**Introduction:** This document includes metrics to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a Producer Unit (PU) and its staff. These metrics are designed as a continuum to measure the progress over time as a PU strengthens its systems and develops the competency of team members. The progress matrix is intended as a **learning tool** to help Implementing Partners (IPs) and BCI better support PUs. *The outcome is not linked to the BCI assurance model or licensing decisions*.

The progress matrix is to be completed by a BCI assessor or third-party verifier as part of the reporting process after an assessment. The PU Progress Matrix will be submitted to the BCI Assurance Managers, and a copy will be shared with the IP for learning purposes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date:      | PU Code:      | Assessor Name/ Organisation:       |

1. Field Facilitators (FFs) have strong knowledge on the most relevant sustainability priorities for the PU, and can communicate these issues to farmers in a clear way

*Guidance: Focus on 2-3 of the most relevant sustainability priorities for the PU. Typically, these will be issues covered in the CIP, but not in all cases. Ask for example, ‘How do you explain to farmers the benefits of cover cropping?’*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| A number of FFs lack knowledge on key priorities; some FFs may struggle to communicate in ways that farmers will understand.  | Some FFs are knowledgeable about these areas, but they may miss pieces of key information. Some FFs need further support to communicate in a simple and clear way that farmers will understand.  | Most FFs are knowledgeable about high-priority areas – there may be some gaps. Some FFs could improve their communication approach to help farmers understand even better. | Almost all FFs have an impressive level of knowledge about key sustainability areas. FFs can communicate these issues clearly to farmers in a simple and relevant way.  |

**Additional comments (good practices/ areas to improve):**

1. Field Facilitators feel that they receive sufficient training and support to do their jobs effectively

*This includes not only knowledge on the BCI P&C, but also communication and training skills, knowledge of local practices, etc.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| FFs report that they received minimal training, or only generic training on the P&C. FFs can readily list numerous areas where they need additional skills, knowledge, or support.  | FFs have received some training, but they can readily list a number of areas where they feel they need further training or support to carry out their role effectively. | Most FFs feel they have had adequate training to do their job well, and they can identify recent and upcoming trainings. However, some FFs can cite additional areas where they need further support or skills. | All or almost all FFs feel they have received adequate training/ support to do their job well. FFs are given regular opportunities to deepen their knowledge and improve their skills. |

List areas where FFs would benefit from additional training or support:

1. Field Facilitators feel they have good working conditions and are fairly compensated

*Ask ‘If you had to change two things about your job or working conditions, what would they be?’ ‘How long does your current work contract extend?’*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| FFs are not yet paid the minimum wage or regional average wage, and/or are hired on temporary contracts. Most FFs express some dissatisfaction with working conditions and can cite specific examples. | Some FFs feel they are compensated fairly, others do not. Some FFs may be on temporary contracts. FFs can identify a number of important improvements they would like to see in working conditions. | Most FFs feel they are compensated fairly and have good working conditions; a minority of FFs may be dissatisfied with compensation or working conditions.  | Almost all FFs feel they have good working conditions and are fairly compensated; most expect to continue working with the PU for the next 2-3 years at least. They are generally positive about the role and work. |

Additional comments (good practices/ areas to improve):

1. The CIP reflects relevant sustainability issues for this PU, and specific actions from the plan have been implemented

*This metric evaluates the quality and usefulness of the CIP. Ask the PU Manager and a couple of FFs: ‘How did you identify CIP priorities? Have these changed over time? What actions are expected in the plan for the next couple of months. Are these realistic? Have they been carried out?’. ‘Is the CIP useful for you?’*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| CIP priorities are generic and not relevant; key sustainability challenges for the PU are not covered in the CIP. PU staff are not clear on how to use the CIP or how it was developed.  | Some CIP priorities are relevant and appropriate; however, some are non-essential or important areas are not covered. Actions are quite generic; a few actions have been implemented but not all  | Most CIP priorities are relevant and appropriate; however there might be a few gaps. Most planned actions are specific and clear; some planned actions (to date) have been implemented but not all | CIP priorities cover the most critical issues for the PU; action plans are clear, appropriate, and implemented. The PU staff are knowledgeable about the CIP and find it useful |

Additional comments (good practices/ areas to improve):

1. The PU shows evidence of improvements in sustainability practices since previous years, as cross-checked through farmer interviews *[Select 2 high-priority focus areas improvements]*

*Select 2 focus areas where the PU has prioritized improvements (usually from the CIP). Look at both farmer interviews/ focus group discussions and document reviews (e.g. training evaluations, adoption data)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| Based on farmer interviews and PU data, there is not yet much evidence of improvements in farmer awareness or adoption of more sustainable practices.  | Some farmers (i.e. 25-50% of those interviewed) show evidence of more sustainable practices in at least one of these areas; this is supported by PU data/ records.  | Most farmers (i.e. 50-75% of those interviewed) show evidence of more sustainable practices in at least one of these areas; this is supported by PU data/ records. | Almost all farmers interviewed show evidence of more sustainable practices in at least one of these areas; this is supported by PU data/ records. |

Additional comments (good practices/ areas to improve):

1. Farmers actively participate in trainings or PU activities, and are able to recall key concepts covered in recent training/ awareness raising

*To get a sample for smallholder PUs, focus on two LGs and two recent training topics covered in each LG. Ask as many farmers as possible: ‘What new information did you learn?’ ‘Are you doing anything differently?’*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| Less than half of farmers interviewed participated in recent trainings or PU activities (based on interviews/ training records). Most farmers cannot recall key concepts covered in the trainings. | Most farmers (at least 75%) in the LGs participated in recent trainings/ activities. Of those, some are able to recall key concepts. Other farmers cannot remember much of trainings or did not find them useful. | Most farmers (at least 75%) in the LGs participated in numerous recent trainings/ activities. Of those who participated, most farmers found the training useful and are able to recall important points. | Almost all farmers participated in numerous recent trainings or activities. Most farmers can recall key points and can relate concepts to their own farming practices. |

Additional comments *(note here the LG codes for smallholder PUs, and training topics selected*):

1. Farmers see value from their participation with BCI thus far

*Carry out individual or small group discussions directly with farmers, without IP/ PU representatives if possible. Ask, ‘Would you participate with BCI next year? Why? If we could change two things to make this programme more helpful, what would those be?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Doesn’t yet meet | [ ]  Partially meets | [ ]  Mostly meets | [ ]  Fully meets |
| A few farmers out of those interviewed can identify specific benefits of participating with BCI. Most farmers are unsure or haven’t yet seen clear benefits. | Some farmers (i.e. 25-50% of those interviewed) can identify basic benefits of participating with BCI (such as ‘receive training’), but without being specific.  | Most farmers (at least 75%) can identify specific benefits of participating with BCI; for example, ‘reduced use of dangerous chemicals’ or ‘learning about new ways of improving yield.’ | Almost all farmers interviewed can identify specific benefits of participating with BCI and can relate these to their own farming practices.  |

Additional comments (good practices/ areas to improve):

Overall feedback

Strengths – areas where the PU team or management system is functioning very well:

Areas where the PU could benefit from additional support or training: