Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Phase II results that frame the Phase III M&E and KM scope

The Phase II Project End Report (10 February 2026) rated the project against the six OECD/DAC criteria. The summary ratings were:

- Relevance: Highly relevant
- Coherence: Strong coherence, with managed in-coherence at the policy interface
- Effectiveness: Varied across outcome areas
- Efficiency: Varied across outcome areas, with GIZ procurement processes flagged as onerous
- Impact: High direct and indirect impact
- Sustainability: Significant sustainability

The Phase II module-level indicators were achieved as follows:

- 19 of 19 ABS compliant MSMEs accessed local and global markets;
- 193 of 150 permanent jobs were created (above target);
- 1,158 of 1,500 seasonal jobs were created (below target);
- the Buyer Confidence Index moved from 73% (2023 baseline) to 81% (2025 endline);
- and trade volume was reported at USD 1.2 to 1.4 million against a target of USD 1 million, with the Project End Report explicitly recording this figure as ***partially unverified.***
  *This unverified data risk is the single most important lesson the Phase III M&E ToR responds to.

2. What the project end of Phase II leaves behind for the M&E and KM contractor to work with

Phase II produced a substantial M&E and KM legacy that the Phase III contractor must use as the starting point, not as background reading. The principal Phase II instruments and deliverables are:

Instrument or deliverable	Phase II status and Phase III implication
Factual Findings Reports (FFRs)	Industry-statistics instruments administered by industry associations under the sector Benefit Sharing Agreements. Implemented for Buchu and Honeybush (5 processors independently reviewed in 2025). Cover production, procurement volumes, hectares, average prices, permanent and seasonal jobs, with built-in confidentiality controls. The FFR is the most important data verification instrument for module-level indicators on jobs and trade volume.
Buyer Confidence Index (BCI)	Seven-dimension index with 20 questions on a 1-10 scale, with five double-weighted critical-factor items. Baseline 2023 (n=6 international buyers, 73%) and Phase II endline 2025 (n=10 mixed local, regional, international buyers at the African Biotrade Festival, 81%). The Phase II report establishes a two-year repeat cycle.

Instrument or deliverable	Phase II status and Phase III implication
Institutional Development Assessment (IDA)	Scored self-assessment across seven governance, finance and sustainability domains. Used to benchmark associations as Emerging, Growing, or Established. Phase II results: Buchu Association "established"; SABPA "growing"; SAHTA score 53/66 "growing".
SDP Transition Tables	Track each Sector Development Plan objective against activities, milestones, outputs, status, and lessons. Phase II versions exist for Buchu, Honeybush, SABPA, and ABA.
SDP Pillar Prioritisation	Ranking of the seven ABioSA SDP pillars used to inform forward planning and indicate the Phase III strategic focus.
Close-Out Evaluation Questionnaires	Three versions tailored to MSME, Industry Association, and BSO respondents. Used in Phase II to capture reflections on implementation, sustainability, and forward needs.
Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey	Administered both online and in-person at the African Biotrade Festival 2025. Phase II response: 48 of 200 stakeholders (24% response rate). Overall satisfaction 84% positive.
Most Significant Change (MSC)	Used as the primary verification methodology for Phase II Outcome indicator 2.3. Recorded 62 stories from 20 individuals across approximately 50 unique pilot participants (women approximately two-thirds, youth approximately one-third).
Knowledge Ecology 2.0 framework	Co-developed during the Quo Vadis year. Defines five Knowledge Practices (Hosting, Valuing Stories, Dialogue and Discourse, Reflecting and Learning, Sensing and Responding) and five Knowledge Scaffolds (Methods and Approaches, Stakeholder Platforms and Networks, Instruments and Tools, Published Knowledge Products, Events and Peer Learning).
Phase III Indicator Recommendations and Menu (4 December 2025)	Feasibility assessment of impact, meso, macro, output, and meta-level indicators based on Phase II experience, plus a 48-indicator menu (14 meso, 6 macro, 24 output, 4 impact) from which Phase III grant applicants select. Reproduced as Annex K and forms part of the procurement package.

