

2002
n° : 26/2002



Département amélioration
des méthodes pour
l'innovation scientifique
Cirad-amis

INDONESIA
Decentralized Agricultural and Forestry
Extension Project (Project ID-PE-59930)

**CIRAD TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
TO THE BENCHMARK STUDY
FINAL REPORT**

Robin Bourgeois
Franck Jésus
Programme Economie, Politiques et Marchés - ECOPOL

Background

The Decentralized Agricultural and Forestry Extension Project (DAFEP) aims at enhancing the farmers' capacity to participate in extension activities, and at improving integrated agricultural and forestry extension system at district level to promote economically viable, environmentally sustainable, and socially acceptable farming practices and increased farmers income. In 2000, a CIRAD/Ide-force team conducted a Pilot Benchmark Methodology Study, on request of the World Bank and funded by a grant from the French Government, with the objective to set up guidelines for the Benchmark Study¹. These guidelines have been approved by the DAFEP PMU and the World Bank. They are currently used by the national consultant team from PT. Hutama Cipta Konsulindo appointed to conduct the Benchmark Study which started mid 2001. The aim is to provide quality reference data for the Monitoring and Evaluation of DAFEP's progress and impact. The guidelines should also be used for the mid-term and end-of-project evaluation.

A team of two consultants from the Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (CIRAD) has been appointed to monitor and support the implementation of the Benchmark Study by PT. Hutama Cipta Konsulindo. This Indonesia-based CIRAD team consist of: (a) Dr. Robin Bourgeois, Senior Agricultural Economist from CIRAD's Economics, Policies and Markets Program (ECOPOL) at CGPRT/ESCAP in Bogor, and (b) Ir Franck Jésus, MSc, Socio-economist also from ECOPOL, who has experience in field research, team work supervision and training. Dr Bourgeois was member of the DAFEP Pilot Benchmark Methodology Study Team.

¹ Two volumes, "Report of the Pilot Benchmark Study -Volume I" and Guidelines for the Benchmark Survey – Volume II", and a CD-Rom database have been produced. These documents are available at the DAFEP Office, at the World Bank and at CIRAD.

Terms of reference for the technical assistance to the Benchmark Study

The CIRAD team has been appointed for a total of 60 days (30 days per each consultant) with the following terms of reference:

- 1) Meet regularly with the national consultant team in order to socialize the recommended approach within the team members.
- 2) Provide customized assistance to the national consultant in the use of tools and methods recommended for the proper implementation of the Benchmark Study.
- 3) Discuss the Benchmark Study program and ensure that planned activities are consistent with the recommended methodology and specifications in the TORs of national consultant team.
- 4) Conduct spot checks of field activities in selected sites to verify their consistency with the CIRAD “Guidelines for the Benchmark Survey”. Specific attention will be given to the proper implementation of data collection process and storage allowing to conduct with-and-without, and before-and-after project analyses. The use of the recommended sampling method permitting the analysis of spill-over effects will be controlled along with the inclusion of the specified target groups.
- 5) Verify that Benchmark Study results are obtained and processed in a way that makes possible their storage and comparison with data collected later for project monitoring and evaluation and especially the mid-term and end-of-project evaluation.
- 6) Elaborate a note on how the Benchmark Study was implemented.

This final report document the progress of the Second Phase of the Benchmark Survey implementation and complies also with the last point mentioned above. An intermediary report has been sent to the World Bank in January 2002.

Implementation of the Benchmark Study Phase I and II

The Benchmark Study and with the CIRAD's TA started in early May 2001. Since then the technical assistance provided by the CIRAD's team consisted in:

- providing training on the approved Benchmark Survey methodology to the national consultant team and supporting the national consultant team in implementing training sessions to the appointed field coordinators, one in May 2001 for coordinators of the first phase of the survey (5 provinces) and one in mid September 2001 for the coordinators of the second phase of the survey (5 provinces);
- supporting the national consultant team in preparing a comprehensive database for the Survey;
- monitoring the survey process of the first phase in two locations: Sulawesi Selatan and Sumatra Utara;
- providing training on data cleaning techniques to the national consultant team;
- providing direct and intensive support to the national consultant team in the data checking and cleaning process;
- monitoring the database construction;
- participating to various meetings organized by the team of the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture in charge of the DAFEP project;
- providing support to the national consultant team for the data analysis and final report plan (based on first draft proposed by consultant team in September 2001).

✓ The implementation of the first phase.

First phase implementation met two main difficulties which resulted in important delays: insufficient training of the field enumerators and coordinators, and ensuing problems in survey and data quality. As stated in the terms of reference, the CIRAD's team was to train PT. Hutama Cipta Konsulindo supervisors who in turn would have to train field coordinators who would have to train field enumerators. This three level chain of training sequences combined with an underestimation of the difficulties by PT. Hutama Cipta Konsulindo had two consequences: field enumerators had insufficient understanding of the survey purpose and questionnaire handling and coordinators did not pay enough attention to checking the quality of survey results and the following data entry.

However, survey quality was generally acceptable for the first phase. The main problem was that many questionnaires had not been filled properly and that the resulting database contained many errors and inconsistencies. Consequently, numerous questions had to be sent back to field coordinators and a lot of time had to be devoted to data checking and cleaning. While surveys of the first phase ended in July 2001, an almost clean database for the first phase was only available by January 2002, after sometimes up to seven verifications.

The experience acquired by the national consultant team in the first phase allowed them to start the second phase in a much more effective way. Instead of appointing one coordinator per province as in the first phase, they appointed one per district for the second phase. The training was more focused and more participatory, enabling thus the coordinators to have a good grasp of the method to be used. Surveys for the second phase have already started and the first overview of a sample of questionnaire seems to show a higher quality compared to the first phase.

