

Result framework PRF III (2017-2019)

		Cumulative Target Values					Comment
Indicator Name Project Development Objectives (PDO)	Baseline	YR1 2016	YR2 2017	YR3 2018	YR4 2019	End Target	
Direct project beneficiaries ¹ (Number) - (Core)	567,762	640,000	680,000	687,000	690,000	690,000	This represents beneficiaries from the last annual sub-grant PRF II (accumulated number), data of new villages just received sub-projects in Cycle XV (PRF III).
		695,663	778,521 ²	819,266 ³			
Female beneficiaries (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental) - (Core) Actual	53	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	As above
		49.8	50.00	49.32			
Ethnic Beneficiaries (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental)	70	70	70.00	70.00	70.00	70.00	As above
		77.00	84.00 ⁴	80.00 ⁵			
% of PRF beneficiary HHs reporting improved	n/a					End	Data to be available before

¹ The baseline value is the total number of villagers who have directly benefited from the PRF II at the time of PRF III appraisal. The Year 1 value includes villagers who would benefit from the last annual sub-grant cycle of the PRF II, in addition to those who would benefit from the first annual sub-grant cycle of PRF III.

² Based on the number of population (82,858 people) in new villages that received PRFIII's support as total 162 out of 341 villages while 179 villages received PRF II and PRF III's support.

³ Based on the number of population (40,745 people) in new villages that just received PRF's support as total 77 villages out 326 villages where sub-project located in 2018, while the other 249 villages already received in PRF II.

⁴ Based on the number of ethnic population in villages received sub-projects in 2017 per total population.

⁵ There are 168,308 people as direct beneficiaries and 134,585 are ethnic groups (134,585/168,308)=80%.

access to basic services (Percentage) ⁶						targets set for each subproject type	project closing through an endline impact evaluation conducted by a firm contracted by PRF, end of 2019
% of PRF beneficiary HHs with access to health services (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental)	36.40				42.40	42.40	As above
% of PRF beneficiary HHs with access to safe water resources (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental)	11.00				14	14	As above
% of PRF beneficiary HHs with access to all weather roads (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental)	48.00				58.00	58.00	As above
% of PRF beneficiary HHs reporting improved quality of educational facilities (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental)	45.00				60.00	60.00	As above

Intermediate Results Indicators

Indicator Name	Baseline 2015	Cumulative Target Values					Comments
		YR1 2016	YR2 2017	YR3 2018	YR4 2019	End Target	
% of total project value contributed by the community (Text)	11.00	8.00	7.79 ⁷	7.59 ⁸		No target value set	Sub-project implementation not yet commenced
% HHs in PRF beneficiary villages voting for village priorities (Percentage)	60.00	70.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	From MIS. It is new indicator of PRF III

⁶ Baseline values for the sub-indicators are the current level of access at the time of PRF III appraisal.

⁷ This used annually cumulative numbers from 2016+2017.

⁸ Based on the suggestion of World Bank during M&E part on 18 June 2018, using cumulative data from 2016+2017+2018, the data may be updated in Annual Progress Report 2018.

		n/a	85.2	87.05 ⁹			
% of PRF Kumbans participating in DSED process promoting PRF KDPs and/or VDPs (Percentage)	0.00	50.00	70.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	We based on data of pilot DSED districts, KDPs are included in annual DSED
		n/a	71.20 ¹⁰	83.00 ¹¹			
% of sub-project activities of high technical quality (Percentage)	85.00			85.00		85.00	Data is available through Technical quality assessment confirmed in May 2018
		90 ¹²		92.00			
% of households in PRF beneficiary villages satisfied with the participatory planning process supported by PRF III (Percentage)	75.00			80.00		80.00	As above
				90.00			
% of PRF III sub-project prioritized by women (Percentage)	91.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	From MIS PRF III
		93.00	91.97 ¹³	91.94 ¹⁴			

⁹ Based on cumulative number of HHs from 2017+2018 participated voting for village priorities.

