The Monitoring and Evaluation Manual of the NGOs of the Forum Solint

The Forum Solint was promoted by five Italian NGOs: CISP, COOPI, COSV, Intersos and Movimondo

DRN Srl, Via Ippolito Nievo 62, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: (+39) 06-581.6074, Fax: (39) 06-581.6390
mail@drn-network.com - www.drn-network.com
The Monitoring and Evaluation Manual of the NGOs of the Forum Solint

January 2003

DRN – Development Researchers’ Network
Prepared by: Paola Gosparini Luca Russo Matteo Sirtori Camilla Valmarana

NGOs’ Support Group
CISP – Paolo Dieci and Luigi Grando
COSV – Emanuele Pinardi
COOPI – Piera Turati
Intersos – Loretta Peschi
Movimondo – Vincenzo Pira
The Forum Solint

The Forum Solint was promoted by five Italian NGOs (CISP, COOPI, COSV, Intersos and Movimondo). It is intended to be an area for dialogue for those working to give new credibility and consistency to the solidarity of the development cooperation, apart from any political rationale. To pursue this goal, the Forum promotes places of reflection and discussion on themes such as; the link between cooperation and foreign policy, the role of development aid in Italy and in Europe, the process of reform in Italian Cooperation, and the reorganization of development aid at the European level.

The NGOs adhering to the Forum Solint provide a central function in the development of an effective partnership with actors of the countries in which they operate, and contribute to the effectiveness of the programmes implemented. In this context, they aim to assess the policies, strategies, and intervention methods used in order to make them more responsive to the specific needs of the populations involved.

The political, economic, and institutional contexts of the development cooperation are continuously and rapidly evolving. In the “cooperation system”, new high-institutional subjects have appeared and international solidarity activity has moved towards a broader and more differentiated realm of associations and groups. A debate has long been underway on the future order of the European Commission and of its multilateral institutions and agencies. Changes of the utmost importance for the future of development aid are taking place.

These processes require concentrated efforts of coordination and communication among the different parties involved. Forum Solint aims to facilitate these efforts, as well as helping to develop and improve the analysis and proposal procedures of the Italian non-governmental cooperation.

The Forum Solint concentrates on themes related to the increase of visibility and self-financing capacity of the NGOs, as well as the identification of common rules to be shared in the relationship among the NGOs.

In addition, the Forum focuses on asserting the political and humanitarian importance of the huge crisis underway in the South of the world, upon which the destiny of millions of people depends.

The NGOs that have promoted the Forum Solint represent a relevant part of the human, financial, and planning resources mobilized by the Italian non-governmental cooperation. For this reason, they believe that they cannot avoid the responsibility of contributing to the evaluation and definition of new elements of cooperation and international solidarity.
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0 FOREWORD

In recent years, the donors’ community and NGOs have become increasingly concerned with the issue of clarifying and (re)defining the aims, objectives and methodologies applied to development assistance.

Despite the multitude of points of view, this reflection is guided by some common principles and goals, above all the need to place development aid within a broader strategic framework aimed towards the overarching objective of poverty reduction.

The NGOs that have promoted the Forum Solint (CISP, COOPI, COSV, Intersos and Movimondo) have decided to accept the global challenge of poverty reduction by including specific projects and interventions – of both humanitarian and developmental nature – under this broader strategic framework, in the belief that no single development cooperation intervention can influence, alone, the determinants associated with poverty.

Given these premises, the issue of ‘value added’ associated to the different development cooperation actors – and to their actions - becomes of paramount importance. In this case ‘value added’ should be viewed as the specific contribution – in both quantitative and qualitative terms - provided by these different actors in the design and implementation of holistic development strategies.

The NGOs that have promoted the Forum Solint have always attached great importance to the issues related to monitoring and evaluation, and therefore to the challenge of assessing their projects and more specifically of understanding the way in which they make a difference in people’s life.

The willingness to adopt a monitoring and evaluation Manual represents a further step in this direction, as it will not only lead to the adoption of standardised internal procedures but also to an improved external visibility of the specific contribution that non-governmental actors bring to the common goal of poverty reduction.

Monitoring and evaluation have been identified as one of the main axes of the NGOs linked to the Forum Solint for two main reasons.

First of all, the adoption of a common framework of analysis of the results and impact linked to a given project and of its capacity to respond to the problems of a specific area or sector will lead to an improved understanding of the technical, economic and organisational principles and means which characterise the work of non-governmental organisations. Secondly, the standardisation and structuring of a monitoring and evaluation system, shared by a group of NGOs currently active in more that fifty developing countries, will reinforce the organisations’ capacity to learn from experience by sharing lessons learnt.

The Manual therefore represents a formal tool that will reinforce the identity of the NGOs belonging to the Forum Solint, and will further increase their on-going efforts aimed at maximising their efficiency and effectiveness. On these grounds, its elaboration has been preceded and accompanied by a strong consulting and analysis work oriented to the enhancement and the standardisation of the evaluation practices already applied by the mentioned NGOs.

The Manual has been prepared with the valuable technical assistance of DRN - Development Researchers' Network, a consulting firm that provides its services to national
Audience

This manual has been designed primarily for NGOs staff; its main intended users include:

- Project staff, who is directly responsible for the day-to-day management of projects and should be fully involved in the development and utilisation of M&E practices.
- NGOs national and regional coordinators, who ensure the liaison between the headquarters and the activities in the field, participate in the monitoring of on-going projects and in the identification of new interventions in their geographical area, and are responsible for the relationship between NGOs and local partners and donors’ delegations.
- Desk officers and NGO managers at the headquarters, who are responsible for the planning, monitoring and evaluation of the activities in particular geographic areas, as well as for the coherence of the projects with NGOs overall strategies.

NGOs may also want to share this handbook with local and international partners who might be interested in developing and applying M&E techniques and practices to their activities. Thus, it might also become a useful tool to enhance partnership on the basis of a better and common understanding on how M&E work and how they fit into NGOs programming and implementation activities.

Organisation of the manual

This manual describes the M&E methods and approaches used by the major aid organisations, and provides NGOs with operational instruments to strengthen their M&E capacities. It is divided into six chapters.

Chapters one and two present an overview of M&E approaches and criteria and include:

- A brief description of the evolution of M&E methods and practices, and the rationale for M&E
- A comparison of the main M&E approaches used by the donor community
- A discussion on the relationship between NGOs and M&E, with particular attention to the most relevant M&E approaches for NGOs activities
- A list of definitions of principal concepts and tools related to M&E
- A description of the evaluation criteria and the different types of evaluations that might be undertaken by NGOs

Chapters three to five present M&E tools suitable for NGOs. These chapters form a stand-alone package focused on the practical aspects of planning and carrying out M&E activities, including:

- Programming M&E during the project design phase
- Procedures for monitoring
- Management and carrying out of evaluations

Chapter six focuses on the use of lessons learnt from M&E:

- Follow-up and implementation of M&E findings and recommendations
- Dissemination of lessons learnt
- Utilisation of lessons learnt for programming of new interventions

The manual is completed by annexes, including:

- Glossary of M&E terms
- Examples of Logical Framework Matrix
- List of indicators
- Summary of data collection techniques
1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the evolution of M&E approaches within the donor community and examines the NGOs approaches to M&E.

1.1 Evolution of M&E

Over the last decades, evaluation has evolved from a one-dimension exercise, carried out by a single evaluator, generally a specialist of the technical field being evaluated, to a multi-dimensional exercise, realised by a wide range of evaluators, analysing multiple levels of the project(s) and addressing a diverse audience.

Many M&E ideas and methods were developed in response to the need to understand how money was being spent on social and education programmes in the West, in order to justify expenditures to donors.

Concepts of M&E related to development began to be used in response to requirements of large-scale bilateral agencies to better manage and control their projects. In the 1960s and 1970s development was seen as something tangible and measurable and this led to the predominance of economics and cost-benefit analysis. M&E were mainly means of control relying on the measurement of quantitative data with only minimal allowance for qualitative aspects.

These methods, which claimed to be scientifically neutral and unbiased, were characterised by the utilisation of standardised procedures and a high degree of managerial control; external evaluators were contracted in the belief that this would increase objectivity.

A second generation of M&E methods focused more on the achievement of objectives and the analysis of projects’ strengths and weaknesses.

During the 1990s, the evolution of M&E approaches and practices reflected the considerable changes in development co-operation strategies, instruments of intervention and management.

New issues such as democratisation, institutional strengthening, environment and gender gained importance, while the reduction of poverty became the priority and the common ultimate objective of most aid organisations. In order to achieve these objectives, there has been a tendency to shift from forms of assistance that focused on the implementation of single projects towards more complex interventions at programme, sector and country level. In order to face these new challenges, a re-assessment of M&E and their potential use was considered to be indispensable.

The importance of interventions’ results and impacts on beneficiaries was emphasised and major aid organisations began to look for ways to improve the performance of their overall strategies and policies. The acknowledged need to improve the performance called for the establishment of effective M&E systems, both to support the implementation of projects and programmes and to provide useful feedback for the design of new initiatives, and to support learning from experience.

1.2 Reasons for M&E

M&E should be carried out with the aim of reducing the gap between plans (projects’ designs) and realities (implementation and results).
blems in order to facilitate the adoption of corrective measures during project implementation.

Evaluations are carried out for three main reasons:

1. **Learning**: evaluations allow NGOs and stakeholders to learn from experience, improve future interventions and support institutional learning. For this purpose, procedures have to be set in place to ensure that the lessons derived from completed projects contribute to shape future policy and project planning.

2. **Empowerment**, by enhancing the capacities of local partners, project staff and project beneficiaries to use evaluations as an instrument of learning and control.

3. **Accountability**: evaluations allow NGOs to account to funding agencies on the use of funds.

### Purposes of M&E

- Ensuring that planned results are achieved
- Supporting and improving management
- Generating shared understanding
- Generating new knowledge and support learning
- Building the capacities of those involved
- Motivating stakeholders
- Ensuring accountability
- Fostering public and political support

### 1.3 M&E and the NGOs

In the last decades, the total amount of public aid being channelled through NGOs has grown considerably both in absolute terms and with respect to funds managed by bilateral and multilateral agencies. This has increased the donors’ community’s concern with the analysis of NGOs’ achievements, associated with a growing scepticism of tax-payers and donating public about the results of development aid.

One of the most comprehensive studies on NGOs impact and impact evaluation methods to date [OECD/DAC Expert Group on Evaluation, “Searching for Impact and Methods: NGO Evaluation Synthesis Study”, 1997] reports that “...a first conclusion – confirmed by data and interviews in all the different case studies and countries – is that in spite of growing interest in evaluation, there is still a lack of reliable evidence on the impact of NGO development projects and programmes” [Ex. Summary, page i].

On the other hand “understanding what they are doing and the impact of their action” have always been an overarching concern of most NGOs, who have often demonstrated a high level of attention with regards to the use of project resources. Nevertheless, M&E activities carried out by NGOs often rely on non-standardised approaches, methods and reporting formats. Moreover, these activities have often been viewed as an internal process.

### Means to strengthen M&E capacities

- Creation of new roles within the NGOs with specific mandates for M&E
- Support for the strengthening of NGOs’ operators capacities (training)
- Allocation of funds for external evaluations
- Promotion of regional and local networks
- Collaboration with academic institutions for exploring new methods and models of M&E
The challenge for NGOs is therefore, on the one hand, to be able to communicate and share their results with other stakeholders by using the same language and, on the other hand, to systematise, streamline and institutionalise M&E practices within their own organisations.

1.3.1 NGOs common features

A review of the literature on NGOs’ evaluations highlights some common features and distinctive characteristics:

1. There is an almost universal concern with participatory methods: beneficiaries’ and major stakeholders’ views should be incorporated into the evaluation process (an overview of participatory approaches is provided in the next paragraph).

2. Projects are increasingly implemented in partnership between Southern and Northern NGOs. Indeed this is most probably a key feature of the approach to development adopted by the Forum Solint, whereby interventions are essentially based on the selection of strong local partners who play an important role in project implementation. However, despite the increasing role of local partners, Northern NGOs still bear the onus of strong accountability towards donors.

3. Major emphasis is placed on evaluation (and monitoring) as a learning tool, thus the feedback of M&E findings and the use of results are seen as an important means to improve future performance of all implementing partners.