✓ The implementation of the second phase.

Data collection and entry for the second phase is now completed for all provinces except for 72 respondents from Nangroe Aceh Darussalam and Bima di NTB. At the time of writing this final report, a data base had been sent for verification after data cleaning by the local consultant team. The results of our verification where sent back with the following observations (see detailed comments sent to PT HCK in Annex I). A further envoy from PT HCK still shows problems.

1. The quality of the data collected and entered for the second phase is significantly better compared to the first phase results. However, it remain below our expectations.

2. In particular, recurrent mistakes have been observed in the second phase data base that are similar to those observed and corrected in the first phase, in spite of a multitude of corrective exchanges with the Indonesian consultancy firm (some provincial data bases have been corrected up to seven times).
3. Even for some first phase data bases, corrected errors have reappeared in new versions sent for verification.

The main problems observed are related with *inconsistencies*.

The design of the database allows for thorough cross-checking of data and inconsistency verification. This seems to be a task that has not been rigorously undertaken by the consultancy firm, since many inconsistencies are still found which could be easily removed with careful checking:

- There are still 72 cases of inconsistencies between land status and cost of land access
- Commodities sheet for shrimp have no entries while this is some times the main activities of the household
- Empty cells where there should be data
- Number of entries do not fit with expected number of respondents by type
- Some villages/district are recorded both as “project” and “non-project” villages which is impossible
- Inconsistencies between asset values
- Wrong content
- Calculation errors (asset value, control buttons, costs calculation)
- Values out of normal “feasible” range (consumption level per person per year)
- Incomplete information
- Inconsistent relations (harvesting cost and systems: more than 20 cases, tenure costs and systems: more than 100 cases, also for “economy”, “extension”, “participation”, “social”, and “Commodities” tables)

A “final report” was sent also to Dafep and to Cirad by PT HCK. Comments from the CIRAD Team were sent to PT HCK (see Annex II) and a new version of final report has been made. It was considered to be insufficient and not consistent with the outline elaborated by Cirad and agreed upon by Dafep (see Annex III). This new version is much better but still has weaknesses that should be addressed before it could be received as the final one. Points still to be addressed in particular include:

- Use pie charts and tables with percentage in order to facilitate the comparison between the three samples (Reference, Spill over and Dafep) instead of presenting only raw data in tables and histograms.
- Give information about how the indicators are calculated or what they represent (for instance “Luas lahan”: it is not indicated whether this represents the owned area or the cultivated area; “kekayaan” represents the value of assets such as animals, equipment, house but this is not indicated; “pendapatan” and “pengeluaran” indicators should be also expressed per capita per year in order to really reflect the welfare level of the households).
- Discuss immediately the indicators (including Skewness and Kurtosis values) one by one as they relate with the data presented. It is important to highlight any significant differences between the three samples as well as the absolute value of the indicators. Hints for indicators discussion are given in the
- Put numbers to all the pages

We therefore recommend that PT HCK put a stronger emphasis in following the outline for final report included here in Annex III. In particular by providing more clarity on the indicators and more report space to their discussion.

General conclusion

Many of the inconsistencies are not due to the complexity of the data base but to the lack of systematic and thorough verification of the results, in spite of extended and reiterated training sessions and verifications by the CIRAD Team.

It is understandable that, since both the software used and the methodical checking of the data represent new approaches for the consultant team hired to implement the Benchmark survey, they experienced some difficulties. But the recurrence of the same errors again and again also underlines a problem of commitment in the work of the national consultant team.

The implementation of this new approach on a consultancy basis seems to be problematical. This appears to be one important lesson for other cases where project implementation will require Benchmark Surveys. The implementation of Benchmark Surveys through external operators, and especially when the methodology to be used has not been developed with or by the operator will always face a quality problem. This is due to the fact that the operator has not “integrated” the approach has its own, and is not “committed” to the results as a direct user would be. In the contractual arrangement linking PT HCK to DAFEP, the only incentive for the operator is the financial aspect. Facing a situation where implementation is delayed by lack of skills, though contractual arrangements stipulate a limited time frame to execute the contract, the operator is put in a difficult situation, where somehow quality is sacrificed to formal results and speed.

It is noteworthy to remember here that one strong recommendation that was made by the CIRAD team in its final report of the Pilot Methodology Study and Guidelines was to favour DAFEP staff from monitoring and evaluation unit as well as from local Project units to conduct the benchmark survey both for field work and data entry and analysis. This recommendation was based on the fact that it would have served better the project to conduct the benchmark survey with DAFEP staff from various units. Staff would have been more committed and aware about it if it had been a project activity rather than an externally contracted activity. The endless series of meetings held by CIRAD staff with DAFEP staff during which it has been necessary to present again and again the objective, the method, the expected outputs to an ever different assistance demonstrate the “raison d'être” of the earlier recommendation to internally implement the Benchmark survey.

Furthermore this would have also ended the perpetual discussion about incorporating new data or new topics (gender issues, monitoring and evaluation) in the Benchmark despite the fact that a clear methodology and related TORs had been approved months before by the World Bank and the DAFEP leaders. For instance, lengthy discussion on how sensitive were the Benchmark indicators to gender issues, have finally ceased after issuing the document presented in Annex IV.

In order to ensure a good quality and ensure the Benchmark Study Report to be produced by PT HCK be of good value for DAFEP, the Cirad team designed a detailed outline to be used for reporting the results. This outline has been sent to and discussed with both DAFEP staff and PT HCK. The detailed outline is presented below. The Cirad team, though the total amount of days dedicated to the supervision of PT HCK is exhausted, will have an eye on the compliance of PT HCK with this approved outline.

ANNEX I

COMMENTS ON DATABASE FOR THE 9 PROVINCES OF TAHAP II

General comment

Kenapa cuman ada 2 kabupaten di Jawa tengah ?

Kenapa cuman ada 2 kabupaten di NTB ?

Did you check if all main activities had a commodity formulir? (misalnya, tidak ada entry untuk udang tapi pasti kegiatannya adalah kegiatan utama untuk banyak RT)

72 kasus where rented land in table one-two and renting costs in table costs are not consistent (see table below)

12 07 19 04 05	12 10 90 07 25	71 03 02 10 07	71 04 22 01 09	74 03 03 11 01
12 07 19 04 06	12 10 90 07 27	71 03 17 05 02	71 04 22 01 11	74 03 20 07 04
12 07 19 04 18	12 12 20 23 08	71 03 17 05 06	71 72 30 09 05	74 03 20 07 08
12 07 19 04 25	33 08 11 06 23	71 03 17 05 20	74 01 11 01 01	74 03 20 07 11
12 09 07 17 01	33 08 11 12 06	71 03 17 05 22	74 01 11 01 06	74 03 60 01 02
12 09 07 17 06	33 23 90 03 03	71 04 12 03 01	74 01 11 01 12	74 04 80 03 01
12 09 07 17 07	33 23 90 03 12	71 04 12 03 02	74 01 19 10 05	74 04 80 03 04
12 09 30 01 11	52 01 60 06 01	71 04 12 03 03	74 01 19 10 06	74 04 80 03 06
12 10 18 07 01	52 01 60 06 10	71 04 12 03 05	74 01 19 10 08	74 04 80 03 07
12 10 18 07 03	52 01 80 08 04	71 04 12 03 08	74 01 19 10 11	74 04 80 03 08
12 10 90 05 02	52 03 90 11 03	71 04 12 03 09	74 01 20 14 07	74 04 80 03 09
12 10 90 07 10	52 03 90 11 11	71 04 22 01 02	74 01 20 14 08	74 04 80 03 11
12 10 90 07 16	71 03 02 08 03	71 04 22 01 05	74 01 20 14 11	
12 10 90 07 18	71 03 02 08 04	71 04 22 01 06	74 01 20 14 12	
12 10 90 07 22	71 03 02 10 05	71 04 22 01 07	74 03 03 02 05	

Query Natura

Ada 4 responden dengan banyak cells yang kosong.

PART I (economic survey)

Table one-two

Kode responden : ada 939 responden dengan kode=1 (seharusnya 936)

Project village: Desa Modomang satu kasus dengan project village=1

Desa Sesaot project village=1 dan project village=0

Desa Tapadak I satu kasus project village=0

Project District: District Minahasa project District =1 dan project District =0

Jumlah anggota kel: 71 02 18 20 15 tidak cocok dengan laki² dan perempuan yg bekerja

Asal dari: kosong untuk responden di Jawa tengah

Status lahan: banyak kasus status=0 tetapi ada area

Luas area 2: 71 03 17 05 24, 33 08 11 12 06, 53 03 10 20 11, 33 08 20 01 21, 33 08 20 01 22, 33 08 20 01 05 = kasus ada area 2 tetapi tidak ada tanaman musim 1, 2 dan 3.

Peternakan: 12 07 19 02 03, 12 10 18 07 06, 33 08 11 06 24 ada peternakan tetapi luas=0

Fishing 1, fishing 2, fishing 3: banyak cells yg kosong

Table Animals dan Assets

Kerbau : 2 empty cells

Domba, nilai domba : 1 empty cell

Kambing, nilai kambing: 1 empty cell

Nilai ayam: satu kasus nilai rata² 1 ekor=400 rp dan satu kasus nilai rata² 1 ekor=250 000 rp

Kuda, nilai kuda: 1 empty cell

Kumbang madu, nilai Kumbang madu: 1 empty cell

Ikan, nilai ikan: banyak empty cells

Ikan: banyak kasus dengan “kg” atau “ekor”, satu kasus ikan kosong tetapi nilai tidak kosong

Lainnya, nama, nilai lainnya: 1 empty cell, satu kasus kerbau di dalam lainnya

Pompa air: 1 empty cell, banyak empty cells untuk usia, satu kasus ada nilai tapi tidak ada pompa, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus usia ditulis “0,5”

Traktor tangan: banyak empty cells untuk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia

Bajak: 1 empty cell, banyak empty cells untunk usia, satu kasus ada bajak tidak ada nilai, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, dua kasus usian ditulis “1,5”

Sprayer: 3 empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, satu kasus ada nilai tidak ada sprayer, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia

Alat memproses panen: banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus usian=20 dan nilai=30 juta/alat (check if possible)

Kumbang : banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus satu kasus ada kumbang tetapi nilai=0, satu kasus satu kasus ada nilai tetapi kumbang =0

Television : banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, satu kasus ada television tidak ada nilai, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia

Radio : banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus usian ditulis “1,5”

Parabole : banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia

Cangkuk: banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, dua kasus satu kasus ada cangkuk tetapi nilai=0

Sabit : banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, empty cells in nilai also, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, ada kasus usian=0 tetapi ada sabit , satu kasus usian ditulis “1,5”, ada kasus usian ditulis “0,5”

Golok : banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus satu kasus ada kumbang tetapi nilai=0

Mobil: banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus satu kasus ada mobil tetapi nilai=0

Motor: banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia

Sepeda : banyak empty cells, banyak empty cells untunk usia, empty cells in nilai also, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia

Grobak: banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, satu kasus satu kasus ada Grobak tetapi nilai=0, satu kasus usian =253 tahun!!