¹⁰ We used the data of KBPs in annual DSED implementation plan in the pilot districts that tested for DSED, we based on data of Sepone district where there is 152 priorities and 114 are included in DSED, Samneua district in Huaphan, there are 93 priorities and 73 are added in DSED, Phonesay district in LuangPrabang there are 222 priorities and 143 are added in DSED, Beng district 40 priorities and in DSED 31. This Indicator = $(114+73+143+31)/(152+93+222+40) = 71.20\%$

¹¹ In 2018, we used the KDPs data of 4 pilot districts, which updated data of 2018, as total of 5,347 sub-projects in the KDPs and 3,790 sub-projects included in district social development plans. it shows that there is different between districts which conducted DSED meeting and other districts without (that means 39 districts have no meeting on this issue).

¹² Based on the finding of technical study in 2016, where 90 percent of sample sub-projects are good quality, 7 % are fair and 3 % are poor

¹³ This based on data of 348 sub-projects that entered to the system by June 7, 2017, as 87 sub-projects are prioritized by only women and 234 sub-projects are prioritized by both men and women, only man 28 sub-projects.

¹⁴ There are 335 sub-projects

% of PRF III sub-projects prioritized by ethnic group (Percentage)	70.00	70.00 n/a	70.00 80.02	70.00 85.33	70.00	70.00	As above, it is new indicator of PRF III
% of PRF built infrastructure in a functioning quality (Percentage)	80.00	80.00 90 ¹⁵	80.00	80.00 97.4 ¹⁶	80.00	80.00	Data is available through Technical quality assessment confirmed in May 2018
% of registered grievances that are addressed according to agreed procedures (Percentage)	90.00	90.00 95.00	90.00 95 ¹⁷	90.00 92.06	90.00	90.00	From MIS in December 2017
# of communities able to plan, implement and monitor their VDPs (Number)	1,124	1,300 1,349	1,400 1,511 ¹⁸	1,450 1,588 ¹⁹	1,450	1,450	Represents # of villages that have developed VDPs under Cycle 14
# and value of sub project activities implemented by types (Number)	1,426	1,750 1,930 ²⁰	2,100 2,279 ²¹	2,450 2,613	2,800	2,800	From MIS in December 2017

¹⁵ Based on the technical audit evaluation in 2016, 90% of sub-projects are good quality, 70% are fair and 3% are poor quality.

¹⁶ Internal monitoring done by PRF district office and Kumban team in February 2018, there are 45 out of 1761 sub-projects are not functioning while 12 of them are poor quality. For the Technical Beneficiary Assessment conducted in May 2018, confirmed that 92% is high technical quality and 8% is fair, it is weak to justify this finding.

¹⁷ We based on data Grievances submitted through hotlines and FRM, as well as issues raise by community during the meeting.

¹⁸ For this indicator we based on the number of villages have received at least one sub-project, as same as we calculated in PRF II , For PRF III, there are 348 sub-projects located in 340 villages, there are 179 villages received PRFII and PRF III, and there are 162 new villages that received supported by PRF III. Therefore, we have 1349+162=1511 villages.

¹⁹ in 2018, there are 335 sub-projects located in 326 villages and there are 77 new villages, so accumulated number is 1,511+77=1588 villages.

²⁰ Based on last number of PRF II, there are 1931 sub-projects that got approved but only 1930sub-projects got completed, and then we can add data of Cycle 14.

²¹ This is based on 348 sub-projects that we requested for NOL and proceeded procurement process (out of 349 sub-projects, one sp in Sepon already implemented by other).

# of individuals with livelihood investments using loans from SHGs (Number)	4,054	8,000 8,213	8,000 9,962	8,000 9,962 ²²	8,000	8,000	Data for Cycle 14 to be available from LN MIS in December 2017
% of SHGs with NPLs 4% and below ^[1]	60.00	60.00	70.00 n/a	70.00 n/a	70.00	70.00	As above, need to be revised and proposed for % functioning of SHG
Additional Indicator: % of poor and poorest villages have received at least one sub-project from PRF III	n/a	n/a	86.47 ²³	85.00 ²⁴			New indicator of PRF III

²² Use the maximum number of members who took the loan from SHG to invest for livelihood activities.

²³ Based on data of 348 sub-project(s) located in 340 villages where 43 are poorest villages, 258 are poor villages, and 47 are relative poor villages, data may be updated in annual progress report.

²⁴ Based on data of 335 sub-project(s) located in 326 villages where 27 are poorest village, 258 are poor villages, and 50 are related poor villages, data will be updated in annual progress report.