

# Republic of Mozambique

## Sofala Bank Artisanal Fisheries Project

### Impact Evaluation

#### Executive summary

#### I. Background

1. As decided by the IFAD Executive Board, the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) carried out an impact evaluation of the IFAD-supported Sofala Bank Artisanal Fisheries Project (SBAFP) in the Republic of Mozambique in 2015/2016. The overall rationale and terms of reference for this impact evaluation are captured in the approach paper.<sup>1</sup>

#### II. The project

2. The SBAFP was implemented in the Sofala Bank, an area with a large diversity of ecosystems, among which are many sandy beaches and dunes, mangrove forests, bays and widespread wetlands. Because of the large surface area and varying landscapes, six concentration areas were chosen along the coast in which "project activities could be implemented most cost-effectively and achieve the greatest impact" (see EB 2001/73/R.16/Rev.1).
3. The project's development goal, as stated in the President's report, was to: "attain a sustained improvement in the social and economic conditions of artisanal fishing communities in the project area".
4. **Project objectives.** The table below lists the objectives to achieve the above development goal and components at design.

##### Project objectives and components at design

Objectives	Components
To improve the well-being of fishers by empowering and creating capacity in fishing communities to take increased responsibility for local development initiatives, including implementing social infrastructure and service activities and managing marine resources in a sustainable manner	Community development
To improve access to, and the commercially viable and sustainable use of, Sofala Bank fish resources by artisanal fishers	Fisheries development
To improve economic and physical linkages of artisanal fishing communities to input and output markets on a sustainable basis	Markets
To increase commercial and economic activity in artisanal fisheries subsector	Financial services
To improve the enabling environment for promoting and supporting artisanal fisheries development	Policy, legal and institutional support

Source: SBAFP President's report (2001).

5. **Target group.** The target group consisted of about 500,000 people and encompassed both fishing families and non-fishing families, with the aim of supporting the community as a whole. Within this target group, the primary beneficiaries – an estimated 26,000 fishers and their families – were located in 290 fishing communities in the aforementioned six concentration areas along the coast. The secondary beneficiaries consisted of (i) an estimated 2,300 fish traders, fish processors, boat builders, craft workers, artisans and other economically active groups within the coastal communities; and (ii) families that provide labour along the access roads rehabilitated by the project.

<sup>1</sup> See: [www.ifad.org/documents/10180/446ed35b-217e-4067-880f-40aeb3623e6f](http://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/446ed35b-217e-4067-880f-40aeb3623e6f).

6. **Institutional arrangements.** The official executing agency of the project is the Ministry of Sea, Interior Waters and Fisheries. It comprises four organizations with administrative autonomy, namely: (i) the Institute for Development of Small-scale Fisheries (IDPPE) – responsible for the organization and management of the project; (ii) the Fisheries Research Institute (IIP); (iii) the National Fisheries Administration (ADNAP) – responsible for fisheries regulations, licensing for artisanal fisheries and the safety at sea; and (iv) the Small Industry Development Fund (FFPI) – managing formal credit activities.

### **III. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process**

7. **Objectives.** The main objectives of this impact evaluation are to: (i) assess project impact in a quantitative manner, while also paying due attention to qualitative aspects; and (ii) generate findings and recommendations for the design of future operations and implementation of ongoing operations in the country and elsewhere.
8. **Methodology.** The impact evaluation was undertaken in line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy (2011) and the second edition of the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2015). It adopts a set of internationally recognized evaluation criteria (annex I of the main report) and a six-point rating system. This means that while the focus of the evaluation is decisively on the impact criterion, the project performance has also been assessed across all other criteria. This allows the impact evaluation to provide a more strategic and holistic assessment of SBAFP's performance and impact.
9. At the outset of the evaluation, IOE conducted a thorough evaluability assessment of the SBAFP. This allowed for a better understanding of the availability and quality of existing data (e.g. baseline data, and data from the Results and Impact Management System [RIMS]) for the impact evaluation.
10. Based on the outcome of the evaluability assessment, IOE decided to follow a mixed-method approach in this impact evaluation, using quasi-experimental techniques that entailed a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The evaluation made extensive use of both primary and secondary data and information.
11. In the absence of a robust baseline, the quantitative component of the survey employed two strategies: (i) an attempt to reconstruct baseline information through recall methods. This was fundamental because, even though the project had conducted a baseline survey in 2002, it did not identify a comparison group nor did it include considerations for sample size decision, such as key indicators to be estimated, level of significance and power; and (ii) adoption of a quasi-experimental approach using "propensity score matching" as a statistical technique that does not strictly require baseline data. A subset of households with and without project intervention were matched according to a set of characteristics<sup>2</sup> that are not likely to have been affected by the project.
12. The above approach allowed the evaluation to conduct a "with or without the project" analysis. Also, the recall questions allowed the ex post reconstruction of the baseline for income and therefore a "before and after the project" analysis was conducted for this key indicator.
13. The evaluation designed an impact survey to collect primary quantitative data, which was administered to 1,028 sampled households including beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The quantitative part of the evaluation was complemented by a set of qualitative tools such as focus group discussions, key informant interviews and site observations, to allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the processes of change induced by the intervention. More

---

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this evaluation, the following variables have been selected: engagement in agricultural activities; position in the community; age of the household head; marital status; and religion.

information on the data collection methods and the approach used to determine the sample size and sampling strategy may be seen in chapter I of the main report.

14. **Theory of change.** A keystone of the SBAFP evaluation was the ex post reconstruction of the project theory of change (ToC) to describe the impact pathways and construct the evaluation framework including key evaluation questions and impact indicators to be measured. The ToC is described in chapter III of the main report and is illustrated in the chart in annex II. The evaluation framework, which contains the key evaluation questions, impact indicators and tools for data collection is in annex III. The ToC also guided the preparation of the final impact evaluation report as described in the section of this executive summary containing the main evaluation findings (paragraph 19 onwards).
15. **Opportunities and challenges.** This impact evaluation represents an opportunity for IOE to gain deeper experience with mixed evaluation methodologies and sharpen its capabilities in assessing impact through greater reliance on quantitative approaches. IOE's growing experience in conducting impact evaluations also benefits IFAD as a whole, as it contributes to strengthening the internal debate on impact evaluations.
16. Additionally, the impact evaluation of the SBAFP was an opportunity for IOE to collaborate with a public, national institution for the design and conduct of the impact survey for primary data collection. Competencies in evaluation are limited in Mozambique especially among public institutions; therefore this exercise was an occasion to undertake evaluation capacity development activities in the country through "learning by doing".
17. The main challenge in conducting an ex post impact evaluation is related to the establishment of a counterfactual, which, in this case, entailed identification of a comparison group. This exercise was particularly complex in the case of SBAFP given the overlap with operations supported by IFAD and other development actors and the proximity of treatment and comparison areas. Linked to this is the difficulty in attributing impact to a project that closed four years ago.
18. The evaluation tried to overcome, to the extent possible, the aforementioned challenges by (i) including recall questions in the impact survey, as requested by IFAD Management in its comments on the 2015 India impact evaluation; (ii) including tagging questions in the impact survey that helped the identification of SBAFP beneficiaries and reduced the risk of interviewing households that benefitted from other projects or programmes; (iii) mapping potential confounding effects from other interventions by the Government and international organizations inside or outside the project area, as well as unplanned events (e.g. natural disasters) or general change processes that might have interacted with SBAFP; and (iv) triangulating the quantitative data and analysis with qualitative data and available secondary data.

#### **IV. Main evaluation findings**

19. The next paragraphs provide an overview of the results and impacts of SBAFP along the causal chain of the key impact pathways depicted by the ToC from bottom to top. Therefore, this section of the executive summary will start by assessing the relevance of project objectives and internal design logic. This assessment is fundamental to capture potential flaws in the design that constrained the project's impact. The achievement of results and outcomes (i.e. project effectiveness) and how these enabled (or constrained) the long-term impact on rural poverty and project sustainability are then described.
20. The above is followed by the assessment of other criteria contributing to rural poverty impact (e.g. environment and natural resources management, gender equality and women's empowerment, innovation and scaling up). Finally, the summary focuses on the findings related to other performance criteria (e.g. efficiency and performance of partners).

21. **Relevance.** The project supported the sustained improvement of the social and economic conditions of the artisanal fishing communities of the Sofala Bank through an integrated approach to the development of the artisanal fisheries subsector. This approach has been relevant in terms of its alignment with national policies, Mozambique country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) and IFAD's strategies. The approach adopted was also particularly relevant to the local context and the needs of the poor and it has proved to be a milestone contributor to the development of the artisanal fishery subsector in remote rural areas of the country.
22. The project design had, however, some inherent weaknesses. For instance, it had a complex design with five over-ambitious specific objectives and a multiplicity of components covering numerous subsectors. These called for enhanced involvement, cross-institutional coordination and buy-in from different ministries at central and provincial levels. This proved to be demanding for the implementation, monitoring and supervision of activities and the overall achievement of objectives.
23. Moreover, SBAFP could have achieved enhanced results and impact if more attention had been devoted to synergies between the activities and the components, and if each component had had its own targeting strategy. The impact evaluation rates relevance as moderately satisfactory (4).
24. **Effectiveness.** SBAFP is considered by stakeholders and beneficiaries as a milestone in the development of the artisanal fishery subsector due to its integrated livelihood approach, which delivered tangible results beyond fishery development in remote fishing areas. The project reached a slightly greater number of people than originally planned, helped fishery communities organize into groups, promoted a culture of savings and credit, created and rehabilitated markets and rural infrastructures (e.g. roads), and contributed to establishing the basis for the future enhancement of the fishery value chain.
25. SBAFP made a useful contribution to policy formulation and legislation favouring the artisanal fishery subsector and helped strengthen institutions in the subsector. The development of the *Plano Estratégico para o Sector da Pesca Artesanal* (PESPA) for November 2006 - March 2016 stands out as one of the project's highest achievements.
26. The above outcomes are positive. At the same time, the project did not manage to take the activities to the next level as envisaged in the five objectives, i.e. to promote wider rural transformation through backward and forward linkages to markets, more effective and less detrimental artisanal fishing practices for the sustainable development of the Sofala Bank or greater attention to economic activities that would generate better incomes and livelihoods. It did some groundwork towards the diversification of the economic base of the rural poor through improved post-harvesting activities, but it did not fully achieve this objective. The involvement of the private sector and the development of small and medium-sized fishery enterprises and relevant linkages remained at an embryonic level. These shortcomings may have been the price to be paid for the broad ambitious approach and substantial involvement in the development of social infrastructure rather than a stronger focus on fisheries management from the start of the project. All in all, the evaluation rating for effectiveness is moderately satisfactory (4).
27. **Rural poverty impact.** The evaluation found that the project had a positive impact on the target group. The percentage of households living above the poverty line (US\$1.90/day) is higher in the treatment group than among those in the comparison group. Similarly, the proportional increase in monthly income for the households in the treatment group is 15 per cent, which is slightly higher than the proportional increase of 11 per cent for the households in the comparison group.
28. Based on a standard of living index, which is an aggregated score of 33 household assets and housing characteristics, the evaluation found that ownership of assets

at the household level was slightly better in the treatment group. This reflects the fact that the treatment group has better income levels than the non-beneficiary group.

29. The evaluation identified three main drivers of better income and assets in the beneficiary group. First, the project contributed to the expansion of the fishing area through the formulation and adoption of sectoral policies and the diversification of fishing practices and technologies, which resulted in slightly higher fish production by the beneficiary group. Second, it had a remarkable impact on the access of the artisanal fishery communities to informal microfinance (through accumulating savings and credit associations), which led to increased personal savings and improved investment capacity in the artisanal fishery subsector. Finally, the project's training activities led to improved post-harvesting activities (e.g. salting and drying) and its infrastructure development component created better access to markets, which indirectly contributed to better incomes.
30. The above are remarkable achievements considering the context in which the project was implemented. Yet, the linkages with the formal financial sector and among private-sector actors along the fishery value chain remain weak. This limited wider impact and transformation of the artisanal communities.
31. The evaluation also found limited impact on food security and fishery productivity. The food consumption score was used to measure food security.<sup>3</sup> The food consumption score captures diet diversity as well as the frequency of consumption of different food types over a reference period. Table 18 in the main report shows a marginally better food security situation in the comparison areas. Moreover, the project did not develop a strategy on food security and nutrition, nor did it collect impact data.
32. In terms of impact on institutions and policies, the project was instrumental in setting in motion an impressive process of institutional change and reform in the subsector that culminated in the adoption of PESPA. The effects of this important institutional change are still visible today and tailored to the decentralized administration of the Government of Mozambique.
33. SBAFP nurtured sound provincial-level approaches and practices, previously not in place, for the co-management of small-scale fisheries and these became enshrined in PESPA. The project played a key role in supporting the decentralization process initiated by the Government by ensuring and consolidating the presence of IDPPE in the three provinces.
34. Yet, there have been shortcomings in the co-management approach and enforcement process of the management measures stemming from PESPA. PESPA recognized the importance of developing linkages to formal microfinance institutions and markets, but it did not promote any conducive policies. This weakness in the regulatory framework is a key determinant of the shortcomings of the project in improving the linkages with the formal financial sector and among private-sector actors along the fishery value chain. The planned renewal of PESPA with the support of the World Bank provides an opportunity to address these issues.
35. Finally, SBAFP strongly contributed to improved human capital in the target areas, mainly through investments in social infrastructure that had a positive impact on access to water, health care and education of poor artisanal fishery communities and in the quality of these services. Moreover, the project is a milestone in terms of actively engaging the artisanal fishery communities in local development processes and promoting their empowerment with respect to local governments.