Lainnya: banyak empty cells untunk usia, banyak kasus ada tulisan “tahun” di dalam usia, ada kasus ada lainnya tetapi nilai=0, ada kasus usian=0 tetapi ada lainnya, satu kasus usian ditulis “2,5”, tanah tidak masuk di sini

Jenis rumah: ada jenis rumah=0, ada luas rumah kosong

Status rumah: ada yg kosong

Nilai rumah: ada rumah yg pinjam dengan nilainya (nilainya cumin untunk yg milik)

Nilai total ewan: 25 cases of false calculation

Nilai total non-ternak assers: 122 cases of false calculation

Nilai asset+ternak: 56 cases of false calculation

Table Consumption

Paddy yg dikonsumsi sendiri: ada kasus >52 minggu/tahun

Biaya makanan: banyak kasus kelihatan biaya makanan terlalu rendah (20 000-100 000 Rp/tahun/orang) please check.

Sewa rumah: 6 responden sewa rumah di table “animal dan asset” tetapi cumin 3 responden dengan ongkosnya di table ini.

Pengeluaran total: 13 kasus pengeluaran total dan kontrol tidak cocok

Table Costs

Kwantitas benih: satu cell yg kosong

Herb1, 2: ada herb2 tapi herb1 kosong

Herbicide pestisida: ada Furadan dan Decis di dalam herbicide dan di dalam pestisida.

Pestisida, 2, 3: ada pestisida 2 tapi pestisida 1 kosong, ada pestisida 3 tapi pestisida 2 kosong, ada urea di pestisida3

Pupuk : ada TSP di dalam KCL, ada Petro di KCL, ZA dan TSP, ada KSP di KCL, ada KNO di ZA, NPK dan kapur fosfat, ada kandang di kapur fosfat, ada gandas di kapur fosfat dan di pupuk organik, ada NPG di NPK dan di TSP, ada gandasil di NPK, pupuk cair dan di pupuk organik

All input : many cases ada ongkos tapi tidak ada nama, ada nama tapi tidak ada ongkos, ada kwantitas tapi tidak ada ongkos

Kalkulasi ongkos: kwantitas, harga, biaya dan biaya riil tidak cocok: 20 kasus untunk benih, 5 kasus untunk herb1, 2 kasus untunk herb2, 12 kasus untunk pest1, 15 kasus untunk urea, 3 kasus untunk KCL, 16 kasus untunk TSP, 6 kasus

untuk pupuk organik, 3 kasus untuk pupuk cair, 148 kasus untuk kerja persiapan lahan, 40 kasus untuk kerja penanaman, 39 kasus untuk kerja pengendalian gulma, 8 kasus untuk kerja pengendalian hama

Sistem pemanen : ada kasus ada tipe sistem tapi tidak ada ongkosnya, ada kasus ada ongkos tapi tidak ada tipe sistem, ada kasus ongkos dihitung 2 kali (dalam bentuk dan uang).

Bagi hasil : ada kasus ada bagi hasil tapi tidak ada sistemnya, ada kasus ada sistem tapi bagi hasil is not ticked, atau tidak ada ongkosnya, ada kasus ada ongkos tapi tidak ada sistem, satu kasus sistem bagi hasil= « 01:06 »

Sewa lahan: ada kasus ada sewa lahan tapi tidak ada ongkos, ada kasus ada ongkos tapi sewa lahan is not ticked

Jumlah hari kerja : banyak empty cells

Ongkos pemanen : check biaya pemanen dibandingkan dengan hasil kotor dan sistemnya untuk responden di table

71 04 12 03 10	71 03 17 05 12	74 04 80 03 23	71 03 17 05 17	71 04 12 03 12
71 04 12 03 10	34 01 01 01 08	74 04 80 03 23	71 03 17 05 17	71 04 12 03 12
71 04 12 03 10	74 04 80 03 10	53 03 14 02 21	71 04 12 03 04	71 04 12 03 12
73 08 50 02 04	74 04 80 03 16	74 01 11 01 11	71 04 12 03 04	
74 03 20 07 05	34 01 02 02 09	71 03 17 05 17	71 04 12 03 10	
71 03 17 05 12	53 03 14 02 27			

Ongkos bagi hasil/sewa lahan: check biaya bagi hasil/sewa lahan dibandingkan dengan hasil kotor dan sistemnya untuk responden di table 1

