

# Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration for Systemic Change: A New Approach to Strengthening Farmer Support Systems



# DIAGNOSIS SCORECARD

Cell to be completed are indicated in blue

<b>COUNTRY</b>	
<b>FARMER SUPPORT FORUM</b> National / Subnational (if subnational please indicate name of province/region/district)	
<b>DATE(S) OF MULTISTAKEHOLDER SCORECARD EXERCISE</b>	
<b>FACILITATOR</b>	
<b>METHODOLOGY USED</b> Questions answered anonymously or not / Initial data collection prior to the meeting or not/supporting software (e.g. survey monkey, interactive real time voting, etc.)	

## Part I – General Information on Service Providers

Please indicate in the table below basic information about the service providers (public, private and/or civil society institutions) currently providing support to Commodity X farmers in the farmer support forum jurisdiction (national or subnational) - add column as needed. More detailed information on each service providers (e.g. sources of funding, annual budget, human resources, financial expenditures, etc.) should be collected during the diagnosis study that normally precede the diagnosis scorecard exercise.

	Service Provider 1	Service Provider 2	Service Provider 3
<b>Name</b>			
<b>Legal Status</b> (national/subnational government, NGO, private sector, farmer based organisations, university based, etc.)			
<b>Year established</b>			
<b>Name of farmer support forum representative</b>			
<b>Contact details (email and telephone)</b>			
<b>Approximate Number of farmers serviced</b>			
<b>Primary source of funding</b> (government, fee for service financing, private sector, donor, other)			

## Part II – Joint Assessment

The assessment should ideally be conducted for the existing farmer support “system” as a whole – i.e. taking into account the different service providers that exist in the targeted jurisdiction – as we are interested in strengthening the existing system at systemic level. In the case where answers differ greatly from one service provider to the other, the average should be recorded i.e. “(in general among service providers)”, and the main difference between providers captured in the comments on discussion row below the answer. Highlighting difference of performance among service providers may also stimulate discussion on recommendations.

### Component 1: Policy Environment & Governance Structures

#### Element 1: Vision

1. Vision for national/subnational extension services	None (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

2. Level of buy-in of stakeholders into the vision (level of shared vision)	None (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

3. Inclusion of SDG objectives beyond productivity in the vision	None (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>4. The extension services approach is largely farmer demand driven</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>5. Existence of long-term political commitment/will for sustainable commodity production</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

## Element 2: Diversity of service providers & partnerships

<b>6. Government policy encourages non-public institutions (e.g. NGOs, the private sector and farmers' organisations) to become involved in the delivery of extension services</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>7. Overall strength of the financial and organizational sustainability of the service providers</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>8. Level of decentralisation</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>9. Coordination mechanisms between service providers (e.g. alignment of activities, farmer training, joint committees, etc.)</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>10. Operational linkages between extension and other relevant institutions (e.g. agricultural research, universities, input suppliers, marketing organisations, credit, etc.)</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

### Element 3: Producer Organisations

<b>11. Existence of producer organisations linking farmers to service providers</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>12. General strength of existing producer organisations</b>	<b>None (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

## Component 2. Organisational and Management Capacity

### Element 4: Staff Numbers

<b>13. The coverage of commodity farmers by field extension workers is adequate</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>14. There is a fair distribution of extension workers across geographical area</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>15. There is an adequate reach of women commodity farmers</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>16. Locally-tailored solutions are actively pursued to overcome staff shortage to reach optimal and cost-effective coverage (e.g. outsourcing, farmer trainers, use of information technology tools, pluralism, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

#### Element 5: Training Levels, Skills and Experience

<b>17. Foundational training for service providers staff is adequate in terms of general technical content</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>18. Foundational training for service providers staff is well balanced between theoretical and practical components</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>19. Foundation training for service providers staff include functional or soft skills such as communication, problem solving, adaptability, etc.</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					



<b>20. Service provider staff at all levels are given frequent opportunities for receiving in-service training to update their technical knowledge and skills for the commodity</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>21. Service providers staff are suitably trained to deal with the range of knowledge needed to work on sustainability (e.g. farm management, land, soil, water, environment and climate change, labour issues, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>22. The capacity of service provider staff to innovate and adapt to new challenges is adequate</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>23. There are incentives in place to maximise performance? And penalties for poor performance</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>24. There are adequate oversight/ supervision mechanisms in place throughout the institution (e.g. staff objectives, reporting mechanisms, performance review, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>25. There are adaptive management systems in place</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>26. Existence of long-term planning to meet staff and farmer needs</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