4. There is a growing interest towards longer term and more complex interventions, e.g. in capacity building and institutional strengthening issues, thus leading to a growing interest in evaluation methods other than project evaluations.

1.3.2 M&E as a learning tool

Donors have long been perceived to be slow learners from their mistakes, and accountability has long been a core concern for the M&E units of the main aid organisations. Concepts of knowledge management and learning organisations - borrowed from the commercial sector - started to be used since the late 1990s.

The great majority of development agencies currently views organisational learning as the area that offers the greatest opportunities and challenges.

The notion of “organisational learning” refers to the process through which organisations obtain and use knowledge to adapt old policies, programmes and strategies, or more generally, to innovate. The World Bank, one of the leading organisations in the application of knowledge management concepts to development, identifies three types of learning: learning from ‘doing’, learning from research and learning from evaluation.

Organisational learning is thus concerned with two linked issues:

a) Whether individual knowledge and insights are shared within organisations and
b) Whether information is used to develop and adapt organisational knowledge.
It is useful to see how these concepts can be applied to M&E, especially for NGOs, which tend to place major emphasis on M&E as learning tools. The question is how can NGOs reap the benefits of M&E from the point of view of institutional learning, and how can NGOs and aid agencies become more effective learning organisations.

The usefulness of M&E for learning purposes can be improved by:

- **Empowering donors/NGOs’ as learning organisations:**
  a) Management of M&E as well as M&E feedback practices should receive greater attention.
  b) Internal and external networking and information flows, as well as agencies’ coordination in the field of M&E should be improved.
  c) New M&E tools, especially related to internet-based communication tools, should be experimented.

- **Strengthening M&E capacities:**
  a) Local partners’ M&E capacities should be developed, by involving them in M&E and lesson learning processes starting from the design phase.
  b) Lessons learnt from M&E experiences should be used to design new interventions and to improve on-going activities.
  c) Findings and recommendations of M&E should be disseminated to a wider audience, including relevant stakeholders.

### 1.3.3 M&E and capacity building

In this framework, the challenges that NGOs will face in the future can be summarised as follows:

- **Reduction of the existing (considerable) gap between the theoretical interest in M&E and the practical use of M&E tools, through the systematic promotion and utilisation of participatory techniques and the promotion of a genuine ‘evaluation culture’.
- **Incorporation of evaluation work into a broader framework, looking at evaluation within a wider continuum that embraces appraisal and monitoring and eventually the overall strategic planning, and using lessons learnt for future planning.
- **Strengthening of planning capacities, in particular the identification of appropriate indicators to assess the different dimensions of impact and the analysis of qualitative data.
- **Research on new methods and experimentation with developing tools of M&E, as well as strengthening of own internal capacities to carry out M&E activities.
- **The transfer of know-how on M&E to local partners.

### 1.4 Main donors’ community’s approaches to M&E

Broadly, there are three main approaches to M&E in use by the major aid organisations:

1. The Logical Framework Approach (LFA), which is the most widely used.
2. The German ZOPP, a close derivative of LFA (from the German Zielorientierte Projektplanung, then translated into English “Objective Oriented Project Planning”).
3. The Result Based Management, which, in recent years, has become the favoured model of the Canadian and American agencies.

However, despite the existence of a number of differences between the approaches, the underlying principles of M&E currently in use are similar and can be summarised as follows:

- **The development of programmes and projects based on a thorough understanding of the situation in which an intervention is planned.**
The efforts to make explicit the cause and effect (means-ends) relationships and external factors that underpin the programme or project.

The establishment of M&E systems, including indicators, which will show if the objectives have been achieved and provide information to support effective management and learning.

**1.4.1 Logical Framework Approach**

The LFA, created in 1969 for the US Agency for International Development, was conceived as a technique to improve the systematic planning of development projects. Over time, it has evolved from a simple framework to structure projects’ objectives to a more sophisticated, process oriented approach to involve stakeholders in project design, implementation and evaluation.

In the last years many bilateral and multilateral donors, including the EC, have adopted the LFA as their main tool for project/programme planning and management.

The LFA aims at presenting the programmes/projects’ objectives in a logic and systematic way. It reflects the casual relationships between the different levels of objectives (in practice a hierarchy of objectives), indicating how to check whether these objectives have been achieved and establishing the assumptions, which are beyond the control of the project that may influence its success.

This approach is normally developed through the following steps:

a) Systematic analysis of the situation in which the intervention is planned.
b) Clear identification of the problem(s) to be addressed and their cause and effects relationship (usually done through the instrument of the problem tree).
c) Consideration of intervention alternatives and development of a logical hierarchy of activities and objectives that will allow to overcome the problem(s).
d) Identification of the assumptions that underlie the logic of the objectives hierarchy and the external risks that may lead to these assumptions not being realised.
e) Establishment of the indicators that will be used to verify if the objectives have been achieved.
f) Indication of the means by which the information for the indicators will be collected and analysed.

The result of this process is summarised in a matrix, the “LogFrame”, which shows the overall logic of the programme/project and its main aspects. Thus, the LF has the advantage of presenting the essential elements of complex projects clearly and succinctly. The M&E practices of specific interventions are included in the LF where the levels, people, processes, documents and information used to monitor and evaluate the project are defined.
### LogFrame Matrix structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong>: The broader development impact to which the project contributes - at a national and sectoral level.</td>
<td>Measures of the extent to which a contribution to the goal has been made. Used during evaluation.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong>: The development outcome expected at the end of the project. All components will contribute to this</td>
<td>Conditions at the end of the project indicating that the purpose has been achieved. Used for project completion and evaluation.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the purpose/goal linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Objectives</strong>: The expected outcome of producing each component’s outputs.</td>
<td>Measures of the extent to which component objectives have been achieved. Used for project completion and evaluation.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the component objective/purpose linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong>: The direct measurable results (goods and services) of the project which are largely under the project management’s control</td>
<td>Measures of the quantity and quality of outputs and the timing of their delivery. Used during monitoring and review.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the output/component objective linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong>: The tasks carried out to implement the project and deliver the identified outputs.</td>
<td>Implementation/work programme targets. Used during monitoring.</td>
<td>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report it.</td>
<td>Assumptions concerning the activity/output linkage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first column of the LFA can be read as an **objective hierarchy**, i.e. the backbone of the project strategy. The hierarchy illustrates how lower level activities contribute to the attainment of higher-level results and how these contribute to the attainment of project purpose and goals. Different development agencies/organisations (see § 2.2) use many differing names for the 4 or more different levels. Yet *all levels can be considered as objectives since they always represent something that project participants want to achieve*.

One way to understand the logical sequence underlying the hierarchy described above is to look at the level of project’s control over factors in the project environment that may influence the achievement of objectives. In other words, the control over activities by project implementers is very high but it decreases together with an increase of the influence of external factors as we gradually move to higher levels.

The LF is thus a tool for improving project planning and implementation although, however good it may be, it does not alone guarantee successful results. If used too rigidly, it risks to lead people towards a formal ‘blueprint’ exercise, while already during the planning stage it is necessary to deal with a number of factors that are likely to influence the success of the project, such as the ability of the planning team, the process of consultation with the stakeholders and the consideration of the lessons learnt from previous experiences.

---

Other approaches: ZOPP and RBM

ZOPP Approach
ZOPP is a project planning and management method that encourages participatory planning and analysis throughout the project cycle with a series of stakeholder workshops aimed at setting priorities and planning for implementation and monitoring. The purpose of ZOPP is to undertake participatory, objectives-oriented planning that spans the life of the project work to build stakeholder team commitment and capacity through workshop sessions.

This process relies heavily on two techniques – stakeholders’ workshops and matrix building – that encourage participation. The main output of a ZOPP session is the Project Planning Matrix (PPM), similar to a LogFrame, which provides an analysis of project objectives, outputs and activities. The development of the PPM is the result of a process characterised by various phases, each of which requires a workshop that focuses on a fixed goal.

Although there is no set formula for a successful stakeholder workshop, some important issues for the development of the PPM can be mentioned:

- Participation analysis: identification of stakeholders’ identities, interests, expectations and concerns;
- Problems analysis: similar to the LF – often visualised as a problem tree, through which key problem(s) to be addressed are identified, grouped and prioritised, making clear their causes and effects relationship;
- Objectives analysis: in a corresponding objectives tree, the desired solutions are articulated, clustered and prioritised;
- Alternatives: analysis of the range of available means to meet the objectives;
- Assumptions: examination of conditions necessary for successful transformation of problems into secured objectives.

The PPM shows activities and results as well as the conditions that are necessary to achieve them. These conditions are important assumptions on the basis of which decisions about activities, location, timing (and others) are taken. The information is organised along axes that show (a) why the project is being undertaken and (b) what are the project outputs that signal success.

Result Based Management Approach
Over recent years the Canadian and American development agencies (respectively CIDA and USAID) have moved away from the explicit use of the LFA and have begun to use the so-called result-based approaches. The two agencies use different definitions (Result Based Management for CIDA and Result Oriented Assistance for USAID), although their approaches can be associated for the purposes of this Manual. The adoption of these approaches follows the recognition that, if planned results are to be achieved, more attention has to be given to the management of programmes and projects.

Besides the need to provide a more effective and flexible tool for implementation, the Result Based Management (RBM) approach also represents an attempt to link more explicitly development projects to an overall donor development strategy at country or region level.

CIDA defines Result Based Management (RBM) as:
"A management approach that centres on the establishment of a process and environment where individuals work together to accomplish expected results. The RBM process allows project managers to allocate or reallocate scarce project resources based on performance information that incorporates lessons learnt into project management”.

The main elements of RBM are:

- A result oriented programme/project description, through the definition of realistic expectations for results, the clear identification of beneficiaries and the design of plans to meet their needs. In the case of RBM, outputs, purposes and goals are considered as a hierarchy of results (see also § 2.2) to which the implementing agency/project can contribute. In such a context the Project goal often coincides with the organisation’s country strategy specific goal rather than more general development goals and is therefore more within the control of the specific project;
- A performance measurement system through the monitoring of progress towards results using appropriate indicators;
- The added value of independent internal audit and evaluation functions;
- Responsibility for performance and transparency in reporting on results achieved and resources consumed.

While RBM and LFA emphasise different aspects, the underlying principles are quite similar. They are both aimed at ensuring logical project design, achieving results and identifying mechanisms for monitoring programmes/projects in order to demonstrate what has been achieved.

The main difference between RBM (and the American Results Oriented Assistance) and LFA/ZOPP is that the first places great emphasis on management, M&E and the design phase, in the attempt to enable programme/project managers to cope with changes, while the second tends to focus more on planning and design.

In essence, there is no particular conflict between the LFA and RBM approach, and they can be used as comple-
**Summary points**

- Effective M&E systems are needed to improve performance and increase learning opportunities.
- Public aid channelled through NGOs has grown considerably in the last years: NGOs therefore need to increase their capacity to share the results and lessons learnt from their projects with other actors.
- NGOs are increasing their investments in M&E, focusing on participatory methods and learning opportunities.
2. PRINCIPLES OF M&E

The aim of this chapter is to help NGOs develop an understanding of some of the key M&E issues and principles by looking at different types of evaluation.

2.1 Definitions

There is no universal agreement on what the terms monitoring and evaluation should cover and which should be the demarcation between them. A useful distinction can be made between activities that are essential to support project implementation (monitoring) and activities that serve a broader and more reflective purpose (evaluation).

**MONITOR** the conversion of Inputs (activities) into Outputs (results)

**EVALUATE** the conversion of Outputs (results) into Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARE WE DOING THE PROJECT RIGHT?</th>
<th>ARE WE DOING THE RIGHT PROJECT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Monitoring

Monitoring refers to the continuous assessment of project implementation and first impact through the process of data collection and analysis, reporting and use of information.

The DAC defines monitoring as "a management function which uses methodological collection of data to determine whether the material and financial resources are sufficient, whether the people in charge have the necessary technical and personal qualification, whether activities conform to work-plans, and whether the work-plan has been achieved and has produced the original objectives".

Monitoring is therefore primarily a management responsibility and should continue throughout the life of a project; monitoring practices should provide mechanisms through which relevant information is provided to the right people at the right time to help them to make the right decision. In particular, feedback on implementation should help managers and other stakeholders in identifying actual or potential successes and problems as early as possible in order to facilitate timely adjustments to project activities.