Table 1

12 10 18 07 06	74 04 80 03 04	34 01 01 01 04	71 03 17 05 02	71 02 16 07 03
12 12 31 11 02	74 01 20 14 05	34 03 07 01 01	33 08 11 06 16	71 02 16 07 03
12 12 31 11 02	74 04 80 03 16	52 01 50 09 09	12 09 07 17 06	73 06 20 05 03
74 04 80 03 10	74 04 80 03 17	34 01 02 02 10	34 02 03 03 20	52 01 60 06 01
71 03 02 10 04	74 04 80 03 23	34 01 01 01 04	34 02 03 03 20	34 02 03 03 20
71 03 02 10 04	74 04 80 03 23	12 07 19 04 18	12 07 19 04 25	34 02 03 03 02
71 04 22 01 04	74 01 11 01 06	34 03 07 01 01	12 10 90 07 18	34 03 07 01 01
71 04 22 01 04	52 01 80 08 06	12 07 19 04 18	12 12 31 11 01	34 03 07 01 01
71 04 22 01 04	52 01 80 08 06	12 10 90 07 21	12 10 18 07 07	34 02 03 03 02
71 03 02 08 01	74 01 19 10 07	71 02 14 06 01	71 03 17 05 02	12 09 30 01 11
71 03 02 08 01	71 03 02 08 04	71 02 14 06 01	12 07 19 04 05	12 09 30 01 11
71 03 17 05 11	74 04 80 03 09	71 02 14 06 01	12 10 90 07 16	34 04 09 11 03
71 03 02 08 01	74 01 19 10 06	71 02 14 06 01	12 10 90 07 16	
73 06 40 08 06	74 01 19 10 06	12 10 18 07 11	33 08 11 06 16	
73 09 01 03 01	73 06 20 01 06	12 10 18 07 11	33 08 11 12 02	
71 03 17 05 11	73 08 30 08 13	71 72 40 07 07	33 08 11 12 02	
74 01 20 14 09	34 04 10 12 11	12 07 19 04 05	71 04 22 01 11	
53 03 14 02 10	34 04 10 12 11	71 02 14 06 05	73 06 20 05 11	
71 04 12 03 03	34 01 01 01 01	71 02 14 06 05	12 10 18 07 05	
71 04 22 01 11	34 01 01 01 01	12 07 19 04 25	12 10 90 07 18	
71 04 22 01 11	34 01 01 01 19	34 03 07 01 10	12 12 20 23 08	
33 23 60 03 06	34 01 02 02 03	12 07 19 04 27	12 10 18 07 01	
33 23 60 03 06	12 09 07 17 06	12 07 19 04 27	12 10 18 07 03	
33 08 11 06 23	34 02 03 03 22	34 01 02 02 03	12 10 18 07 07	
33 08 11 12 06	34 04 10 12 11	12 09 07 17 01	52 01 60 06 01	
33 08 20 01 02	34 01 01 01 19	12 09 07 17 01	12 10 90 05 02	
33 08 20 01 02	34 03 08 10 08	12 09 07 17 07	12 12 20 23 08	
33 08 20 01 02	34 02 03 03 22	12 12 31 11 01	12 10 90 05 02	
52 01 60 06 10	34 02 03 03 22	12 10 90 07 25	34 03 07 01 01	
52 01 60 06 10	34 03 07 01 10	12 07 19 04 06	34 01 01 01 04	
74 04 80 03 22	34 03 07 01 01	12 07 19 04 06	71 04 12 03 05	
74 04 80 03 22	34 01 01 01 19	12 10 90 07 27	33 08 11 06 18	
74 04 80 03 05	71 72 40 07 07	34 03 07 01 10	34 01 02 02 03	
74 04 80 03 05	71 02 18 20 05	71 03 17 05 02	12 10 90 07 10	

Table Income

Nama hasil panen dan Nama Hasil yg jual empty cells

Harga waktu panen: dua kasus harga=0

Pendapatan kotor: 45 kasus tidak cocok dengan kontrol

Penjualan: ada kasus dengan nam hasil yg jual tapi tidak ada jumlah yg jual atau harganya

Waktu penjualan: many cases jumlah yang dijual tidak kosong tetapi tidak ada waktu penjualan.

Pendapatan penjualan: 83 cases with false calculation (see kontrol)

Konsumsi sendiri: ada kasus konsumsi sendiri is ticked tapi tidak ada kwantitasnya dan kasus dengan kwantitasnya tapi tidak di-ticked. One empty cell in jumlah yg dikonsumsi sendiri

Koefisien trnaformasi: Check coefficient Tracon and Trate for responden di table :

33 08 11 12 03	34 03 08 10 08	74 01 12 06 12	33 08 20 01 08	33 08 12 08 01
33 08 11 06 22	33 23 90 03 05	33 08 11 06 26	71 04 12 03 10	33 08 12 08 02

Table Animalincome

Bentuk hasil: 4 kasus tidak ada nama hasil, tidak ada hasil, tidak ada apapun, kenapa dimasukan di table ini?

Waktu penjualan: many cases jumlah yang dijual tidak kosong tetapi tidak ada waktu penjualan.

Jumlah hasil kotor: ada kasus dengan nama tapi tidak ada hasil, tidak ada ongkos.

Table Animalcost

Total responden: total responden animalincome=219, responden animalcost=220.

Refcrop: one empty cell

Kalkulasi ongkos: kwantitas, harga, biaya dan biaya riil tidak cocok: 3 kasus untunk benih

Part II

Economy

Empty cells : check responden 52 01 60 06 15, 52 01 60 05 02

Inconsistencies: cases where variables **timelinkinp** and **succlinkinp** are not consistent (74 01 19 10 15, 74 04 40 09 13, 74 04 80 03 29, 74 04 80 03 28)

Extension

Womenpartmethod2 : many empty cells

Inconsistencies: cases where variables **type2** and **crop2** are not consistent (33 08 20 01 09, 33 08 11 12 01, 33 08 11 12 06, 53 03 10 20 02, 71 04 22 01 10, 33 23 60 03 08, 33 23 60 03 09)

Participation

Empty cells : check variable **benef1group3**, **reaswpart**,

Inconsistencies: variables **reaswpart** and **Wishpart** are not consistent (71 02 16 07 05, 71 72 40 07 04)

Pengetahuan

Empty cells : check variable **komadv41**, **komadv42**, **komdis41**, **komdis42**, **reascom31**, **reascom32**,

Social

Table one-two has 1209 responden, and table social has only 1023

Empty cells : check variable **Wpart**, **readycont**,

Inconsistencies: many cases where variables **partpoor** and **reasnpart2** are not consistent

many cases where variables **wpart** and **lesspartreas** are not consistent

82 cases where variables **Reasenvchge1** and **Envchge1 or Envchge2** are not consistent

72 cases where variables **Reasenvchge3** and **Envchge1 or Envchge2** are not consistent

Ayam, Babi, kedelai, kelapa, padi sawah, singkong: Many empty cells

Jagung

Inconsistencies: many cases where variables **mpricevar** and **mpvreas1 or mpvres2** are not consistent

Kacang tanah

Inconsistencies: many cases where variables **pnpricevar** and **pnpvreas1 or pnpvres2** are not consistent

ANNEX II

DAFEP BENCHMARK SURVEY

Comments on the “LAPORAN AKHIR”

General Comments

The voluminous “Laporan Akhir” produced by the consultants does not fully correspond with the required and commonly accepted format that was designed by Cirad and approved by DAFEP and the consultants.