3. Alignment Frameworks

The following alignment requirements are important for ABioSA Phase III:

- **OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.** All major deliverables (baseline, mid-term, close-out) must be structured around the six OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Each criterion must receive a rated assessment with justification. The format expected matches that of the Phase II Project End Report.
- **UNCTAD BioTrade Principles and Criteria.** The seven principles remain the substantive M&E framework, especially for conservation, sustainable use, equitable benefit sharing, productive sustainability, and compliance.
- **SECO Standard Indicators.** The contractor must report against SECO standard indicators SI 4 (capacity), SI 12 (access to capital), SI 13 (jobs created, retained, improved), SI 15 (market access), and SI 16 (trade volume), with gender disaggregation throughout.
- **Global Biodiversity Framework.** Phase III contributes to the module objective of the GIZ global project on biodiversity-target implementation. The contractor must provide data and narrative that can feed into the global project reporting. However, the most important target for the project is Target 13:
    - **CBD Target 13 alignment.** Phase III indicators must be aligned with monitoring and reporting for Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework Target 13 (Access and Benefit Sharing). This includes both qualitative reporting on ABS implementation progress and quantitative reporting on benefit-sharing arrangements (number of agreements, ABS-compliant value chains, traditional-knowledge governance instruments). Where possible, indicator definitions should mirror those used in the CBD monitoring framework so that Phase III data can feed national Target 13 reporting in addition to project reporting.
- **Theory of change and systemic competitiveness framework.** Verification must address direct and systemic effects across the four levels (micro, meso, macro, meta).

4. Methodology Expectations

Below is the most important methodological response to the lessons of Phase II summarised for the purpose of this assignment.

4.1 Mixed-methods foundation

The contractor will use a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative monitoring and qualitative learning, building on the Phase II design. Quantitative methods include indicator tracking against the logframe, the Buyer Confidence Index, IDA scoring, the Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey, FFR-derived industry statistics, and trade-volume estimation. Qualitative methods include Most Significant Change, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, facilitated workshops, and story-collection across stakeholder platforms.

4.2 Verification protocols

The contractor will operate under the following verification protocol, which addresses the partial-verification risk identified in the Phase II Project End Report:

1. **Indicator classification (verification status).** Every module and outcome indicator must be classified at inception as: independently verified (e.g., PPECB data, independently reviewed FFR data, or third-party certifications); partially verified (e.g., association-aggregated FFR data without independent review, or self-reported with documentary triangulation); or self-reported (e.g., survey responses without external corroboration).
2. **Indicator classification (feasibility tier).** Every indicator must additionally be classified by the feasibility of accurate measurement, drawing on the Phase II indicator-feasibility recommendations prepared by the previous service providers (December 2025). The starting tiers are summarised in section 6.2.1 below. The contractor may revise these tiers in the inception report, with explicit reasoning, where Phase III conditions or new data sources justify a different rating.
3. **Verification upgrade path.** For every partially-verified or self-reported indicator, and for every indicator in the LOW or MODERATE feasibility tier, the contractor will propose, document, and implement an upgrade path or proxy strategy during the phase. Where independent verification or precise measurement cannot be achieved, the limitation must be reported transparently.
4. **Triangulation.** Quantitative indicators must be triangulated against at least one independent source where possible (e.g., PPECB statistics, customs data, association FFR returns, Stats SA, ITC Trademap, third-party certifications).
5. **Transparent reporting of verification status and feasibility tier.** All reports must record both the verification status and the feasibility tier alongside every indicator value. The Phase II practice of reporting indicator values without flagging verification status is to be discontinued.

4.2.1 Feasibility tiers (starting point, revisable in the inception report)

Source: Review of ABioSA Phase III Logframe Indicators (Based on Phase II Experience), prepared by the previous M&E service providers, 4 December 2025. The tiers below are presented as a starting position the contractor may revise in the inception report with explicit reasoning.