Monitoring should focus on:
- Physical progress (service delivery, implementation of foreseen activities)
- Process (management and eventually local capacity building)
- Preliminary response of target groups/communities to project activities
- Unexpected events and projects’ responses
- Financial matters (budget, expenditures)

The ways in which the projects’ field staff and NGOs’ managers may carry out monitoring are extremely varied: different circumstances, people and skills will require different approaches and methods. Further discussion on monitoring issues is provided in chapter 4.

2. Evaluation

An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, of its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and the fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (DAC, 1992).
Monitoring and review systems are very important for evaluation purposes, as evaluations significantly depend on the information regularly collected and reported through monitoring and review activities.

Evaluation is both a management and a learning tool: (a) it offers opportunities for organisations to be reflective about the quality of their work and the appropriateness of their strategies, and supports learning for decision-making, resource allocation and accountability; (b) it provides the opportunity to draw lessons from the experience gained and therefore guide future planning action.

The role of evaluation vis-à-vis monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project selection</td>
<td>All projects should be monitored</td>
<td>Selective basis for projects of interest or concern to management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Continuously, all along the project duration</td>
<td>In specific moments of the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Carried out by project staff and NGO management staff</td>
<td>Carried out by external (to the project or to the NGO) evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Focus on project’s progresses and first results</td>
<td>Focus on results and longer-term impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Emphasis on quantitative indicators</td>
<td>Relies more on qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Straightforward presentation following standard and comparable formats</td>
<td>Less standardised presentation focusing on fewer performance issues analysed in greater depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Normally limited to internal staff and direct users</td>
<td>Wider diffusion, including public opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Other assessment tools

- **Appraisal**

  Appraisal is the critical examination of a proposal, on the basis of agreed selection criteria, that takes place before the approval for funding of the proposed action.

  The DAC identifies three possible standpoints for guiding the selection of proposed interventions: (i) relevance; (ii) technical, financial and institutional feasibility; (iii) socio-economic profitability. The EC uses the same criteria although the third criterion is more focused on sustainability.

- **Review**

  The main purpose of reviews is to share information and perspectives on project progress, to identify management actions that may be required to keep the project on track and to overcome constraints, and to agree on who should take the required action, when and how. Reviews’ findings should feed back into planning to help keep operational plans updated and relevant. Reviews thus provide project implementers with the opportunity to further analyse the information collected through monitoring and take appropriate management actions to support implementation.
purpose, who is expected to attend and contribute, the reporting and review requirements of donors, the scope and duration of a project.

Reviews involve the examination not only of implementation, but also of basic concepts and strategies. DAC defines the concept of “Management review” as “a term used to describe an element of manager’s job which may involve a wide range of monitoring and problem-solving activities designed to ensure that operations are functioning satisfactorily”.

- **Audit**
Audit is the process of determining whether, and to what extent, the measures, processes, directives and organisational procedures of the aid organisations conform to norms and criteria set out in advance. The audit function is therefore more limited in scope than an evaluation, in that it only examines compliance with the legal and contractual obligations.

### 2.2 Making your way through definitions and terminology

A correct application of the LFM for M&E starts with the establishment of a common understanding of key terminology. A brief set of definitions is given below:

- **Overall Objective:** The longer term, high level improved situation, at sector or national level, that a programme or project is contributing towards. The overall objective helps explain why a programme or project is being undertaken. Generally the overall objective can only be achieved through the combined efforts of multiple actors, i.e. a programme or project cannot be solely responsible for the overall objective being realised. Example - *To improve living conditions in the region XY.*

- **Purposes:** What the project or programme is expected to achieve within the timeframe and the resources available. A project or programme may have more than one purpose. Example – *provision of health services in community XY has increased, and their quality improved by the end of the project.*

- **Result:** The direct service or product that must be delivered for the realisation of outcomes. They are tangible and they result from the undertaking of a series of activities. Each purpose must have at least one result. Example - *Health personnel trained to provide support to communities. Network of feeder road increased and maintained.*

- **Activities:** Specific tasks that need to be undertaken for a result to be produced or a purpose/objective to be achieved. Example - *Training workshop for Health Centre personnel.*

- **Inputs:** Resources, i.e. personnel, equipment, material required in order to do the work. Example - *10 m/m of project manager; textbooks; equipment and material to build new Health Centre; provision for travelling.*

- **Assumptions/Risks:** Refer to conditions which could affect the progress or the success of a project and on which the project manager does not have direct control. A *killing assumption* is a condition, which is not under the project’s control and makes the project unfeasible. *Pre-conditions* are those assumptions that need to be realised prior to the project implementation to guarantee its success. Example – *funds are available to hire new Health Centre personnel in the health sector.*
**Indicators:** Represent a qualitative and/or quantitative statement about the situation that will exist when an objective is reached. They should be specified in terms of quantity, quality and time (QQT). Indicators do not cause a result, but only measure it. Example – *infant mortality rate decreased from X% to Y% in the villages A, B and C by the end of the project.*

**Quantitative**

Are indicators that can be measured in an objective way, can be object of statistical treatment and can be compared. They give the breadth of a result. Example – *Number of kilometres constructed per year.* There are also quantitative indicators of quality, Example - *Teacher per pupil ratio,* and quantitative indicators of qualitative information, example - *number of women participating in leading position in village committees.*

**Qualitative**

Are mostly used to understand a process, a change and are therefore suitable in relation to participatory or capacity development projects. They give the depth of a result. They are defined as descriptive statements and require specific skills and time-consuming methods for information collection. Example – *capacity to develop quality project proposals following the participation in PCM.*

Though definitions remain broadly unchanged among donors, the terminology used may differ and thus lead to possible confusion. The Manual has opted for the adoption of the terminology used by the EC because of the importance of this donor for Forum Solint NGOs, as well as the simplicity, adaptability and straightforwardness of the approach. The following table compares the terminology used by main donor agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Overall Objective</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDF</td>
<td>Development Objective</td>
<td>Immediate Objective</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Country Assistance Strategy-related Goal</td>
<td>Project Development Objective</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Immediate Objective</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINNIDA</td>
<td>Overall Objective</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Overall Goal</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Development Objective</td>
<td>Project Objective</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Evaluation criteria

Most of the basic evaluations criteria and concepts are universally accepted and used by all the organisations within the donors’ community. They are based on the OECD/DAC criteria for evaluation, and address five major sets of issues:

1. Relevance
2. Efficiency
3. Effectiveness
4. Impact
5. Sustainability

Each of these criteria is linked to key elements of the Logical Framework, as explained in the following chart and paragraphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>LINKS</th>
<th>LOGFRAME LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact: contribution to the long-term change &amp; Sustainability: durability of the change</td>
<td>OVERALL OBJECTIVES (overall lasting change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: from results to purpose: to what extent service and products were used to eliminate the problem(s)</td>
<td>PURPOSE (benefits actually received)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency: from inputs through activities to results</td>
<td>RESULTS (confirmed planned deliverables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: to the identified problems or real needs to be addressed</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES (process of converting inputs into results)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INPUTS (material, personnel and financial resources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from EC, AidCo Evaluation Unit H6; Evaluation in the EC, Brussels, 21 March, 2001

2.3.1 Relevance

The relevance of a project relates to its design and concerns the extent to which the original design:

- Continues to reflect the beneficiaries’ needs and addresses the identified problems.
- Reflects development priorities and policies of local partners.
- Contributes to the NGOs’ development priorities.

Relevance needs to be assessed throughout the life of the project, and focuses on the appropriateness of the project design to the problems to be solved at two points in time:
1. The consistency of the design with the local situation and coherence with other interventions:
   - Identification and selection of target groups/beneficiaries
   - Identification of target groups/beneficiaries’ needs and priorities
   - Participation of local stakeholders in the design phase
   - Assessment of local absorption and local implementation capacities
   - Coherence with other development initiatives in the same country/region and/or sector

2. The overall logic of the project design:
   - Quality of the LF, including the assumptions and risks identified
   - Realism in the selection of objectives and services to be provided
   - Overall degree of flexibility

2.3.2 Efficiency

Efficiency refers to the extent to which:
- Services were provided and managed.
- Foreseen activities were carried out in the most appropriate manner giving the available resources and time.
- The above was done at the least cost to produce the expected results.

Thus, efficiency addresses the question related to whether similar results could have been achieved in a better way by other means at lower costs and in the same time, or at the same cost but in less time.

The analysis of efficiency focuses on:
1. The quality of the project management:
   - Management of the budget
   - Timely provision of services
   - Relationship with stakeholders, beneficiaries and other local institutions/authorities
   - Quality of monitoring procedures and practices, including the use of indicators of efficiency

2. The use of the most cost-effective alternatives to achieve the results in comparison to similar projects or approaches.

3. The unplanned results eventually arising from project’s activities.

2.3.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness refers to the extent to which:
- The project produced the expected results;
- The results achieved lead to the project purpose.

The effectiveness measures whether the planned purposes/outcomes have been achieved and whether the planned benefits have been reaped by the intended beneficiaries. In particular, it focuses on:
1. The factors influencing the achievement of the purpose, including unforeseen external factors.

2. The management capacity to ensure that the results achieved allow the reach the
4. The unplanned results that are likely to affect benefits.

5. The potential effects of results obtained on crosscutting issues such as gender, environment and poverty reduction.

### 2.3.4 Impact

Impact refers to the effects of the project on target beneficiaries as well as to its wider overall effect on larger numbers of people, within the sector or in a geographic area, in terms of technical, economic, socio-cultural and institutional factors. It relates to the relationship between the project’s purpose and overall objectives, taking into account the fact that at this level the project is normally one of the variables contributing to the wider outcome.

The focus of impact is normally on:

1. The extent to which the overall objectives were achieved and the contribution of the project to their achievement.

2. The external factors that influenced the overall impact and the capacity of the project to respond to these factors.

3. The possible unplanned impacts of the project and their effects on the overall impact.

4. The possible longer-term effects of the project.

5. The impacts of the project on gender-related, environment and poverty issues.

*Remember that some donors speak of impact starting from purpose level*

### 2.3.5 Sustainability

Sustainability is often the most important criteria of evaluation and refers to the extent to which:

- The positive impacts of the project at the purpose level are likely to continue after the project assistance is over.
- The target groups/beneficiaries want - and can - take over the project activities and thus continue to accomplish the project objectives.

This criterion is very large and the relative importance of the different issues will depend on the nature of the project and its relation with the local context. Analysis of sustainability can focus on:

1. Stakeholders’ ownership of objectives (participation in their definition during the design phase) and achievements (participation throughout the duration of the project).

2. Institutional sustainability: the extent to which the project is embedded in and respects the local organisations/institutional structures, the capacity of these structures to take over after the project end and the adequacy of the project’s budget for this purpose.

3. Financial sustainability: whether the services provided to the beneficiaries are likely to continue after the funding ends; whether enough funds were available to cover all costs and whether the costs are likely to continue after the funding ends.

4. Socio-cultural sustainability: whether the project takes into account the local perception of needs and respects the local status’ systems and beliefs; whether the changes brought about are likely to be sustained.
5. Technical sustainability: whether the technology and knowledge provided fit in with existing traditions, skills and knowledge; whether the beneficiaries are likely to be able to maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.

6. Possibility of replicating successful impacts for a possible extension of the project or of other similar interventions.

### 2.4 Types of evaluation

There are several ways of categorising evaluations.

A first distinction can be made between **summative** and **formative** evaluations. Summative evaluations are carried out when the project is over, and aim to assess effectiveness and impact. Formative evaluations, on the other hand, are usually undertaken earlier to gain an understanding of what is being achieved in order to introduce improvements.

A second distinction can be made between **quantitative** and **qualitative** evaluations. Quantitative evaluations focus on measurable inputs provided and changes that result from the direct implementation of projects’ activities. Qualitative evaluations are more process oriented and focus on the assessment of changes of uncountable factors such as attitudes, behaviour, skills, level of knowledge.

Other distinctions between types of evaluation include the following:

**By agent:**

a) **Self-evaluation**: an evaluation conducted by people that are directly involved in the implementation of the project in the field.

b) **Internal evaluation**: an evaluation conducted by people who form part of the staff of the organisation that provided the aid but are external to the project.

c) **External evaluation**: an evaluation conducted by those who are external to the aid organisation and the project.

**By timing/stage in the project cycle:**

a) **Mid-term evaluation** (sometimes referred to as “on-going”): an evaluation carried out during the project implementation with the purpose of assessing performance to date, and provide recommendations for adjustments during the continuing implementation.

b) **End-of-project evaluation**: an evaluation carried out at project completion. If the project is part of a multi-phase initiative, the evaluation provides information for consideration in the implementation of the subsequent phases.

c) **Ex-post evaluation**: an evaluation carried out after (usually two/three years) project completion with the purpose of assessing the longer-term impacts and draw conclusions for similar interventions in the future.

**By scope:**

a) **Project evaluation**: evaluation of a single project.

b) **Programme evaluation**: evaluation of a programme composed by a number of projects.

c) **Country evaluation**: evaluation of development aid strategies and interventions in a particular country.

d) **Sectoral evaluation**: cluster evaluation of projects or programmes in a sector or sub-sector as well as of general support of aid organisations to a sector.
Evaluations focusing on specific issues and processes:

a) Policy evaluation: evaluation of programmes and projects dealing with particular issues at sectoral or thematic level.

b) Institutional evaluation: evaluation of multilateral aid organisations or international, national and local NGOs.

c) Process evaluation: evaluation of programmes and projects to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a particular process or modality adopted.

Summary points

- Monitoring is primarily a management function and aims at supporting project implementation; evaluation, on the other hand, focuses primarily on learning and accountability.
- An accurate evaluation significantly depends on the regular collection and reporting of information through monitoring activities.
- A common understanding on terminology is essential for a correct application of the Logical Framework for M&E purposes.
- The evaluation criteria commonly used address five sets of issues: (a) relevance; (b) efficiency; (c) effectiveness; (d) impact; (e) sustainability.
- There are several types of evaluation, distinctions can be found according to agent, timing, scope, specific issues and processes.
3 M&E THROUGH THE PROJECT CYCLE

Defining and setting up a M&E system begins with the understanding of the links between M&E and the project cycle as indicated in the following chart.

The close relationship between the project cycle phases and M&E activities implies that increasing effectiveness and quality of projects through M&E requires a forward thinking. It is necessary to answer the question "what do we need to do today to be able to assess a change tomorrow?". The first step will be ensuring the evaluability of a project since the beginning of the project cycle.

3.1 M&E and project approval: making evaluability possible

Ensuring that a project will be able to benefit from future monitoring and evaluation activities is a concern both for the donors when selecting the project proposals for funding and for the NGOs who would like to ensure the quality of their work and increase the probability of being funded. Assessing the evaluability is therefore the first quality control to be carried out on new project documents. It includes four main steps, which need to be undertaken during the project design phase:

a. Ensure that the intervention logic is coherent and that all parts are clearly set out.

b. Ensure that the M&E framework is feasible and meaningful in relation to the project results and objective.

c. Ensure that the project plan provides for adequate monitoring and evaluation activities.

d. Ensure that the lessons and best practices from previous projects have been incorporated.

Making sure that a project is evaluable is the responsibility of those appraising and approving a project. The following checklist should help project designers and people in charge of the project appraisal to assess project evaluability on time.
### CHECKLIST TO ASSESS EVALUABILITY

| **Objectives** | a. Problem or need that the project is attempting to address has been identified and analysed |
|               | b. Identification of whose problem or need it is |
|               | c. Causes of the problem or need have been identified and ranked |
|               | d. Expected objectives have been consistently defined |
|               | e. Lessons learnt from previous operations and evaluations have been taken into account |
| **Indicators** | f. Conditions (physical, institutional, economic, social) prior to the execution of the project have been described |
|               | g. Baseline data on the conditions prior to the execution of the project have been included |
|               | h. If no baseline data are provided, project design includes data collection |
|               | i. Benchmarks, target figures, or other evidence to monitor progress and determine attainment of the objectives have been provided |
| **Results**   | j. Goods or services that the project will generate have been identified and described |
|               | k. Description of how and when the beneficiaries will use the goods and services generated by the project have been provided |
|               | l. Benefits to be derived from the use of the goods and services generated by the project have been identified |
| **Assumptions** | m. Individuals, groups, institutions and organisation that could positively or negatively affect the execution of the project have been identified |
|               | n. Events or elements that are outside the direct control of project management and that could affect project viability, results and objectives have been identified and described |
|               | o. Provisions have been made to review financial and economic feasibility analyses if the project experiences implementation delays which will negatively impact the indicators of project success |


### 3.2 M&E at the project design phase: the use of the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM)

Assessing a project evaluability starts during the design phase. The output of this phase, will have to be presented in such a way to allow the understanding of the project intervention logic, of its main assumptions, the project’s time frame and to deduct which are the key stakeholders and key data that will have to be taken into consideration when carrying out M&E activities.

To facilitate the assessment of the above-indicated elements, it is suggested to fill in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) as the final step of the project design phase. The LFM is a synthetic presentation tool that illustrates a project’s intervention logic and its main components. The **LFM should be considered an aid to thinking**, as it allows the assessment of: (a) the cause-effect relationship between different parts of a problem; (b) the assumptions, constraints and risks, which could influence the successful implementation of a project; and (c) the principle of the correspondence, or horizontal logic, which
Furthermore, if appropriately reviewed and modified, the LFM is also a useful management tool during implementation, that provides a clear point of reference to assess progress towards a stated objective.

However, it is important to remember that the construction of a **LFM provides no magic solution to the correct identification or design of a good project**. It is merely an analytical, synthetic presentation tool. The principle “garbage in, garbage out” can apply to the LFM if it is used mechanically.

Examples of LogFrames are provided in annex 2.

### 3.2.1 The intervention logic: the cause-effect relationship and the assumptions

**The cause-effect relationship**

The so-called vertical logic emphasised in the LFM should be based on the objective tree, elaborated during the project identification phase as part of the problem analysis (i.e. elaboration of a problem tree and corresponding objective tree).

**The project intervention logic and its assumptions**
The overall objective clearly indicates the justification for the project and is coherent with the development policy of the donor and country/region where the project is implemented;

The purpose contributes to the overall objective, it is SMART (Simple, Measurable, Agreed, Realistic, Time-bound, see box in paragraph 3.3.1) and will remove the causes that have created the problem that the project aims to solve.

The Results are conducive to the attainment of the project purpose within the agreed project duration. All results foreseen under the project to achieve the purpose are listed. They are described as products and services to be delivered to the target group.

The Activities are described in order to provide a clear picture of the strategy that is used to achieve the results. The activities should be realistic in relation to the time available, the financial and human resources requested, and the local conditions. The activities should be presented in such a way to allow following the process leading to the achievement of the results and the objective.

A clear project intervention logic, based on a sound problem analysis, provides the basis for a correct formulation of M&E questions around the five evaluation criteria (see also the previous chapter).

The Assumptions

Assumptions represent the hypotheses related to external factors which fall beyond the project’s control, and that will have an impact on the successful implementation of the project. A good understanding of these factors is therefore essential for a good project design.

M&E activities will also have to take into account the assumptions as they have an impact on the feasibility of a project, on its relevance, its potential effectiveness and therefore on the sustainability of the results and on the final impact of the project. With respect to the assumptions, M&E activities will need to:

During the design phase: Check that assumptions are correctly formulated: a) distinction between pre-conditions and assumptions; b) no inclusion of "killing assumptions"; c) elaboration of assumptions for each level of the project logic; d) formulated as positive statements; e) elaborated on the basis of the problem analysis and stakeholder analysis

During implementation: Monitor assumptions during the implementation so as to provide an early warning on potential constraints and possible solutions/reorientations

During the evaluation process: Assess if assumptions have changed in the course of the project life, how this has affected the project implementation process and results and what correcting measures were undertaken
### 3.3 Setting the M&E framework: the choice of the indicators and the collection of data

The ability to define an indicator in consultation with stakeholders, and agree the target value and timing, is a demonstration that project objectives are clearly stated, understood and supported. At the same time, if indicators are to be an effective instrument for M&E, it is necessary to ensure that they are measurable.

Indicators have two main functions:

- To help monitor the progress towards the achievement of the objective (question: how do we know whether what has been planned is actually happening?).
- To clarify the project intervention logic by indicating the target figure to be attained, the timing, the quality sought, and the target groups.

A correct definition of indicators is crucial for any M&E system because by defining the focus for data collection, the indicators provide a map for the monitoring and evaluation activities.

Without a clear set of indicators, monitoring or evaluation activities lose their capacity to assess what is realised against what was agreed and foreseen.

### 3.3.1 Characteristics of indicators

There are no universal principles about what makes a good indicator, however the SMART characteristics listed below are useful and can be applied to all sectors and types of intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMART characteristics for indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific:</strong> indicators should relate to the specific conditions the project seeks to change. For this reason, they need to be defined together with the local counterpart and the stakeholders and according to the local conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurable:</strong> quantitative indicators are often preferred as they are easier to manage and allow further statistical analysis of the data. However indicators can also capture qualitative issues. What is important is to define how the data that needs to be available for an indicator can be collected and to reduce to a minimum the number of indicators that have a subjective component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attainable:</strong> the information related to the indicators must be attainable at reasonable costs using an appropriate collection method. The indicators therefore will have to be kept simple and limited in number. A careful assessment of the data requested, their availability, the cost for their collection and treatment must be carried out before selecting the indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant:</strong> indicators must be relevant to the management information needs of the people who will use the data. Field staff may need particular indicators that are of no relevance to managers at the headquarters. However, to facilitate the overall performance assessment and avoid different understanding on the project progress and performance by the different users, the number of indicators must remain limited for each level of objective considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely:</strong> the indicators need to be collected and reported at the right time to influence management decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Structure and type of indicators

The LogFrame approach to project design provides an efficient structure by postulating a hierarchy of objectives for which indicators are required. Following this structure also allows allocating responsibilities for who will have to monitor the indicators and to whom the information is addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objectives</th>
<th>Types of Indicators</th>
<th>Nature of the indicators: how to obtain them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Long term statistical evidence resulting at National sectoral level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Social and economic surveys, field visits, interviews, meetings, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Management records and progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Management records and financial account records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Financial account records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chart provides a visualisation of the relationship among indicators.

**Inputs indicators** are quantified and time-bound statements of resources to be provided. Information on these indicators comes largely from accounting and management records.

Please note that the LFM does not foresee indicators for the inputs. These will be elaborated only when setting up the framework for M&E. The source for designing the input indicators is the project budget.

Example of input indicators:
- Vehicle operating costs for crop extension services
**Process indicators** measure what happens during implementation and they mostly refer to the realised activities. They can be defined as the link between the activity and the results, as they are usually indicated as a set of contracted completions or milestone events taken from an activity plan, and they therefore illustrate the steps leading to the results.

Today, both monitoring and evaluation activities pay less attention to process indicators than in the past, because it has become clear that their satisfaction does not ensure quality results and successful projects. Nevertheless, it has also been shown by many evaluation reports that limited performances in terms of results often depend on the implementation process. **Monitoring the implementation process through process indicators is therefore important to create the conditions to achieve the agreed results.**

Furthermore, for capacity development projects such as institutional development or participation enhancement projects typically carried out by NGOs, process indicators still have an important role. They clarify the strategy followed and therefore allow to monitor the quality of the ongoing development process, and when defined together with the beneficiaries they increase the latter’s self-evaluating capacity and sense of ownership of the results.

Please note that with respect to the LFM, process indicators are not foreseen in the *Means of Verification* column, which has the inputs in correspondence of the activities box in the first column. Nevertheless, since they are crucial for monitoring the progress, they will have to be included in the LFM when setting up the M&E framework in correspondence of the Activities and at the place of the Inputs. Process indicators can be deducted from other project design documents, such as the work plan or the description of the project.

Example of process indicators:
- Status of procurement of textbook
- Number of health centres equipped
- Date by which fertilisers are delivered to farmers
- Number of village committees created
- Number of training courses developed
- Beneficiaries of food aid by gender

**Result indicators** refer to both the planned products/services to be delivered by the project (*outputs*) and to the changes that need to occur to meet the project purpose (*outcomes*).

In the LFM output indicators and outcome indicators are defined separately, in correspondence to the project results and project purpose respectively. **However, with respect to M&E, usually one speaks of result indicators.** They combine both outputs and outcomes, as both are necessary to the achievement of the project purpose, which is the primary preoccupation of monitoring activities and one of the key questions for evaluation.