---

<sup>3</sup> The FCS is a frequency-weighted diet diversity score calculated using the frequency of consumption of different food groups by a household for a recall period of seven days. The food items are categorized into nine main food groups: cereals; starchy tubers and roots; legumes and nuts; meat, fish, poultry and eggs; vegetables (including green leaves); fruit; oils and fats; milk and dairy products; and sugar or sweets. Based on its FCS, a community can be divided into three categories, namely poor FCS, borderline FCS and adequate FCS.

36. All in all, the project had remarkable impacts in a complex and remote context where – before basic amenities were created by SBAFP – markets and microfinance services were inexistent and the voice and interests of artisanal fishers were neglected. The impact evaluation concludes that the overall rural poverty impact of the SBAFP was satisfactory (5). The full analysis of project impact is provided in section IV of the main report.
37. **Sustainability of benefits generated by project impact.** The perception among all heads of key government institutions interviewed by IOE during the field mission (i.e. four years after project completion) is that SBAFP was a milestone in the development of the country's artisanal fishery subsector. The fact that the project was implemented at the provincial and district levels by the IDPPE – an agency of the Government of Mozambique – ensured stability of government support. The plans to renew PESPA will secure the required continuity to sustain the impact of the project's several components.
38. Notwithstanding the above, several factors challenge the long-term sustainability of the project's impacts. First, SBAFP did not develop an exit strategy, which would have helped clarify the roles and responsibilities of different institutions and actors in ensuring that beneficiaries received the necessary inputs and services after completion. Second, inadequate operation and maintenance of the infrastructure developed by the project is a major constraint to sustainability. Finally, grass-roots institutions are weak because by and large they have not been federated into apex organizations. This would have given them more leverage in policy dialogue with government authorities and resource allocation processes.
39. It is important to acknowledge that the project is part of a broader development context and IFAD's country programme framework. In this regard, a scaling-up project (the Artisanal Fisheries Promotion Project [ProPESCA]) is currently addressing some of the above challenges, and this is expected to improve sustainability. All in all, the evaluation concludes that the sustainability of project benefits is moderately satisfactory (4).

**Other criteria contributing to rural poverty impact**

40. **Environment and natural resources management.** The adoption of PESPA and the co-management approach were key to promoting an enabling environment and set the basis for the sustainable management of the marine resources of the Sofala Bank. However, while establishing an enabling environment is essential, it is not the same as "reducing unsustainable practices that threaten the natural resource base in the project area" as foreseen in the President's report. Despite improvements in fishers' awareness and capacity to fish more sustainably, the adoption of different and more targeted fishing techniques than those used at the start of the project appears to be less widespread than expected given the thrust of the project in this regard.
41. All in all, the impact on natural resources management is limited. However, the role of the project in preparing the ground for the long-term sustainable management of marine resources of the Sofala Bank is noteworthy. Therefore, the evaluation rates environment and natural resources management as moderately satisfactory (4).
42. Achievements towards greater gender equality and women's empowerment have been moderately unsatisfactory (3). Notwithstanding the key role that women play in the fishery value chain, the project design did not include a strategy for gender mainstreaming, although it implemented some activities that benefitted women. This is surprising considering the important role that women play in the artisanal fishery subsector. In this regard, towards the end of the project in 2010 and based on its experience, SBAFP helped the Government of Mozambique develop its first gender strategy in this subsector. Moving forward, this provides an overarching framework for engaging women in different stages of the fisheries value chain.

43. However, women's role in broader economic and social activities remains weak. SBAFP has helped women to organize themselves (e.g. into savings and credit groups) and provided them with capacity-building support in processing and marketing. Yet, the limited financing capacity of accumulating savings and credit associations means that larger loans commensurate with women's entrepreneurial desires and their improved capacity to save and repay are still outside their reach and remain the prerogative of men.
44. Access to health services has improved, but women still have to invest disproportionate effort and time in collecting water – especially given that the majority of water pumps installed under the project are no longer operational. Finally, insufficient attention was devoted to changing relations and interaction between men and women, particularly with respect to promoting greater involvement by women in different stages of the fisheries value chain.
45. **Innovation and scaling up.** SBAFP introduced a number of innovations that were new to the context, such as the development of a co-management approach to fishing resources and the creation of savings and credit associations where financial services were previously absent.
46. In terms of scaling up, the sequence of the three IFAD-supported fishery projects (e.g. the Nampula Artisanal Fisheries Project, SBAFP and ProPESCA) can be considered as successful. Also, the Accumulating Savings and Credit Associations (ASCA) concept has been successfully scaled up to the national level. The impact evaluation concludes that satisfactory (5) results have been achieved in the promotion of innovation and scaling up.

#### **Other performance criteria**

47. Project efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory (4). The cost per beneficiary is within the range of other similar IFAD fishery development projects. Also the allocation of project management costs is good compared to these other projects. However, the project did not calculate the economic internal rate of return and experienced some difficulties in efficiency such as late provision of funds, rigid contract and procurement norms, insufficient quality of contractors and constructions and infrequency in IFAD's withdrawal applications, which were not well adapted to the complexity of the project.
48. **Partner performance.** IFAD's long-term support to the sustainable and inclusive development of the artisanal fisheries subsector in Mozambique is appreciated by the Government and other partners. The setting up of the IFAD country office in Maputo and outposting of the country director, and the shift to direct supervision and implementation support are two important adjustments to IFAD's operating model made during the course of project implementation. Partnerships with the Government of Mozambique, non-governmental organizations, and civil society have been good.
49. The partnership with the private sector has not been sufficiently explored. Moreover, IFAD could have done more to capture and address design issues at the beginning of implementation, as this would have ensured more timely implementation and effectiveness. Finally, the plans for a renewal of PESPA offer prospects for collaboration with the World Bank and further scaling-up of SBAFP's successful experiences.
50. The Government provided continuity and good leadership throughout the three IFAD-supported projects in the fisheries subsector, including the SBAFP. Through this continuity, and the adopted bottom-up and integrated approach, IDPPE managed to build up a fisheries co-management model between communities and authorities. However, the evaluation raises concerns regarding the management of fiduciary aspects which will require careful consideration in the future. Both IFAD and government performance as partners is assessed as moderately satisfactory (4).

51. **Monitoring and evaluation.** The project had a generally well-functioning monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. A baseline survey was undertaken quite early after project effectiveness, additional surveys were conducted during implementation, and an end-line survey was also undertaken at completion. The project's M&E team provided continuity, as they were also part of the Nampula project team, and had good skills and competencies in M&E.
52. Notwithstanding the above, there were several shortcomings, which constrained the use of M&E as a full-fledged monitoring, management and evaluation tool. For instance, the M&E system was not properly linked to the project's logical framework, which itself had some limitations (including weak articulation of the causal links between the project's components and its objectives and goals). The M&E system collected a wealth of data on inputs and outputs, including in the area of community development, but fell short of reliably assessing outcomes and impacts.
53. With regard to the latter, a baseline study was conducted in 2002, and an end-line study in 2011. Furthermore, two surveys were also conducted as inputs for two of the three tri-term reviews. While the availability of such detailed studies is praiseworthy, there are issues with respect to the sample size calculations and data collection (e.g. no gender disaggregation and no comparison groups despite several recommendations to this effect by supervision missions and tri-term reviews).