Logframe level	Feasibility	Reasoning and implied strategy
Impact level (e.g., percentage change in value of biotrade sector)	**LOW**	National trade statistics are low and incomplete and often do not distinguish biotrade categories. Associations rarely capture full market value; SMEs provide inconsistent data. The contractor must use proxy subsector indicators (e.g., export value of essential oils, tonnes processed of honeybush, baobab pulp powder exports), collaborate with Stats SA, ITC Trademap, and sector associations for harmonised annual reporting based on the baseline data collected at SME and association level in Phase II, and develop a biotrade index

Logframe level	Feasibility	Reasoning and implied strategy
		together with DFFE (aligned with CBD Target 13 monitoring and reporting) rather than attempting precise valuation.
Meso level (sector coordination and services)	**HIGH**	Associations and BSOs can readily report number of trainings, meetings, MoUs, guidelines, SOPs etc. The contractor will standardise a simple Association Reporting Template across all grants (see section 6.6), require reporting at least twice per year covering number of members, sector events, compliance tools developed, and MSMEs supported, and use a digital reporting portal (Excel or Google Forms) to reduce inconsistencies.
Macro level (stakeholder perception)	**MODERATE**	Surveys were conducted successfully in Phase II (stakeholder and buyer surveys) but with risks around response rate and representativity. The contractor will offer incentives (anonymous dashboard feedback, benchmarking reports) to increase response rates, collect perception data at all events via QR codes, and integrate perception questions into association training events, B2B events, and annual stakeholder meetings.
Output level	**VERY HIGH**	Most grant projects will deliver tangible outputs aligned with the Phase III logframe. The contractor will require applicants to choose a minimum number of output indicators (3 to 5) from a standard menu provided in the application form (see Annex K). Each output must have a clear definition, deliverable format, and verification source (report, guideline, test result, certificate).
Meta level (shared vision and commitment)	**LOW to MODERATE**	Sector vision and commitment are hard to measure directly because actions are often diffuse and informal. The contractor will use documented commitments (MoUs, statements, resolutions), track usage of shared platforms (e.g., charter adoption), and track participation across value chains (a working benchmark of approximately 60% participation across three or more species groups). Meta-level indicator measurement should be brought together with the Knowledge Ecology 2.0 concept of Discourse (see section 6.8) so the meta-level evidence base is consistent with the KM framework.

4.3 Role of the Factual Findings Report (FFR)

The contractor must work with and through the FFR system established under the Buchu and Honeybush Benefit Sharing Agreements, and any other association that adopts an FFR-style return during Phase III. The FFR is an industry-statistics instrument administered by associations, not by the M&E contractor. The contractor's role is to:

- Draw on FFR aggregated data for module-level indicators on permanent and seasonal jobs, hectares under cultivation, harvested and procured volumes, and trade pricing, while respecting the FFR's confidentiality protocols (no company-level data is to be reported).
- Triangulate FFR data with independent sources (PPECB, customs data, association financial records) wherever possible, and document where independent review is part of the FFR process (as in Honeybush 2025 with five processors).
- Support associations to maintain and where appropriate extend the FFR system, including by helping to standardise lightweight versions of the data return for associations that wish to adopt the practice but lack the BSA-driven legal basis Buchu and Honeybush have.
- Document the relationship between the FFR's independent review function (where it exists) and the M&E contractor's verification protocol so that responsibilities and accountabilities are explicit.

Note on terminology. *The acronym FFR in ABioSA refers to the industry-statistics Factual Findings Report administered under sector Benefit Sharing Agreements. This is distinct from the ISRS 4400 "Report of Factual Findings" used for donor expenditure verification under European Commission and similar grant agreements. The contractor must be aware of the distinction and not confuse the two instruments in reporting or in stakeholder communication.*

4.4 Most Significant Change as a recognised verification methodology

MSC is to be used as a primary verification methodology for indicators dealing with awareness, attitudes, self-perception, agency, engagement, networking, and collective vision. The Phase II Honeybush community engagement pilot established four change domains (awareness; attitudes and self-perception; engagement and networking; collective vision) and produced 62 stories from 20 individuals across approximately 50 unique participants. The Phase III contractor will:

- Continue MSC story collection across the MSME pipeline, the SDP implementer cohort, and community engagement activities.
- Code stories against the four established change domains and identify and report any emergent domains.
- Maintain gender and youth disaggregation, recognising that Phase II MSC participation was approximately two-thirds women and one-third youth under 35.
- Use MSC findings as evidence for systemic-change indicators that quantitative measurement cannot adequately capture.

4.5 Buyer Confidence Index continuity

The BCI is to be operated as an institutionalised module-level instrument across Phase III with the following parameters:

- Retain the seven-dimension structure (trust in supplier claims; trust in certification bodies; compliance with product requirements; product quality and safety; punctuality and reliability; transparency and compliance; value proposition and communication).

- Retain the 20-question instrument with the five double-weighted critical-factor items, on the 1 to 10 scale.
- Cadence: at least a baseline confirmation (carrying the 2025 value of 81% as the Phase III starting point), a mid-term measurement, and a Phase III endline measurement. Annual measurement is encouraged where feasible.
- Sampling: continue the practice of administering the BCI in person at the African Biotrade Festival, supplemented with targeted online administration to international buyers to retain comparability with the 2023 baseline.
- Reporting: every BCI round must report the score against the prior measurement and against the 2023 baseline, with explicit interpretation of comparability given changes in respondent composition.

4.6 Standardised Association Reporting Template and Phase III Indicator Menu

The contractor will inherit and operationalise the Phase III Indicator Menu prepared by the previous M&E service providers (December 2025), reproduced in full in Annex K. This menu provides a standard list of meso-level, macro-level, output-level, and impact-level indicators from which grant applicants select. The contractor's responsibilities under this section are:

- Adopt the menu in Annex K as the baseline structure for Phase III applicant reporting requirements. The contractor may propose adjustments to indicator definitions, codes, or coverage in the inception report, with explicit reasoning.
- Operationalise the Association Reporting Template so that every grant applicant under Outcome 2 (associations, BSOs, and other meso-level organisations) selects at minimum: 2 meso-level indicators, 1 macro-level indicator, and 3 to 5 output indicators from the menu. Mature organisations applying under closed calls additionally select from the impact indicator section.
- Design and operate a lightweight digital reporting portal (Excel-based or Google Forms based) through which grant applicants submit quarterly or bi-annual returns. The portal must consolidate MSME, association, and BSO data into a single dataset that can feed both the Phase III logframe and Target 13 reporting.
- Provide each indicator with a clear definition, the required deliverable format, and the verification source (report, guideline, test result, certificate) so that reporting is unambiguous.
- Integrate the reporting requirements into the GIZ grant application and contracting templates so that applicants commit to the indicator selection at the proposal stage.

Connection to the FFR. *The standardised Association Reporting Template is the natural extension of the FFR concept to associations that do not (yet) have a Benefit Sharing Agreement-driven legal basis for FFR returns. Associations with established FFRs (Buchu, Honeybush) will continue to use the FFR as their primary statistical return, with the Association Reporting Template providing the project-specific reporting layer on top. Associations without FFRs will use the Association Reporting Template only, with the option to develop an FFR-equivalent over time. The contractor will document this layering in the inception report.*

Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

4.7 OECD/DAC criteria as the reporting structure

All three major evaluative deliverables (baseline, mid-term, close-out) should take into consideration the six OECD/DAC criteria that will be required as part of the project end report being: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Each criterion must receive a rated assessment with justification. The format expected is that of the Phase II Project End Report (10 February 2026).

Note on coherence. *Coherence is a particularly important criterion in Phase III given the partnership architecture with SIPPO, SSAIP, GQSP, the BIA legacy, and the GIZ global biodiversity programme. The contractor should consider these criterea at every evaluative stage, drawing the lesson from Phase II that collaboration between donor-funded projects requires clear communication to prevent confusion (notably illustrated by the GEF 6 Honeybush Small Grant situation).*

4.8 Quo Vadis as a recurring formative-evaluation mechanism

The Quo Vadis approach (annual participatory evaluation with partners taking place during the annual PSC meetings) is carried forward. Quo Vadis is a time-bound check-in to compare project reality with the theory of change, and to identify where adaptations are needed. The contractor will design and facilitate Quo Vadis sessions, integrating MEL evidence, MSC stories, BCI signals, and stakeholder feedback into a single forward-looking conversation.

4.9 Working within the Knowledge Ecology

The contractor will operate within the Knowledge Ecology framework, treating MEL as a reinforcing scaffold within the ecology and not as a separate function. Specifically:

- Stories collected through MSC, SenseMaker, BCI open-ended responses, satisfaction survey responses, and stakeholder interviews will become knowledge artefacts that flow into the Knowledge Ecology and inform the project's adaptive management.
- Indicator data, verification evidence, and trend analysis are scaffolds that support sense-making across stakeholders, not just accountability outputs.
- M&E rhythms (baseline, mid-term, close-out, Quo Vadis) align with KM rhythms (annual PSC meetings, ABF cycles, peer learning events, public-private dialogues, SDP review cycles) to create coherent feedback loops.
- Reporting formats must support both formal accountability and stakeholder learning, recognising that different audiences require different formats (technical reports, summaries, visuals, stories) to be supported by the Marketing and Communications service provider.
- **Meta-level indicators and Discourse.** The meta-level indicators in section 6.2.1 (documented commitments, charter adoption, cross-value-chain participation) deal with the same underlying phenomenon as the Knowledge Ecology concept of Discourse: the way the sector talks about sustainability, competitiveness, value, and future direction, and the narrative coherence that emerges across many dialogues. The contractor will treat meta-level indicator measurement and Discourse-tracking as two perspectives of a single evidence base, drawing on documented commitments, platform usage data, and the narrative analysis of stakeholder events.

4.10 Narrative and Ethnographic Tools

In line with the ABioSA Knowledge Ecology approach, the service provider must apply narrative and ethnographic tools that combine storytelling with statistical and pattern analysis. The aim is to capture lived experience, surface weak signals, and visualise patterns across complex stakeholder ecosystems.

The service provider must be able to:

- Collect lived experiences from a wide range of stakeholders across the four levels of the systemic competitiveness framework.
- Capture stories of change and trajectories, including changes in practice, narrative, agency and relationships.
- Apply self-signified narrative methods that allow respondents themselves to attach meaning to their stories through structured signifiers, supporting distributed sense-making.
- Visualise patterns across the resulting dataset and surface clusters, outliers and weak signals of systemic shift.
- Integrate narrative findings with quantitative indicator data for triangulated analysis.

Reference example of the type of platform-based narrative and signifier approach expected: https://platform.sensemaker-suite.com/r/d/a8760451-d38c-4dc2-8919-ef326b5d7b7e. The service provider may use SenseMaker or an equivalent narrative inquiry platform, provided that the proposed approach demonstrably meets the capabilities listed above. The selected approach must comply with applicable data protection legislation, including the South African Protection of Personal Information Act (POPIA), and must include explicit informed consent procedures.

4.11 Gender and youth inclusion as cross-cutting

All quantitative indicators must be disaggregated by gender (and by youth where appropriate). Phase II results showed strong female participation (68% of stakeholder survey respondents; 40 to 77% of jobs across value chains; approximately two-thirds of MSC participants) and growing youth participation (approximately one-third of MSC participants). The Phase III contractor will maintain or exceed these levels of disaggregation in data collection, analysis, and reporting.

5. ABioSA Phase III Indicator Menu

Source: Review of ABioSA Phase III Logframe Indicators (Based on Phase II Experience), prepared by the previous M&E service providers, 4 December 2025 to form part of the procurement package. The contractor may propose adjustments in the inception report.

Applicants under Phase III grant calls select indicators from this menu as follows:

- At least 2 meso-level indicators.
- At least 1 macro-level indicator.
- 3 to 5 output indicators.
- Meta indicator(s) where applicable.
- Closed-call / mature organisations additionally select from the impact indicators section.

A. Meso-level indicators (select at least two)

Code	Indicator	Short description
MESO-1	Governance mechanisms strengthened	Boards, committees, steering groups established or improved.
MESO-2	Sector strategies / SDPs updated	Updated or refined sector plans, strategies, constitutions.
MESO-3	Coordination meetings held	Meetings among value-chain actors with documentation.
MESO-4	Financial / membership systems improved	New processes for membership, fees, financial governance.
MESO-5	Capacity-building events delivered	Training or knowledge sessions supporting sector needs.
MESO-6	Number of participants trained	Participants disaggregated by gender and youth where possible.
MESO-7	Improved knowledge reported	Post-training feedback showing increased knowledge.
MESO-8	MSMEs and harvesters supported	Compliance, ABS, TK, quality or technical advisory support.
MESO-9	ABS / TK / BSA support sessions	Sessions, clinics or tools supporting regulatory compliance.
MESO-10	Quality / testing services provided	Lab, certification, standards support to sector actors.

Code	Indicator	Short description
MESO-11	Technical guidelines / SOPs adopted	Sector members adopt guidelines developed by the project.
MESO-12	Transboundary initiatives	Cross-border collaborations, missions, or studies.
MESO-13	Cross-country joint activities	Joint workshops, committees, or documents produced.
MESO-14	Collaboration agreements signed	MoUs or cooperation agreements between countries / associations.

B. Macro-level indicators (select at least one)

Code	Indicator	Short description
MACRO-1	Multi-stakeholder dialogues	Dialogues between industry, government, communities, BSOs.
MACRO-2	Policy or regulatory engagement sessions	Meetings or engagements with regulators or policy-making bodies.
MACRO-3	Improved understanding of ABS / TK	Stakeholders report increased understanding (survey-based).
MACRO-4	Improved satisfaction with enabling environment	Perception improvements from surveys or structured feedback.
MACRO-5	Use of ABioSA knowledge products	Knowledge products used or adopted by public institutions or associations.
MACRO-6	Policy influences or contributions	Guidelines or recommendations incorporated into national or regional processes.

C. Output-level indicators (select three to five)

C. Governance and organisation outputs

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-1	Constitution updated or approved	Governance documents revised or adopted.
OUT-2	Financial sustainability plan developed	Documented plan for long-term financial sustainability.

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-3	Secretariat established or strengthened	Administrative or coordination capacity improved.
OUT-4	Governance tools developed	Policies, processes, systems for membership or finance.

C. ABS, TK, and regulatory compliance outputs

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-5	ABS / BSA implementation tools	Templates, guidelines, toolkits developed or piloted.
OUT-6	TK governance materials and tools	Tools aligned with national TK systems or community protocols.
OUT-7	MSMEs and harvesters supported	Compliance support delivered (permit, PIC / MAT, templates).

C. Conservation and sustainable use outputs

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-8	Resource assessments completed	Resource assessments, NDF contributions, or ecological baselines developed.
OUT-9	Sustainable harvesting guidelines	Species-specific or area-specific guidelines completed.
OUT-10	Conservation training delivered	Harvesters and communities trained in sustainable practices.
OUT-11	Biodiversity management plan contributions submitted	BMP drafts or framework submissions to authorities.

C. Quality, testing, and standards outputs

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-12	Laboratory tests completed	Chemical profiles, contaminants, microbiology, stability.
OUT-13	Safety dossiers produced	GRAS, Novel Food, cosmetic safety, toxicology, etc.

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-14	MSMEs prepared for certification	Training, audits, readiness plans (GACP, GMP, HACCP).
OUT-15	Quality / SOP tools developed	QMS manuals, SOPs, checklists.

C. Market access and competitiveness outputs

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-16	Market intelligence products	Market reports, buyer briefs, opportunity analyses.
OUT-17	MSMEs prepared for B2B events	Training, profiles, pitch documents.
OUT-18	Collective marketing tools	Sector profiles, branding assets, promotional materials.

C. Sector data, M&E, and traceability outputs

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-19	Sector data systems created	Dashboards, digital platforms, datasets.
OUT-20	Participation in shared M&E system	Reporting by association or BSO into the ABioSA framework.
OUT-21	Target 13 indicators tracked	Biodiversity and ABS indicators tracked using standard methods.

C. Peer learning and cross-sector collaboration outputs (optional, bonus points)

Code	Indicator	Short description
OUT-22	Peer-learning events	Exchanges, learning circles, cross-sector dialogues.
OUT-23	Technical exchange groups	Multi-species or multi-country thematic groups.
OUT-24	Joint studies and tools	Co-developed tools, cross-sector guidelines, shared analyses.

D. Impact indicators (closed call / mature organisations only)

Code	Indicator	Short description
IMP-1	Increase in sector production or value	Percentage change in raw or processed ingredient production.
IMP-2	Increase in exports	Percentage change in export value or volume.
IMP-3	Increase in compliance	Number or percentage of MSMEs and harvesters reaching compliance.
IMP-4	Jobs supported	Permanent or seasonal jobs supported.

Note for the contractor. *The contractor will provide each indicator above with: a clear definition; the required deliverable format; and the verification source (report, guideline, test result, certificate). The contractor will also propose mandatory verification steps in the inception report, including the standardised templates and supporting documents to be submitted with each quarterly or bi-annual return.*