A key concern when elaborating these indicators must be to capture the quality dimension of an output or outcome. This is indeed the current preoccupation of donors when financing a new project or programme and when reviewing or evaluating the interventions funded.

The elaboration of quality result indicators will be facilitated by considering the following
Usefulness of the results: for whom and in which terms. The delivery of a foreseen output is not enough to guarantee its quality. For instance, the construction of a health centre or the delivery of food aid in a village are not, per se, indicators of quality result. A first step in this direction is given if we consider indicators such as the number of health centres per village or the average distance of the health centre from the served villages or the analysis of food receivers disaggregated by gender. These indicators show an improvement of the access to the service and, in the case of food aid, to food by vulnerable groups. A further step towards quality is defining the usefulness for the participants and beneficiaries. For a health centre this could be in terms of population treated in the centres. In this case, a quality indicator could be: the increase of X% of the people attending the constructed health centres in the region Y by the end of the project. In the case of our food aid intervention quality indicators may refer for instance to the % of chronically malnourished children attending the local health centre. The final choice of the indicator should be done with the beneficiaries and the participants in the project so that the indicator captures what is most relevant for them. This is particularly important when a project target group are the poor or other disadvantaged groups. A crucial factor for the quality results will be linked to the use of disaggregated indicators according to the specific groups or specifically addressing the targeted groups within a larger target group (i.e. in a health or education project, the indicator of utility of the service can be seen for the entire village population, by gender and by class of economic revenue).

Sustainability. The quality of a result will also depend on its capacity to continue to produce its effects beyond the project duration and financing. For example, if the result is the villages of the region X are equipped with new water points, the sustainability issue could be taken into account by formulating the indicator as follows in each village the water committee is able to manage and maintain the water point. If the result is the provision of a new scheme for house construction to limit damage from natural disasters, the indicator could be the municipalities of the areas subject to natural disasters have adopted the new house model for all future constructions. Depending on the project, the local context and participants, addressing the sustainability concern through an indicator will be different, as the reasons affecting sustainability may vary. However, the factors related to sustainability that should be taken into account by a project and that indicators should reflect, are: a) cultural, social and institutional acceptance of the proposed solutions and changes; b) financial limitations; c) lack of skills and knowledge; d) organisational settings.

Capacity development. In case of projects aiming at capacity development or having a capacity development component, the indicator has to be able to highlight the growth and development of the individual/institutional capacities and to chart changes and trends. Furthermore, given that learning, adaptation and change are intrinsic to CD projects, the opportunity and ability of the participants to design their own indicators of capacity development is critical to their acceptance and potential use. The key questions to be answered to define CD indicators are: what are the critical functions/skills to be created/improved? What is the level of the capacity before the starting of the project? Whose capacities? Based on which strategy for change? For instance, if the expected result is the quality of teaching in primary education is improved, the indicator will not be X new teachers have been trained in the method ABC, but the new trained teachers apply the method ABC to teach mathematics and literature. Further specifications of the indicator in terms of quantity, quality and time should be made following discussions with the stakeholders. At the end the indicator could be by the end of the project at least 90% of the new trained teachers apply the method ABC to teach mathematics and literature in all rural schools.
Quantitative indicators of participation focus on information that can be measured objectively and can be quantified. For example: number of people participating by social, economic, education, age, ethnic group; or the quantity/frequency/attendance of developed institutions, such as village committees; engagement of people in projects activities, as indicated, for example, by level of maintenance of common services, the personal inputs in project activities. Most of this information can be easily collected through management records and therefore quantitative indicators of participation tend to be preferred. They also are useful for monitoring the process during the implementation.

Qualitative information of participation refers to behavioural aspects, changes, and use of certain skills that require a descriptive statement that cannot be quantified. For example: how groups are managed and organised; what capacities the participants are expected to develop; the quality of the participant contribution and their behaviour in group meetings. Given that the collection of qualitative information is time-consuming and requires special skills, the use of qualitative indicators of participation is suggested at the assessment level of the project purpose, more specifically during mid-term reviews, during the desk officer’s field visits, or at the end of project evaluation.

A good approach to combine both quantitative and qualitative dimension of participation in the LFM, is to use certain indexes of participation (quantitative dimension) with some indicators of socio-institutional maturity focusing on the specific skills and changes that the project aims at achieving. For example:

- Number of groups formed
- Number and drop out of members
- Frequency of, and attendance at meetings
- Number of groups forming cluster links with others
- Attendance of group members at leadership and skills training workshops
- Members’ labour and material contributions to group activities
- Democratic changes in leadership over time (elections)
- Consensual production of micro-plans and implementation workplans
- Evidence that workplans have been adhered to and that the specified outputs have been achieved
- Effective applications of skills to maintain group assets in working order (buildings, equipments, water supply installations etc.)
- Mutual support between group members in non-project activities
- Examples of group members accessing non-project resources from other local institutions.

**Impact indicators** refer to medium-long term development changes and are generally referred to project goal/overall objective, though some agencies speak of impact also at purpose level. Since impact is defined as the difference between the situation before and after an intervention, or as the comparison between similar realities with and without an intervention, its measurement requires a clear description of the original situation/population/region. Therefore, measuring impact involves complex statistics about social and economic welfare and data collection that may be unfeasible in certain countries and/or situations. Furthermore, this measurement is hampered by the fact that it is difficult to elicit the effect of a specific intervention on a situation that is influenced by many different factors and in the presence of other projects.

Since impact indicators refer to the global objective they should be linked to the development indicators selected for the beneficiary country and more generally to the agreed world development indicators (see annex 3).
Given the difficulty in collecting data and in isolating the effect of a single project, impact will be measured using proxy indicators, which are indirect measures linked to the expected result by one or more assumptions. They are used whenever a direct measure is not possible or not advisable (for instance because it would be too expensive).

Example of proxy indicators for impact:

- **Literacy rate**: perception of increased social and economic opportunities for the intended group;
- **Infant mortality rate**: parents’ perception of children resistance to certain illnesses;
- **Income indicator**: the proportion of households with a tin roof (and/or having a bicycle or a plough). *(The assumption would be that households with higher incomes tend to invest in house improvements or in farm equipment).*

For NGO projects intervening at local/micro level the impact will be referred in connection to social, economic and behavioural changes in the region/institution/population including the participants in the project, rather than the overall country where the project is realised.

### Be clear about crosscutting issues

Cross cutting issues (i.e. gender, empowerment, participation) are acquiring prominence in project design and this needs to be duly taken into account in M&E through the identification of appropriate indicators. In fact while everybody will agree on promoting participation or gender equality, the interpretation of these terms may vary. For instance gender analysis in a food aid intervention may be perceived in terms of access of women to food distribution or as women’s actual control over resources. The indicators will vary: in the first case they will concern the number of women receiving food whilst in the second case they will be of a more qualitative nature (e.g. women’s participation and role in food distribution committees).

### 3.3.3 Baseline data and data collection

The selection of indicators to be used for M&E depends not only on the project structure and objectives, but also on data availability and the time and skills requested for their collection, i.e. factors that have important implications at project management level and in financial terms. The typical situation is that where data is available it is often unreliable.
Institutions with the support of the project. In practice the creation of parallel or unsustainable data collection systems should be avoided or kept to the minimum indispensable.

In order to make possible future M&E activities, the following are the important steps to be carried out at the M&E planning stage:

1. **Identification of baseline data.** Since the ultimate objective of an indicator is to measure a change, it is essential to know what the starting point is. This is fundamental also to quantify and qualify the expected change. Without knowing what the situation is, there is a significant risk that the targets to be achieved are set at a wrong level. In fact, excessively high targets would become unrealistic and of little use for monitoring purposes, while excessively low targets would reduce the relevance of the intervention and its potential impact.

   If baseline data is not available, for instance from national statistics, other projects, or donors reports, it will be necessary to include its collection as the first project activity. Considering the costs and the sustainability implications of such an operation, the identification of data to be collected will have to be extremely selective. The use of proxy indicators will have to be preferred whilst data collection will have to be limited to representative samples of beneficiaries.

2. **Identification of the source and data** to be collected in order to construct the indicators as well as the time and resources necessary. This should be done during the construction of the LFM in order to decide on the indicators. The danger here is to simplify the indicators to overcome the data collection problem, with the possibility of losing relevance and effectiveness of the indicator.

   If certain data is crucial to make monitoring of progress and quality effective, but it is not easily available, then data collection should be included specifically among the activities of the project and the necessary resources (time, human and equipment) should be allocated.

   Since data collection and analysis may be carried out at different levels and by different people, it is important to ensure that collected information is relevant for the analysis and that resources are not wasted collecting data which is never effectively used.

3. **Selection of the data collection method.** The method selected will depend on the type of indicator to be built and on the M&E activities to be carried out. Management records will be primarily used for input and process indicators. Direct observation and field visits will be used to record data for process indicators (for instance number of schools built), including participatory information which will be used for quantitative indicators of participation. Qualitative methods, that require more specific skills and are time consuming, will have to be carefully assessed before their use.

   At the M&E planning stage, there should be a clear agreement on the method for data collection at field level, and, by the starting of the project, the forms
Data collection systems should be set-up starting from the current administrative records-keeping system if this is of good quality which should later be improved to enable recording of data for M&E purposes.

4. Definition of clear procedures and responsibilities for data collection. If data is not collected during the project, then the evaluation of results, as well as the monitoring of progresses during the project life, may be of limited meaning. At the same time, it is important to ensure that the data collected is reliable and comes at the right time.

Most of the primary data will have to be collected by the project coordinator and local partners in the field or directly by the involved communities. In both cases it may happen that there are no specific data collection skills. It will be useful to provide some basic training and tools such as guidelines for data collection that could improve the reliability of the outcomes of this task.

The agreed procedures will have to indicate when and how often data collection activities are to take place as well as the different people responsible for data collection and for data analysis. If the person in charge of data collection in the field is the project coordinator, this task should be clearly indicated in his/her terms of reference and be kept within his/her normal administrative activities. If the communities will be in charge of data collection, this task should be well explained and agreed with them so that it is included among their activities.

3.4 Linking M&E to the project planning and budgeting

The following illustrates when M&E could intervene in the project cycle. In order to allow for these activities to take place and be effective, the following tasks must be done:

- Allocating the time for data collection. In particular at the project inception phase for the definition of the baseline situation.

- Synchronising data collection activities with the preparation of the progress and monitoring reports. This also implies the inclusion, at project planning level, of a given amount of time for the analysis of the collected data and the formulation of possible comments.

- Establishing field visits and other progress reviews (such as mid-term reviews) in relation to project milestones, in order to be able to produce and introduce in an effective way corrective measures, if necessary. For instance, a monitoring visit or a mid-term review carried out few months before the end of the project does not allow the attainment of its main objective.

- Stating clear M&E responsibilities within the TOR of the different people who will be involved, namely the project coordinator, the regional coordinator and the desk officers. This also means that the duration of their involvement on a given project should take into account these additional tasks.

- Listing data collection, monitoring and evaluation activities in the project work plan. This means that time and funds must be allocated to these activities; effective allocation of funds and time to these activities will also be an indication of the degree of feasibility and potential effectiveness of these actions.

- Deciding at the beginning of the project if there will be a end-of-project evaluation or an impact evaluation. This in order to: a) define a control group; b) establish the appropriate methodology for collection of qualitative data; and c) include the budget for an evaluation to be carried out by experts not involved in the
Monitoring and evaluating emergency interventions

From the methodological point of view there are no major differences in monitoring and evaluating emergency projects vis-à-vis development or rehabilitation interventions. There are however some particular issues that should be taken into account when monitoring / evaluating emergency project:

- The issue of coordination is particularly important in the case of emergency interventions when there is a natural tendency to poor coordination and to operate in an institutional vacuum. Coordination should therefore be viewed as a key element for project effectiveness.
- Given the context of emergency interventions, protection issues are also critical in determining the effectiveness of humanitarian actions: beneficiaries’ may be physically unable to gain access to the assistance provided and/or may be the object of targeted attacks because of the assistance provided. Assessment of the level of security/protection and freedom of movement in the area of intervention together with the steps taken to improve the situation should be duly taken into account in the design of M&E activities.
- It is also necessary to distinguish between sudden-onset crisis (i.e. earthquakes, floods) and slow-onset emergencies such as drought. In the case of sudden-onset emergencies M&E activities have to be often initiated on the basis of an incomplete understanding of the situation; and a minimum set of monitoring activities are to be started quickly and then expanded as circumstances allow. Monitoring activities particular at the initial stage of the crisis will therefore focus essentially on input indicators. It should also be noted that, especially in conflict zones and or in absence of local partners, M&E activities will have to be undertaken entirely by the NGO and therefore resources will have to be allocated to this end. In the case of slow-onset emergencies appropriate monitoring activities can be planned ahead. Attention should be given to the fact that while the tendency to concentrate monitoring and evaluation focus on process and impact indicators in an emergency context is understandable, in the case of slow-onset emergencies context, the selection of a limited number of outcomes indicators (see annex 3) will have to be pursued. This, in addition to a better understanding of the actual relevance of the project may provide key elements for the definition of appropriate rehabilitation and development interventions thus creating the necessary continuum.

Summary points

- M&E activities should be linked to project cycle phases.
- The Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) is the main instrument for project design, and should be also used as a management tool during project implementation.
- A clear project intervention logic, based on a sound problem analysis, provides the basis for a correct formulation of M&E questions around the five evaluation criteria.
- Indicators are used to monitor the progress towards the achievement of planned objectives; they should be measurable and defined in consultation with stakeholders.
- There are several types of indicators that refer to the different levels of objectives postulated in the LFM: the selection of indicators depends on the project structure (LFM), as well as on the availability of data, time and skills requested for their collection.
- Baseline data, as well as sources and methods for data collection should be identified when designing future M&E activities.
- In order to make M&E possible and effective, clear responsibilities and sufficient resources should be identified at the planning stage.
MONITORING

Monitoring refers to the continuous assessment of project implementation and first impact through the process of data collection and analysis, reporting and use of information.

Donors are mainly concerned with demonstrating tangible project results, whereas NGOs are generally more concerned with the implementation process and the way in which results are attained. This difference in approach needs to be recognised and appropriately managed to reduce the scope of disagreement between NGOs and donors.

For this purpose, additional monitoring practices and tools tailored for NGOs – which complement those required by donors, such as progress reports - need to be developed and used. This chapter presents the steps required for the successful implementation of monitoring activities and provides NGOs with practical monitoring tools.

Data and information collected for monitoring purposes is presented in specific formats that take into account NGOs’ typical needs and constraints. The formats have the following common characteristics:

- Only data of interest and use to the field staff are included;
- Information that can be fairly easily obtained is selected;
- A simple presentation is provided;
- Sound basis for summary conclusions and comparisons by third parties is included.

4.1 Introduction

NGOs’ projects involve many types of actors that play different roles, at different levels of the monitoring process; each of these levels is characterised by distinct information needs and must be addressed with specific management tools.

PURPOSE OF MONITORING:
(a) Support day-to-day management
(b) Assess progress towards planned results
(c) Assess progress towards the achievement of specific objectives

FOCUS OF MONITORING:
(a) Implementation of on-going activities
(b) Quality of results and analysis of deviations
(c) Review of the intervention logic

ORGANISATION OF MONITORING:
(a) Information collection on an on-going basis: project staff
(b) Quarterly analysis of information collected: national/regional coordinators
(c) Field visits at specific moments in time: managers from headquarters

MONITORING TOOLS:
(a) Management records
(b) Flash reports
4.2 NGOs’ structure and current monitoring practices

NGOs have different project management systems and related monitoring and evaluation practices; the following bullet list and table provide a general overview of their main features:

- At the headquarters level, the Management (Desk Officers and Programme managers) is mainly concerned with information and analyses that can be used for organisational learning activities and lobbying initiatives towards donors, and with the dissemination of information within their constituency. In such a framework it will be important to be able to provide indications (on a sample basis) on the actual impact of the interventions carried out.

- At country level, the management (country/region representatives) and local partners are interested in receiving feedback from the field in order to: i) prepare progress reports for donors and local authorities, ii) demonstrate results (focus on outputs and outcomes indicators) particularly to main donors whose decision-making mechanisms are often decentralised at country level, iii) understand the overall progress of the project in the framework of the NGOs Country Strategy, iv) extract lessons for future projects in the Country.

- At project/field level, NGO staff (project team-leader and administrator) and implementing partners are concerned with the day-to-day management and monitoring of project inputs and outputs (focus on inputs and process indicators). Data, information and reports are usually transmitted to Country Offices and/or Headquarters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HQs/Programme level | Evaluation/Impact | Is the portfolio working?  
                       |                           | Is the strategy effective? |
| Country/Project level | Evaluation/Impact | Is the project working?  
                       |                           | Is it sustainable? |
| Project management level | Monitoring/Performance (results) | Is the project producing the desired results?  
                       |                           | Can it be more efficient? |
| Project operational level | Monitoring/Progress (inputs & activities) | Is the project on schedule?  
                       |                           | Are disbursements on schedule?  
                       |                           | Any changes in the context? |

Monitoring is thus undertaken at different levels and by different actors, all of which require different but complementary information.

Financial monitoring is carried out on a regular basis by project administrators and supervised by the desk officers and/or NGO managers in charge of the specific geographical area. As this is the area where procedures and monitoring practices seem to be more systematic and effective, the issue will not be dealt with specific separate tools. Financial monitoring will therefore be treated within the other types of monitoring.

4.3 Purposes and focus of monitoring

Not everyone needs the same information or the same degree/detail of information. Information requirements and tools for collecting them need to be broken down in relation to the role played by each actor within the management structure, and to the purposes of monitoring at the different levels. In this way, functions and responsibilities can be clarified and a clear link can be made between information needs and levels of management.

The importance of selectivity needs to be stressed, as only a limited amount of information can be collected and managed.
In order to clearly define the different types of management information needed by project managers, as well as what this information will be used for, three main categories of information that correspond to three different purposes of monitoring have been identified:

a) Information on the implementation of planned activities and beneficiaries’ participation, to support the day-to-day management of projects on the field.

b) Information on the results attained through the realisation of activities and beneficiaries response, to assess progress towards results and review work plans for follow-up.

c) Information on the achievement of specific objectives and first impact, to review the logic of intervention and problem solving.

As a consequence, monitoring activities will be carried out at distinct levels of implementation. In particular, we can distinguish between three types of monitoring:

- **On-going monitoring**: to identify and highlight problems as they emerge.
- **Regular monitoring**: to analyse problems and deviations and suggest follow-up measures.
- **Monitoring at specific moments of project life**: to review the whole intervention logic and recommend adjustments.

These monitoring activities are complementary and provide feedback mechanisms aimed at helping managers in the identification of successes and problems during project implementation, and therefore facilitate appropriate adjustments.

Local partners and beneficiaries should be involved in all types of monitoring, through participatory mechanisms that take into account both the nature of the project and the local context.

### 4.4 Organisation of monitoring

Different types of monitoring will fall under the responsibility of different actors involved in project management, both in the field and at the headquarters, and will require specific monitoring tools. The interval of monitoring activities will depend upon the monitoring purposes.

The table below illustrates how monitoring activities can be organised. Some of the issues highlighted will be further developed in the next sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Type of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management records</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Support day to day management</td>
<td>- Inputs</td>
<td>Project team leaders</td>
<td>National/regional coordinators, Central administration</td>
<td>All projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash report</td>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td>Assess progress towards planned results</td>
<td>- Physical progresses</td>
<td>National/regional coordinator</td>
<td>Coordinators, Heads of project in the region, Desk officers and managers, Local partner</td>
<td>All projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visit report</td>
<td>8 months to 1 year</td>
<td>Assess relevance of the intervention logic</td>
<td>- Review of the Log-Frame matrix</td>
<td>NGO managers and desk officers</td>
<td>Heads of project, Coordinators, Local partner, Other desks and managers</td>
<td>Projects of minimum 2 years, Projects with partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGOs resources, capacities and constraints must be kept in mind in order to design procedures that are not too complex, time-consuming or expensive. The following paragraphs focus on the need to optimise value-added, while respecting the realities of what can be achieved.

4.5 Inception phase

The inception period of a project, i.e. the first three months of implementation, is a very important phase within the project life. Given that a considerable amount of time may elapse between project formulation and the actual beginning of the activities, this is the best moment to carry out a review of the project design and decide the most appropriate approach to implementation.

Monitoring should start at the inception phase, with the main purpose of re-assessing the project environment and adapt, if necessary, the intervention logic outlined during the planning stage. The overall objective and purposes should not change, while project managers may adjust the planned results and the scheduling of activities to adapt them to the changed circumstances.

Holding a workshop at the very beginning of the implementation could serve the above-mentioned purpose and at the same time – by involving project beneficiaries and other stakeholders – it could provide the opportunity to assess the relevance of the intervention logic vis-à-vis their needs and expectations, and re-define the strategies for their participation in future monitoring activities.

4.5.1 Responsibilities

The specific responsibilities for carrying out this initial assessment will depend on the nature of the project:

- The heads of project will be responsible for projects of less than one year.
- The national/regional coordinators and the heads of project will be responsible for longer projects.

4.5.2 Tools for re-assessment

The re-assessment of the project at the inception phase will be focused on two main issues: relevance and feasibility. The main purpose of this analysis is to answer a crucial question; has any change occurred since project formulation? The table presented in annex 5 provides an example of check-list to guide such an assessment.

Once this analysis has been done, project managers will have to re-define the work-plan in order to adapt, if necessary, activity and result targets in the planning documents.

This can be done through two main actions:

1. Review of the work-plan, by developing detailed activity schedules linked to expected results for the first three months of implementation.
2. Assessment of the adequacy of tools for data and information collection selected during the planning stage, and definition of specific responsibilities for monitoring the indicators.
4.6 Data and information collection techniques

The main techniques that can be used by NGOs for data collection relate to standard core M&E and group discussion methods. These are document review, direct observation, question checklists, questionnaires, stakeholder analysis and focus group discussions (the list is not exhaustive). All of them are likely to be applied to all levels of monitoring, and can be used independently or in combination (the main methods are summarised in annex 4).

4.6.1 Documentation review

The purpose of documentation and secondary data reviews is to gain a better understanding of the history and evolution of the project. It consists in the examination of project reports, but also other mission reports as well as articles, minutes of project meetings and others. The review of such documentation can possibly integrate or substitute a baseline data and provide a good background to the monitoring and evaluation exercise. If undertaken at the beginning of the M&E mission can also help in identifying information gaps to be further pursued though other data collection techniques.

4.6.2 Direct observation

The purpose of direct observation is to obtain information by observing what people are actually doing and providing insights on key issues that can be further developed. From a M&E point of view this method is critical to cross check other data. Observation is the technique that requires less time and specific skills and can be used either by project staff who works full-time for the project and lives in the project area, or by ‘outsiders’ during monitoring visits in the field. In both cases, those acting as observers and those who want to access the information for management purposes should agree in advance on guidelines establishing the objectives of the observation and the issues to be covered.

Tools to record the results of the observation for monitoring purposes should also be established in advance, in order to allow comparison of similar issues over time and limit as much as possible bias deriving from observers or observed attitudes. These tools should be simple and can include interview guides or observation summary sheets.

4.6.3 Question checklists

A question checklist is a simple tool that can be used by project staff to support the dissemination of more structured and standardised monitoring practices. Question checklists can be used and compared at different stages of the life of the project, and represent a practical instrument to help incoming staff to familiarise with project issues and thus become effective more quickly.

Question checklists are usually project-specific, although they can be adapted and used for different projects in similar contexts. Checklists should be drafted by people with a greater knowledge of project issues, e.g. the project coordinator and/or other field staff. A review of checklists by national/regional coordination offices may be necessary to ensure accuracy and consistency with project purposes and objectives.

The project staff should use checklists as a guide for interviews or more informal conversation, and should never feel any sort of restriction to inquire on arising matters despite the fact that they are originally not included in the checklist. Question checklists may either be structured so that answers to closed questions (yes/no) can be written on the checklist itself, or left as a set of more open-ended questions.
4.6.4 Interviews

Interviews are at the core of monitoring and may be conducted as informal talks with groups of beneficiaries or in a more structured way through sample survey questionnaires. The type of option chosen will depend on various issues such as the nature of the project, the specific objective of the inquiry, the skills of the project’s staff, amount of time available, the characteristics of target groups. The list below provides an overview of possible types of interview, by respondent selection and techniques.

By respondent selection

Individual interviews
are easier to manage and allow interviewers to collect information that would have been difficult to get in group interviews (interviewed people are more prone to speak freely). However, they are time-consuming and judgements can easily be biased by individual opinions; interviewers may have to interview an important number of respondents in order to gain a representative picture of the situation.

Focus group interviews
involve small groups of people (usually eight to twelve) who have a common interest in the project, and are useful to validate project design, and assess project performance as well as the degree of responsiveness of a particular category of people. Members of focus groups should be selected within the same economic and social milieu; the selected people will draw from local experience and traditions, and therefore provide local insight. Topic focused or semi-structured techniques may be used for focus group interviews (see below).

Community interviews
involve a large mixed group of community members and are aimed at gaining an understanding of how the target communities view the effects of project activities on their lives. Community interviews should be carried out by more than one interviewer through structured or semi-structured techniques. The interviews must be planned in advance in order to guarantee the presence of the majority of the community involved.

By interview technique

Semi-structured interviews
are less formal than structured interviews, having more open-ended questions and a more flexible sequence of items that allow for conversation and reciprocal transmission of information. Preparation usually involves outlining the broad areas of inquiry, while the specific questions are formulated during the interview itself. The questions should be kept simple and be sequenced with easier questions coming first and more personal at the end of the interview. The principal advantage of this technique is that the project managers receive information on given topics in a relative short time.

Topic focused interviews
are carried out through an interview guide focused on specific topics that the interviewer wants to cover. The kind of information and type of questions are decided in advance, while the specific questions will result from the interview depending on the degree of responsiveness of target groups. With a group of people using the same guide for interview, this technique allows for comparison between respondents. Statistically reliable data on the whole population, however, cannot be obtained through topic-focused interviews and will require more structured approaches.

Informal interviews
are carried out to gather information through an informal conversation between the interviewer and the respondent. Particular communication skills are required: the interviewer must keep a neutral attitude in order to avoid any influence on the answers. This technique may be very time-consuming as conversation can easily drift from issue to issue and it is difficult to draw conclusions. This technique may prove very useful to gain an understanding of respondents feelings and concerns about project implementation in a way that does not influence respondent opinions.

4.6.5 Stakeholder Analysis

A stakeholder analysis in a M&E exercise can play a fundamental role in identifying and defining who should be involved in the M&E system and in better focusing information needs. It can also help to identify potential and/or existing conflicts and highlight ways to address them. There are several stakeholders who can play an important role in the M&E exercise, among them:

- Project staff/participants
- Community or groups targeted by the project
- Neighbouring communities or groups excluded by project benefits
• Local leaders
• Local elites having an interest in project activities

4.6.6 Focus group discussions

Focus group discussions are useful to collect general information on a community and on their perceptions of a project, including its performance, inclusion and exclusion mechanisms and areas for improvements. Separating stakeholders in different interest groups can also elicit the emergency of point of views (i.e. from women or vulnerable groups) that would not come out in larger gatherings. Focus group discussions are also useful in building up consensus.

4.7 Monitoring at the field level

The first level of monitoring falls under the responsibility of the heads of project and project administrators, who will keep administrative and management records on a on-going basis. For this purpose they will be provided with specific job descriptions, and monitoring activities will be included as a part of their management tasks.

Basic administrative records describing actual expenditures against expected costs will be established on a week-by-week basis. They will be summarised and reported in the form of management record reports once a month.

The main purpose of monitoring at this level is to support the day-to-day management through the collection of information concerning the realisation of activities. Problems will be highlighted when they arise and reported to the coordination offices, which will deal with the analysis of possible solutions and suggest measures for follow-up.

The aim is to provide sufficient information to the coordinators, while minimising the reporting workload placed on project management.

Data and information will be reported through management records that will compare the activities planned in the LogFrame matrix (and eventually reviewed during the inception phase) with those carried out in the field, with particular attention at the participation of beneficiaries. The format is provided below.

Management record format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LogFrame Matrix</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Total duration:</th>
<th>Month:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country/Region:</td>
<td>Matrix prepared by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities planned</th>
<th>Activities implemented</th>
<th>Reasons for deviation</th>
<th>Beneficiaries’ participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities planned</th>
<th>Activities implemented</th>
<th>Reasons for deviation</th>
<th>Beneficiaries’ participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Monitoring by the coordination offices

The second level of monitoring is that of coordination offices: it will consist of a first assessment of the implementation strategy (analysis of the deviations highlighted by the heads of project) and will recommend possible corrective measures for follow-up.

On the basis of the management records received by the heads of project, as well as other relevant project documents (e.g. the planning documents revised during the inception phase), coordinators may decide to carry out monitoring missions to visit those projects that present more problems. Specific guidelines for carrying out monitoring field visits are provided in paragraph 4.10.

This type of monitoring seeks to define the extent to which the implementation of activities is attaining or is likely to attain planned results within the set timeframe. In particular, it will focus on:

- **Level of activities**
  - Means planned and used (including reasons for deviation)
  - Activities planned and implemented (including reasons for deviation)
- **Level of results**
  - Achievement of results (including progress against indicators)
- **Progress towards sustainability**
  - Ownership by beneficiaries
  - Institutional and management capacities
  - Coherence and complementarity with other interventions carried out in the same region
- **Conclusions and recommendations**
  - Overall conclusions on implementation
  - Main problems/constraints
  - Progress towards the achievement of objectives
  - Recommendations for the next implementation period

This information will be summarised in a flash report that the coordinators will prepare and send to the project coordinator and to the headquarters on a quarterly basis (see suggested format in annex 5).

The monitoring results will provide the basis for the review of the workplan and the updating of detailed activity schedules linked to expected results for the next three months of implementation.

4.9 Monitoring by managers and desk officers

Collection of information in the field is not an end in itself and should not be seen as a passive exercise. Data and information regularly collected must be analysed and this can be done at different levels. The first one, as seen, is the coordination offices level, where information coming from the field is further analysed and reported to the headquarters. Monitoring field visits carried out by ‘outsiders’ from the headquarters, who must be invested with decision-making authority, provide the second level of analysis. The monitoring should respond to the key question:

What conclusions can be drawn from the information regularly collected?

Only some projects may need monitoring field visits from headquarters. The selection of projects subject to monitoring field visits will be done on the basis of some pre-established criteria.
The duration of the visit will depend on the moment of the project’s life and the nature of project; it is, however, recommended not to plan missions shorter than 1 week. More time will be needed to visit more than one project in the same region.

Monitoring visits can take place at different points during implementation, depending on the project’s duration, or when particular problems arise. As these visits also address design problems, missions should be organised at the beginning of the implementation phase, so that efforts are not wasted in trying to implement ineffectual design.

Field visits are also an occasion for reviewing the efficiency and effectiveness of the monitoring systems adopted by the coordination offices, therefore the participation of national and/or regional coordinators is advisable.

4.9.1 Purpose and focus

The main purpose of monitoring field visits is to review the whole intervention logic and come up with strategies to deal with problems arising during project implementation. NGOs’ managers will review the information regularly collected by the heads of projects and coordinators and, more specifically, look at the extent to which activities carried out and results attained are achieving the purpose and are likely to achieve the overall objective of the project.

Monitoring through field visits will in particular focus on:

- **Review of the LogFrame matrix**
  - Overall assessment of project design
  - Activities
  - Purpose
  - Overall objective
  - Risks and Assumptions
  - Capacity of the project to adapt to changes during implementation

- **Efficiency of implementation to date**
  - Means planned and used
  - Activities planned and implemented

- **Effectiveness to date**
  - Achievement of results within the given timeframe (including progress against indicators)
  - Beneficiaries’ access to and satisfaction with results

- **Impact to date**
  - Progress towards the achievement of the planned overall objective
  - Capacity of project to adapt to external factors (including coherence and complementarity with other interventions in the same region)

- **Progress towards sustainability**
  - Capacity building – empowerment of local partner/institutions
  - Use of adequate technology
  - Socio-cultural and other cross-cutting issues (gender, environment, etc)
  - Financial and economic sustainability

- **Conclusions and recommendations**
  - Overall conclusions on implementation
  - Main problems/constraints
A suggested format for field visit reports is provided in annex 5. A system of ranking provides a sound basis for summary conclusions and comparisons by NGOs’ managers and other third parties.

4.10 How to carry out field visits

Monitoring field visits are likely to be short (one week to ten days), yet managers from the headquarters will be expected to look at an important number of issues related to project design and implementation.

For field visits to be productive, clear guidelines must be established in order to help managers and desk officers to make the most of their time and carry out effective monitoring activities. For this purpose, a case study of a ten days monitoring mission is provided in this paragraph.

4.10.1 Preparation of the mission

• Clarify the purpose of the monitoring visit: what will the visit achieve?
• Check the timing with project staff and coordinators: are coordinators and project staff available during the period selected?
• Contact the coordinators and heads of project to finalise the indicative programme of the mission. Ask their opinion on:
  a) Methods and approaches for the collection of data and information
  b) Key persons to meet
  c) Indicative itinerary
• Collect and organise background material and reference documents. These might include:
  a) Original project design document
  b) Inception report and other previous project monitoring reports
  c) Any study document on similar projects in the region
• Finalise the programme of the mission and fax it to the coordination offices and project staff.

4.10.2 First days in the Capital

• Attend a first informal meeting with the coordinators (and heads of project if they are in the capital) in order to:
  a) Check that possible meetings with people in the capital have been arranged
  b) Distribute relevant documents
  c) Discuss further details on field visits
• Organise a workshop with coordinators (possibly project staff) and local partners, aimed at:
  a) Introducing yourself and explaining the purpose of your visit
  b) Reviewing the methods for data and information collection
  c) Getting a first feedback from local partners on project implementation

4.10.3 Project site

• Meet local institutions and authorities to introduce the mission (it may be useful to ask local authorities to release a staff member directly concerned with the project to participate in the field work).
• Meet the community leaders to inform them on the purpose of your visit.
• Hold a workshop with project staff, beneficiaries’ representatives and possibly representatives of other local communities. Issues to be touched upon during the workshop might include:
  a) Progress of the project
• Proceed with data and information collection through interviews and other methods previously selected.
• Hold a final workshop to present the preliminary conclusions.
• Meet the local institutions and authorities for a de-briefing in order to assess if they are likely to support possible measures that concern them.

### 4.10.4 Back in the Capital

• Organise a de-briefing with coordinators and local partner and discuss the preliminary conclusions.
• Draw the conclusions and recommendations that will be contained in the field visit report, including the assessment of project design.

### 4.10.5 Back home

• Present the results of the mission in a de-briefing with desk officers, administrators and other NGO staff who might be interested.
• Finalise the field visit report, if possible within the first week after the mission.
• Send the draft report to the local partner and coordinators for comments, specifying that it will be considered approved if comments are not received before a fixed date.
• Send the final version of the report to the local partners, coordinators, project staff and other stakeholders who might be involved in future phases of project implementation.

### Summary points

- Monitoring practices and tools that respond to NGOs’ structures and strategies of intervention, need to be developed.
- During the inception phase the relevance and feasibility of the projects’ design should be re-assessed, the work-plan reviewed and precise responsibilities for monitoring defined.
- There are three types of monitoring that correspond to distinct levels of management and NGOs’ information needs, each of which needs to be carried out by different actors; data and information techniques should be selected on a case-by-case basis.
- Monitoring activities need to be carried out at the field level (realisation of activities), at the national/regional coordination offices level (attainment of planned results), and through monitoring visits from the headquarters (achievement of specific objectives and the progresses towards overall objective).
- If field visits are to be productive, clear guidelines need to be established in advance.
- The local partner and beneficiaries should be involved in all types of monitoring.
5 EVALUATION

An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, of its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and the fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

5.1 Characteristics of a good evaluation

In order to contribute to NGO’s performance, the evaluation process should be:

- **Impartial**, implying neutrality, transparency and fairness of the analysis and findings. The evaluator can have no vested interest or conflict of interest.
- **Credible**, using appropriate evaluation design and reliable data that ensures the thoroughness of data analysis. The connection between findings, conclusions and recommendations should also be made explicit.
- **Useful** for NGOs and key stakeholders who should benefit from timely contributions to decision-making processes and learn from the evaluation.
- **Participatory**, reflecting different stakeholders interests, needs and perceptions.
- **Cost-beneficial**, balancing the need for thoroughness and validity with appropriate return.
- **Feedback** into decision-making and organisational learning. Thus, the evaluation managers have particular responsibility for ensuring the systematic dissemination of findings to NGO staff (in particular project planners) and other stakeholders.

