable' Food Consumption Score indicator to "Household reports being able to eat three meals per day on a regular basis."
- Switch the current Sanitary Latrine indicator so that the condition of the water seal is not considered.
- Continue to monitor the previous indicators as sustainability or standard of living indicators, and feedback lessons into operations with the aim of maintaining a positive 'direction of travel' in these areas. This will particularly revolve around reviewing the behavioural change and awareness-raising activities.

2. Annex 1 – Current Criteria and Recommended Criteria

Current Criteria	Recommended Criteria
1. HH has had more than one income source during the last 30 days.	1. HH has had more than one income source during the last 30 days.
2. HHs achieves acceptable food consumption score.	2. HH reports eating three meals per day in the last seven days.
3. HHs has access to improved water.	3. HH has access to improved water.
4. Access to a sanitary latrine (includes the requirement that the water seal be unbroken or undamaged).	4. Access to a sanitary latrine meeting DFID guidance standards.
5. Presence of ash/soap near to water point or latrine.	5. Presence of ash/soap near to water point or latrine
6. Productive assets worth >=30,000 taka.	6. Productive assets and / or savings worth >=33,000 taka.
7. Participant is able to influence HH decisions.	7. Participant is able to influence HH decisions.
8. Homestead is on a flood-protected plinth.	8. Homestead is on a flood-protected plinth.
9. HH has cash savings >=3,000 taka.	9. HH has membership of a group.
10. HH has membership of a group.	**HH must achieve 5 of 9 indicators to be considered 'graduated'**
HH must achieve 6 of 10 indicators to be considered 'graduated'	