### Component 3. Advisory Methods

#### Element 4: Staff Numbers

27. National curricula to train farmers on sustainable commodity production practices (e.g. client driven, based on international and national best practices, etc.)	No (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					
28. The curricula is regularly reviewed/updated	No (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					
29. Services focused on holistic needs of commodity farmers	No (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					
30. Training curricula include gender sensitisation	No (0)	Very Limited (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

## Element 8: Delivery

<b>31. Service providers use locally-suited/proven extension strategies</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>32. Delivery services provided are cost effective (e.g. results obtained compared to resources invested)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>33. Transportation for field level staff is adequate</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>34 The frequency of training (and refresher training) provided to farmers is adequate enough for farmers to adopt more sustainable practices</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>35. The training is being delivered in a coordinated way within and between service providers (e.g. integration of themes)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>36. Farmers access to inputs (e.g. fertiliser, credit, seeds, shade trees, etc.) is adequate</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>37. The extension service provider serves a broader set of clientele than established male farmers (women farmers, landless rural households, young people, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

#### **Element 9: Technologies**

<b>38. The extension services make use of modern information technology in support of extension activities (e.g. apps for disease identification, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>39. ICT initiatives are applied at scale</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>40. ICT initiatives are not only focused on information delivery but also include other uses such as capacity strengthening or performance monitoring</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

#### Component 4. Budgeting & Financing

#### Element 10: Budget Levels

<b>41. The financial resources available are adequate to maintain a functional support system on Commodity X</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>42. The total extension budget has increased adequately in the past 5 years</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>43. Budget targets are known and based upon sound budget planning</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

#### Element 11: Sources of funding and Sustainability

<b>44. Diversity of revenue sources</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>45. Innovative revenue instruments are in place to fund farmer support system (e.g. cost recovery from farmers, export tax, commodity funds, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>46. Revenue mechanisms are transparent and adequately managed</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>47. The different revenue mechanisms are closely coordinated</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>48. Capacity to provide extension services on a long-term basis (e.g. constant and sustainable income stream)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

#### Element 12: Budget Allocation

<b>49. Sufficient budget allocated for field work and operational expenses</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>50. The budget is adequately distributed between geographical area/region</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					



<b>51. The budget is adequately distributed between national, provincial, district level</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>52. Sufficient budget allocated for infrastructure needs</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

### Component 5. M&E, Learning

#### Element 13: System Level Performance

<b>53. Service providers have indicators in place to evaluate the performance of advisory services provided (e.g. timeliness, relevance, access, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>54. Performance data collection is done in a participatory way with clients and used for learning by farmers</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>55. The monitoring system is operating at scale</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>56. There is a system in place to capture lessons learned from farmers and trainers</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

#### Element 14: Farm level

<b>57. Existence of data management to capture data at farm level related to uptake and adoption</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>58. Accountability of service providers to farmers and ability of farmers to exercise voice and formulate demand (e.g. specifying programs, setting priorities, assessing performance)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

**Element 15: Continuous Improvement**

<b>59. Lessons learned from M&amp;E system are fed into national strategy</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

<b>60. Service provider M&amp;E system include mechanisms to measure impact (yield, productivity, income, etc.)</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Very Limited (0)</b>	<b>Limited (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>
Comments on discussion					
Recommendations for strengthening					

## Part III – Results

Ideally, the scorecard should be completed by the Farmer Support Forum every year in order to show the yearly situation of the national/subnational Farmer Support System. The first year the scorecard is completed becomes the baseline situation. Then every year, the scorecard should be completed, and the results compared to the baseline data and data from previous years to show the annual progress of the country. Key progress made and priorities for the next year are also recorded.

Scoring	
<b>Score of 0 to 60</b>	Lower level of performance
<b>Score of 60 to 120</b>	Mid level of performance
<b>Score of 120 to 180</b>	Higher level of performance

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Total Score</b> (Max score is 180)	
<b>Overall Comment on diagnosis exercise</b>	

**Progress**

To be completed only if not first/baseline year

<b>Year</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Key progress made</b>	<b>Priorities for next year</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Baseline</b>				
<b>Year 1</b>				
<b>Year 2</b>				
<b>Year 3</b>				

---

**Name**

---

**Date**

---

**Signature**

---

**from Chair of Farmer Support Forum (and/or Service Provider Heads)**



---

**GREEN  
COMMODITIES  
PROGRAMME**

---