Among the main problems:

- The structure of the Outline is not used.
- The information is presented independently for the three samples (Reference, Spill over and Dafep) while it should have been done in a comparative manner in order to be able to discuss the difference/similarities among the samples and derive implications for the project.
- Most of the histograms display too broad intervals; in order to better depict the variations in each sample, it is required to set up smaller categories, and then detailed tables such as in page BABIV-5 would not be necessary.
- There is no information for the reader about how the indicators are calculated or what they represent (for instance “Luas lahan”: it is not indicated whether this represent the owned area or the cultivated area; “kekayaan” represents the value of assets such as animals, equipment, house but this is not indicated; “pendapatan” and “pengeluaran” indicators should be also expressed per capita per year in order to really reflect the welfare level of the households).
- It is not necessary to systematically present Kurtosis and Skewness. These values are useful for specific indicators as mentioned in the outline.
- It is not necessary to include in the report the tables found in the “Lampiran lampiran” section. It makes it very big and furthermore all the data is in the database. I recommend attaching a CD-Rom (with the final version of the data base verified by Cirad and the questionnaire forms). That will live more space in the report for a real discussion and analysis of the indicators as specified in the outline.

Specific Comments

- The document does not provide information about the percentage of households owning at least one parcel.
- The share of income sources in the total income is not calculated and not presented for the three samples. It was requested in the outline.
- The Histograms used to display qualitative data should include the categories label and not just numbers on the x-axis.

- BAB IV-44 Data in the upper table is not consistent with BAB IV-43 table (should be 499 respondents and not 903).
- The “gender analysis” section is not an analysis at all, it only displays results, and there is no comparison between the general sample and the sample of women who are head of households. In the same way, there is no comparison between the women farmer sample and the main sample for the more qualitative part of the survey (participation, extension, etc).
- The part about technological level of the farmers (item A.3.7 in the outline) is completely disregarded.
- The “F. Permasalahan” section has several point that are not relevant, or not related to the survey itself but to the fact that an external consultancy firm has been selected to implement the benchmark with all the constraints related to time and money spending. For instance, points 1. to 4. and 6.-7. would not have been constraints if undertaken by the DAFEP staff. In particular the duration of the household survey is directly linked with the commitment and the quality of the training of the enumerator. With its organization in different stages (central supervising team, provincial supervisor, provincial coordinators, enumerators) the consultants have multiplied the intermediary levels and made the training of enumerator more difficult. The fact that a survey takes time is not prohibitive if the survey is undertaken by local staff who have thus a better chance to understand the real situation of the households they are supposed to work with. This could have been an opportunity for them to start a new relationship with a more diverse group of farmers. Point 5 is not relevant since the set up of the questionnaire design and data base conception make it easy to check and then correct the accuracy of the answers from an economic analysis point of view. Saying that “catatan tertulis” would have made the results more accurate does not help, since this does not happen in Indonesia. Finally points 9-11 are not problems related to the benchmark methodology but with the design and conception of the whole DAFEP project under the circumstances of the regional autonomy process.
- The “Temuan dan saran” part in BAB V should not be separated from the data in BAB IV. It is not easy for the reader to go back and forth in the whole documents from the data and table to the findings and recommendations. Furthermore, the findings are rather weak, there is almost no discussion comparing the DAFEP and reference sample, item by item. This is what really DAFEP leaders expect from the benchmark besides the raw data presented in the database. For instance, it is noteworthy to state for which indicators DAFEP and reference sample do not differ significantly and for which the difference is important and discuss why. Another point is that, the Spillover sample seems more different from the two other with higher variability, different values, and wider deviations. All this probably reflects the heterogeneity of the respondents in this sample due to the methodology selected (spillover at village, sub districts and district level).
- It is not relevant to conduct a comparison among women head of household between Dafep, Reference and Spillover, because the respondents are not enough. The gender analysis should be conducted between the three samples combined and the general sample.

ANNEX III

DAFEP BENCHMARK SURVEY

Outline of Technical content for the Benchmark Survey Report to be submitted to DAFEP

The sections below describe what is the minimum information required and to be included in the Benchmark Survey final Report to be submitted by PT HCK to the DAFEP Head of Project. In addition to this report, it is expected that PT. HCK deliver to DAFEP the full content of the data base including, households surveys data, women and youth farmers survey data, extension workers survey data, village monographs data in the form of various tables as well as the related forms, requests and reports inside the data base. This information will be recorded by PT HCK on CD-Rom.

The report of the Benchmark Survey should present sections on the background, methods, field work organisation and protocols, data collection process, data entry and processing, data cleaning and data analysis.

As far as data analysis is concerned, the report is not expected to be a catalogue of tables presenting the answers to all items discussed during the survey. In order to facilitate an analytical reporting of the benchmark, it is recommended that the results should be presented according to the indicators that were agreed upon as needed for the assessment of the project at mid-term and at its end.

A. Specific results from the global household survey

1. General issues on the survey sample

Before discussing indicators, a preliminary section should be devoted to a discussion of some general characteristics of the DAFEP (D), REFERENCE (R) and SPILLOVER (S). The following social characteristics should be examined in particular:

Average age of the responding head of household as indicated in the Form I.1
Average education level of the responding head of household as indicated in the Form I.1
Average size of the family as indicated in the Form I.1
Average cultivated land as indicated in the Form I.1
Percentage of households owning at least one parcel as indicated in the Form I.1
Average household consumption level as indicated in the Form I.3

It is expected that there should not be any significant differences between D, R and S concerning these points. Any discrepancy should be highlighted and commented.

2. Economic indicators

Then the next section of the report should deal with the relevant economic indicators revealing the welfare level of the households as listed below:

1. Total income (to be calculated)
2. Agricultural income(to be calculated)
3. Non agricultural income(to be calculated)
4. Household assets
5. Total consumption without including exceptional consumption (to be calculated)

These indicators apply only to the main representative sample of household. For these indicators it is required to present the results as follows:

- ☞ Comparison of average total, average agricultural income and non agricultural income between DAFEP (D), REFERENCE (R) and SPILLOVER (S) for the whole sample
- ☞ Graphic representation of total income distribution in the three D, R and S samples
- ☞ Calculation of skewness and kurtosis for each sample.
- ☞ Comparison of the relative share of agricultural income in the total income between D, R and S
- ☞ Comparison of total assets between D, R and S
- ☞ A regrouping of all households led by women will be established, and comparison made in terms of average income, average agricultural income and total assets with the rest of the households

Interpretation of the results should highlight discrepancies between samples and/or related to the gender of the household head.

3. Agricultural productivity and agricultural knowledge indicators

The technical indicators are the following

6. Increase in productivity (changes in yields and inputs use)
7. Technology adoption (changes in production systems)

Only the current productivity will be indicated for the dominant crops. These will include rice, some other staples and possibly tree crops. Only crops productivity for which there is a sufficient number of observation will be measured (minimum sixty observations). In the case of several cropping seasons, the yearly average per hectare will be used.

Technology adoption cannot be measured yet, however the characteristics of farming practices should be highlighted for the main crops. These are mainly based on the use of agricultural inputs.

For these indicators it is required to present the results as follows:

- ☞ Comparison of land productivity for the main crops between D, R and S samples
 - ☞ Frequency of use of N, P, and K fertilisers
 - ☞ Frequency of use of other chemicals (herbicide, insecticide)
8. Knowledge of agricultural techniques
- ☞ This is based on the commodity forms. For each commodity, a synthetic table will summarize the current knowledge about some inputs (seeds, fertilizers), about pest and disease and control techniques, and about marketing.

B. Results from the global and the gender/youth samples

In addition to the D, R and S samples, there are two other farmers sample: the women farmers sample (W) and the youth-farmer sample (Y). These two samples focus on the forms II and III. For the following indicators, the results will show different types of data. Data must be presented so that it is possible to compare results from:

- ✓ the three households samples (D, R and S) as in Chapter A.
- ✓ the households sample respectively with the women farmers sample (W) and the youth farmers (Y) sample. This will apply for all indicators listed below except when not applicable as duly mentioned.

Thus for each series indicators as grouped below, it will be possible to discuss, in addition to the respective characteristics of D, R and S samples, the specificity of the women farmers sample and the youth farmers sample.

4. Decision making empowerment indicators

9. Knowledge of the decision making process at the village level (based on Form II.1 qu. 1b and c.)
10. Participation in the village decision making (based on Form II.1 qu. 1d.)
11. People involvement in project implementation (based on Form II.1 qu. 1e and f.)
12. Willingness to participate at the decision making process (based on Form II.1 qu. 1g.)
13. Awareness of changes in the characteristics of the village

5. Formal institution participation (based on Form II.1 qu. 2.)

14. Involvement in village group/organisation
15. Frequency of the group meeting
16. Interest on group activities
17. Benefits from group activities

The involvement in women groups and youth groups will not be included in the comparison between D, R, S with W and with Y for obvious reasons. The involvement level in these organisation will be specially analysed for W in the “Gender issue” indicators section

6. Access to extension and agricultural information (based on Forms II.2 and II.3 qu. 3.)

18. Accessibility to agricultural information
 - ☐ This indicator combine the need for information, the type of product and the availability, as well as recent changes in availability.
19. Source of agricultural information
20. Willingness to pay for agricultural information
21. Access to extension worker
 - ☐ This indicator is an assessment about how well the respondent knows the extension worker, through the answers given to the questions related to the name, gender, origin, and institution of the extension worker.
22. Frequency of meetings with the extension worker
23. Extension methods used by the extension worker
 - ☐ This includes the type of meeting, who leads the discussion, the level of interaction, and the extension activities conducted by the extension worker

7. Access to markets and market information (based on Form II.4 qu. 4)

24. Input sources
 - ☐ This includes both the main source for each type of input and the main choice element for selecting a source compared to others.
25. Access to inputs and information on inputs
 - ☐ Combines quality of information on input and whether inputs are a limitation and why
26. Group purchases of inputs
27. Access to output markets
 - ☐ Includes, by commodity, the main and secondary market destination, and the reason for selecting the main market. Information is presented by commodity for easy analysis.
28. Group sales of outputs
29. Source of capital