## **V. Conclusions**

54. SBAFP has been an important milestone in the development of the artisanal fishery subsector. This is attributed to its integrated livelihood approach, which delivered tangible results beyond fishery development in remote and complex fishing areas. Before the project, basic amenities, markets and microfinance services were inexistent in these areas and the voice and interest of the artisanal fishers were neglected.
55. SBAFP had remarkable impacts at the household, institutional and policy levels. This takes into consideration better incomes and assets among beneficiaries, enhanced human and social capital, improved access to social and market infrastructure, as well as better participation in grass-roots institutions. Moreover, the provision of microfinance services supported the creation of a culture of savings and small investments by artisanal fishers.
56. The overall strengthening of IDPPE's capacity and competencies in managing complex, large-scale fisheries development projects and funds, and in collaborating across fisheries and non-fisheries institutions, has been a significant step towards creating the enabling and supportive institutional environment needed for SBAFP to make a difference. It was also fundamental in laying the groundwork for the successful implementation of SBAFP's successor project, PropESCA.
57. PESPA's 10-year vision for the artisanal fishing subsector emphasized – alongside fishing – social and environmental progress. Looking back at the developments intended for the subsector and achievements at project end, SBAFP was instrumental in providing the targeted assistance needed to step up progress towards artisanal fisheries development.
58. Although progress may have been unevenly achieved across the pillars of the vision, PESPA nonetheless provided the subsector with the coherent framework it needed to guide interventions towards better livelihoods for artisanal fishers. Plans for a renewal of PESPA offer good prospects for addressing the weaknesses of the institutional framework and sustaining impact across the several SBAFP components.
59. Notwithstanding the above, more could have been done to achieve greater impact and ensure realization of the project's full potential and achievement of the envisaged impacts, especially in food security, access to formal microfinance,

connectivity to markets and value chains, private-sector engagement and gender mainstreaming. Finally, the weaknesses related to the availability and quality of data impinges on the assessment and attribution of impact to IFAD operations on fishery productivity, food security and nutrition.

## **VI. Recommendations**

60. The impact evaluation makes four specific recommendations for IFAD to consider in the formulation of the forthcoming Mozambique COSOP, the implementation of ProPESCA, as well as in the design and implementation of future operations in the country aimed at artisanal fisheries development.
61. **Recommendation 1: IFAD should work in close partnership with the Government of Mozambique and the World Bank in order to ensure that artisanal fishers' access to markets and finance are duly considered in the revised sectoral policy framework.** IFAD should be involved in the renewal process of PESPA, build on its experience and identify opportunities for further partnership and policy dialogue with the World Bank and the Government of Mozambique. The updated sectoral strategy should generate policies which facilitate artisanal fishers' access to financial institutions (in particular formal financial institutions) and markets.
62. **Recommendation 2: Wider private-sector engagement is needed.** The private sector is playing an increasing role in Mozambique, and its contribution is fundamental for promoting prosperity among artisanal fisheries communities. In particular, IFAD and the Government should ensure that private-sector stakeholders are clearly identified as key partners in fisheries development, both in upstream and downstream activities, ranging from the provision of fishing inputs and financial services, to processing, storage, transportation and value addition of fish produce.
63. **Recommendation 3: Project design should include due attention to gender mainstreaming, and specific activities should be carried out to empower women and ensure that they are prominently involved in productive activities.** This will require attention to building cooperatives or federations of women's savings and credit groups and linking them to formal financial services. Artisanal fisheries projects in Mozambique should include dedicated activities to train women, especially in value addition and marketing for better returns. Specific training sessions should be conducted for fishermen as means of promoting gender equality, to enable them to better recognize the valuable role that women can play in fisheries development. For all this to happen, future project design should clearly include a gender mainstreaming strategy.
64. **Recommendations 4: M&E needs to be enhanced for promoting greater development effectiveness.** This includes ensuring that logical frameworks are constructed in a participatory manner with the main stakeholders and include a theory of change, with simple and clearly measurable indicators and targets. The hypothesis and assumptions for converting inputs to outputs, and outputs to outcomes and impacts should be spelled out. Moreover, logical frameworks should be aligned with project design, as captured in project design documents. Finally, greater attention should be paid to ensuring that M&E systems collect, analyse and report on results beyond the output level, and that their indicators fully reflect the RIMS.