8. Social issues (based on Form II.5 qu.5.1.)

30. Perception of the welfare level of the village
☐ This includes the assessment of the welfare level of the village, the reason, the recent changes and the reason for changes if any.
31. Awareness of the presence of poor people in the village
☐ This includes an assessment of the percentage of poor households, the criterion used to identify poor households, the main factor of poverty, the evolution over the last five years.
32. Participation of poor people to extension activities
☐ This includes an assessment of the presence of poor farmers in extension activities, the reason, the evolution over the last 3 years.
33. Willingness to promote poor households participation in extension activities

9. Gender issues (based on Forms II.3 qu.3 and II.5 qu.5.2.)

34. Participation of women in decision making process
☐ This is analyzed based on the results specific results from the W sample only
35. Women participation in extension activities
☐ This is analyzed based on the results specific results from the W sample only
36. Perception of women's role in agriculture
☐ This includes perception of women presence in agricultural activities, type of women activities, type of commodities, reasons for their low participation (if any), and evolution and desired evolution.
37. Participation of women in group activities
☐ This includes level of women presence in farmers groups, perception of what women can bring in group activities and desired level of participation.
38. Willingness to contribute to women participation in farmers group

10. Environmental issues (based on Form II.5 qu.5.3.)

39. Awareness about the conditions of the natural environment
☐ This includes perception of the level of fertility of the environment for agriculture, the reason for it, recent and long term changes and reasons .
40. Influence of agriculture on this environment

11. Farmers agricultural knowledge

41. Commodity assessment (based on Form III.1. qu. 1 and 2.)
☐ This includes the perception of suitable crops/commodities in the farmers area and related reasons
42. Rationale of the cropping choice(based on Form III.1. qu. 3.)
☐ This includes what main crops/commodities the farmers used and the reason why.
43. Awareness of agroforestry/benefit of trees planting (based on Form III.1. qu. 4 to the end.)

C. Results from the surveys of BPP/BIPP/BLPP (extension survey)

12. Qualitative group survey results

The first part of this section should present the qualitative group interview procedure used by the consultant team so that it will be easily reproduced during the mid-term and end-of-project evaluation.

This presentation should include the people met, and the topics/issues discussed. The synthetic report of the qualitative discussions should present the results in relation with the topic/issues discussed.

13. Individual questionnaire results

The results of this questionnaire will be presented for the total sample of PPL surveyed, so that it will be possible to quantitatively analyse the results. Relevant indicators are listed below

1. Training (based on question 2, PPS/PPL form)
 - ☞ This indicator should show the training topics by order of frequency among the total sample, the average ranking for each topic, and the frequency of use by the extension workers.
2. Extension activities (based on question 3, PPS/PPL form)
 - ☞ This indicator should show, per extension activities implemented, the frequency of implementation, and the total number of participants.
3. Women and youth participation to extension activities (based on question 3, PPS/PPL form)
 - ☞ This indicator should show, per extension activities implemented, the percentage of participating women and youth.
4. Needs (based on question 4, PPS/PPL form)
 - ☞ This indicator should show the priority needs, and for all respondents who have selected “training” as a priority need, the priority topics by order of frequency.
5. Perception of extension institutions (based on question 5, PPS/PPL form)
 - ☞ This indicator should allow to rank the type of agricultural extension organisation, according to how extension workers rate their activities with farmers, which organisation should be more active, and the intensity of the links between respondents and the different organisation.
6. Training activities conducted by BLPP staff (based on BLPP questionnaire)

D. Other relevant information

Any relevant information that is necessary to help understand how the benchmark was implemented should be included in this section. This includes but is not limited to:

- ☞ the sub-district and village sampling method and its implementation in the field (including a table of provinces, districts, sub-districts and villages surveyed),
- ☞ the households and respondents selection method and its implementation in the field,
- ☞ household survey techniques,
- ☞ data processing and cleaning methods,
- ☞ data analysis methods for the final report,
- ☞ any changes made in the recommended methodology that might have affected the approach.

ANNEX IV

DAFEP evaluation indicators and gender sensitive indicators

No star: Indicator is not gender sensitive

* Indicator is gender sensitive (representative sampling includes women head of households)

** Indicator is * and specific survey of women farmer or topic directly deals with gender issues

*** Indicator is ** and the topic is directly dealing with gender issues

A. Not gender sensitive indicators

Empty

B. * Gender sensitive indicators

1. Increase in productivity (changes in yields and inputs use)*
2. Technology adoption (changes in production systems)*
3. Impact of increased agricultural efficiency on village wealth*
4. Total income*
5. Agricultural income*
6. Non agricultural income*

C. ** Gender sensitive indicators

7. Household assets*
8. Participation to the village decision making**
9. Knowledge of the decision making process at the village level**
10. Involvement in project implementation**
11. Willingness to participate at the decision making process**
12. Self confidence to participate in the decision making process**
13. Involvement in village group/organisation**
14. Frequency of the group meeting**
15. Interest on group activities**
16. Benefits from group activities**
17. Accessibility to agricultural information**
18. Source of agricultural information**
19. Willingness to pay for agricultural information**
20. Access to extension worker**
21. Frequency of meetings extension workers**
22. Extension methods used by the extension worker**
23. Awareness of changes in the characteristics of the village**
24. Access to input markets**
25. Access to information on inputs**
26. Group purchases of inputs**
27. Access to alternative output markets**
28. Group sales of outputs**
29. Source of capital**
30. Perception of the characteristics of the village**
31. Awareness of the influence of agriculture on the environment**
32. Establishment of participatory activities**
33. Awareness of the presence of poor people in the village**
34. Participation of poor people to group activities**
35. Participation of poor people to extension activities**

C. *** Gender sensitive indicators

36. Women participation in extension activities***
37. Perception of women's role in agriculture***
38. Participation of women in group activities***
39. Participation of women in decision making process***