5.2 Criteria to select projects to be evaluated

An evaluation is an important tool for learning and ensuring accountability. However it is not possible for an NGO to evaluate all its projects, considering the costs and the time that would be required to do so. Thus, if the evaluation is to be cost-effective and realistically manageable by NGOs, it has to be undertaken on a selective basis.

Proposed criteria to select projects for future evaluations are:

- When the projects have a budget of a certain amount or more (e.g. more than 1M€ for EC projects).
- Whenever a second or additional phase of the project is proposed.
- When the project is considered to be innovative or strategic, in order to broaden the knowledge base to improve future interventions.
- When projects are considered seriously deficient, in order to learn from mistakes.
- When the intervention occurs over more years (e.g. at least three years).
- When projects are carried out according to specific financing/management schemes (e.g. when the project is co-financed by different donors).

*Whatever the selection criteria are, an adequate number of projects (corresponding to a significant financial coverage) from which lessons learnt can be drawn to support organisational learning, should be evaluated.*
5.3 Type of evaluation

The selection of the type of evaluation to be carried out will depend on the purpose and the user(s). Thus, self-evaluations should be carried out to strengthen internal capacities and empower project staff and local partners, while evaluations undertaken by people not involved in the implementation should be carried out for accountability purposes as they are often seen as more 'objective'.

The planning and management of the evaluation will largely depend on who is going to carry it out, i.e. whether or not an ‘outsider’ (external consultant) will be entrusted of the study. Some of the benefits and limitations of internal and external evaluations are presented in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros and cons of external/internal evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No vested interest – more objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Free from organisational bias – fresh perspec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well developed evaluation skills and/or technical knowledge of evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be participatory, given time and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluator may not fully understand NGO’s policies, procedures, personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can give those being evaluated a negative perception of the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less likely to be able to follow-up on implementation of recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May be more expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluator closely involved with the NGO’s activities – knows its way of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less likely to cause anxiety and defensiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops in-house skills and capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produces findings and recommendations that are more likely to be acted upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluator finds it harder to stand back from the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May avoid critical/negative conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluator may lack appropriate evaluation and/or technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of time to commit to evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Managing effective evaluations

This section is intended to help those who will manage evaluations by describing the steps that are to be taken to initiate and manage an evaluation following the NGO’s decision to proceed. Sometimes external evaluators contracted for this purpose will carry out these evaluations. In such cases, this section will provide the evaluation manager and the evaluator a step-by-step guide to help the evaluation manager control the quality of the evaluation, and ensure successful evaluation.

5.4.1 Responsibilities

Successful evaluations often require a combined expertise of:

- Evaluators
- Managers
- Stakeholders

The *evaluator* is responsible for the content and the presentation of the evaluation report, while the *evaluation manager* is responsible for the management of the evaluation process. Other *stakeholders* are expected to participate in the evaluation, provide data
Professional evaluators have the necessary evaluation and technical skills and knowledge, but it is the task of the evaluation managers to ensure that the evaluators’ expertise fits into NGOs’ existing processes and practices. The evaluation management is an important task at all stages of an evaluation: (a) during the design phase, to identify and administer the human and financial resources to carry out the evaluation; (b) throughout the evaluation, to ensure the quality control; (c) following evaluation completion, to ensure the dissemination of results to stakeholders and other people concerned.

5.4.2 Key questions when planning an evaluation

Asking a few questions before starting an evaluation will help the evaluation manager to make the study more effective. Questions will include:

a) **WHY** is the evaluation being done? What is the purpose of the evaluation?
b) **WHAT** are the major issues to be addressed by the evaluation? What is the scope and the focus of the evaluation and what are the key questions that need to be answered?
c) **WHO** will conduct the evaluation? Who else will be involved within the NGO?
d) **WHO** will participate in the evaluation? Who are the key stakeholders to be involved?
e) **HOW** will the evaluation be carried out? What is the appropriate methodology?
f) **WHEN** will the evaluation be undertaken? Is the timing suitable for key stakeholders that need to be involved in the evaluation?
g) **HOW LONG** will the evaluation take? How many persons-days should be calculated for external expertise?
h) **HOW MUCH** will the evaluation cost? What resources will be needed, financial and other?

5.4.3 Preparing the Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference (ToRs) define the evaluation by articulating the management’s initial requirements and expectations for the evaluation. They guide the process until the evaluation work-plan takes over as the primary control document.

It is recommended that the ToRs be prepared by the evaluation manager or by another person within the NGO who has been involved in the project.

Broadly, ToRs describe:

- What is being evaluated (**scope**)
- Why the evaluation is being carried out (**objective**)
- Broad parameters for conducting the evaluation (**focus and methodology**)

More in particular, ToRs are expected to address a number of essential elements that are described below.

1. **Title**: it should be short, descriptive and easy to remember.
2. **The Scope of the evaluation**: what is going to be evaluated and the indication of the type of evaluation (mid-term, end-of-project, ex-post).
3. **Reasons for evaluation**: indication of why the evaluation is being carried out; for whom is it primarily intended; and what are the expected achievements.
4. **Project background**: statement on the objective and the purpose of the project to be evaluated; its context and evolution; its cost and duration; the current state of implementation outlining the significant changes, successes or problems.
5. **Focus of the evaluation**: including the issues to be studied, a description of the specific
7. **Methodology.** Description of the evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) mentioning in each case the specific issues to be analysed; and indication of the evaluation techniques and research methods to be adopted (e.g. data collection and analysis).

8. **Responsibilities.** Identification of the structure of the evaluation and description of the roles and specific responsibilities of NGO personnel to be involved in the evaluation.

9. **Expertise required.** Indication of the key qualifications and experience requirements of the evaluator.

10. **Reporting and feedback.** Identification of the NGO’s requirements for the reports and the presentations (e.g. inception report, aide-mémoire, draft report, final report, debriefing presentations), indicating the language, the number of copies required, the date of delivery. The report format/layout should also be specified.

11. **Time schedule and costs.** Indication of: the duration and timing of the evaluation; the estimated cost that should be broken-down between the amount allocated to professional fees and the reimbursable expenses.

12. ** Annexes:** Provision of additional information, format and guidelines useful to carry out the evaluation and which cannot be included in the TOR (e.g. report format, detailed project description).

A guide to the preparation of the ToRs with specific examples for each of the above-mentioned points is provided in annex 6.

### 5.4.4 Selecting an evaluator

Both internal and external evaluators are useful to strengthen the NGOs’ M&E capacities and learn from past experience. The usefulness of both cannot be discussed in abstract terms and must be considered within NGOs specific needs and constraints at the moment of the evaluation.

In the case of an external evaluation, once the ToRs are approved the evaluation manager can proceed to the next step in the evaluation process: the selection of the evaluator(s). As a general rule, there should be no previous involvement of the evaluator(s) with the project being evaluated or any other initiative that could give rise to a conflict of interest.

Two main issues are concerned with this phase: (a) what is expected from the evaluator(s), and (b) how can they be selected.

a) The skills required to carry out an evaluation in a successful way vary according to the nature of the project, the purpose of the evaluation and the methods selected. However, a good balance between evaluation skills, technical knowledge and in-depth local knowledge is necessary. A checklist outlining the skills needed for an evaluator is provided in the box hereby.

b) The selection of the evaluator(s) involves finding a candidate that meets the requirements for the delivery of the evaluation. Some months may be needed to recruit suitable evaluators (good consultants are likely to be booked several months in advance). Use the widest possible network of contacts to identify candidates. Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the evaluator….</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the evaluation skills required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet the requirements for technical and sectoral knowledge and expertise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an adequate understanding of local social and cultural issues, and possess the language skills necessary for carrying out the study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess the facilitation skills and knowledge of group dynamics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate leadership and communication skills?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have experience with participatory methods and NGOs’ projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.5 Preparing the Evaluation Plan

Once the contract is signed, the evaluator is ready to start with the study. The contract should set out the terms and conditions of the evaluation. The first deliverable output is typically the Evaluation Plan. It is prepared by the evaluator and represents his/her response to the ToRs and the proposal for conducting the evaluation. Thus, one of the major functions of the Evaluation Plan is to re-conceptualise the ToRs into a more operational framework that applies directly to the project evaluation.

In order to adequately prepare the work-plan, the evaluator should review the ToRs with the evaluation manager (or the person who drew up the ToRs) so that parameters and requirements can be clarified and eventually redefined. The evaluator will also need basic information on the project that can be obtained through a review of major project documents and possibly through meetings with the project coordinator or staff.

The Plan will then be submitted to the evaluation manager for approval. Once approved, the Plan serves as key reference for managing the evaluation, although slight modifications might become necessary as the evaluation develops.

Evaluation Plans typically address a number of key components. The following paragraphs provide a sample work-plan outline and a description of the contents by section.

Project overview

It should be 1-2 pages long and summarise the project background and context. The expected results of the evaluation should also be included, and they should incorporate the results of the evaluator’s preliminary review of major project documents and consultation with project staff.

a) Is the reader left with a clear understanding of the project being evaluated?
b) Are management’s expectations for the evaluation clearly articulated?

Evaluation matrix

In the evaluation matrix the evaluation issues elaborated in the ToRs (typically in the section concerning the scope and focus) are turned into specific questions related to each level of the LF: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

a) Are the essential questions that need to be answered well articulated?
b) Are the indicators clearly established?
c) Are the sources of data and methods for data collection provided?

Sample of Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology

Aims at formulating a strategy to achieve the objectives of the evaluation given the range of available information, relating to scope, limitations. At this stage, the evaluator, based on the project overview and evaluation matrix, will define the following.

- Evaluation team:
- Schedule of activities:
- Report outline:
data and information sources; (iii) data collection processes; (iv) techniques for data analysis.

a) Are the methods identified likely to achieve the objectives of the evaluation?
b) Will the methods selected for the information and data collection and analysis lead to the correct identification of the results attributable to the project?

Evaluation team
Name, role and responsibilities of the members of the evaluation team and of the evaluation manager should be indicated.
a) Have the primary roles and responsibilities for all individuals involved in the evaluation been adequately identified?

Schedule of activities
The schedule will have to list the tasks to be carried out, the dates for milestones, as well as an estimate of the persons-days necessary for the evaluator to complete the tasks.
a) Does the work schedule set out a logical progression of activities from inception through to completion?
b) Has the timing been clearly established for all milestones?

### Sample of schedule of activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Mnth 1</th>
<th>Mnth 2</th>
<th>Mnth 3</th>
<th>Mnth 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing with NGO staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk study phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews in EU (NGO, donors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field mission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings in the capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to project area 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to project area 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of mission memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of mission workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-briefing with NGO staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of draft report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Waiting for comments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report outline
An outline or table of contents for the evaluation report should be included in the work-plan. Although it will invariably change during the evaluation process, it serves the purpose of indicating what will be covered in the report and gives an idea of how issues will be presented. Formats for reporting are provided in annex 7.
a) Are the key issues of the evaluation taken into account in the report outline?

### 5.4.6 Field work
Once the evaluation manager has accepted the work-plan and the evaluator has revised the documentation available, the field mission is ready to start. It is recommended, however, to have continuous discussions with the evaluation team and, in particular, with the evaluator before making any changes or adaptations to the field mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Mnth 1</th>
<th>Mnth 2</th>
<th>Mnth 3</th>
<th>Mnth 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to make the mission productive, some organisational aspects should be considered before departure to the field. Some of them will also influence the duration of the work in the field in particular when internal travels to visit project sites are difficult.

The purpose of the field mission is to collect information that would not be otherwise available; it also allows the evaluator to gain his/her own perspective of the project.

Field missions typically adopt a mixture of different data and information collection techniques, as well as appraisal methods, which should have been selected during the design of the work-plan, but can be re-adjusted during the work in the field.

Some of the tools for information and data collection, which are likely to be used during the evaluation field missions, are described in the box provided below (see chapter 4 for a more detailed description of these tools and techniques).

The combination of such techniques will largely depend on a number of factors including the purpose of the evaluation, the availability of information and the key persons to be met, the timing of the mission, and the users of the evaluation. Qualitative methods are more time consuming and their use should be carefully assessed.

The importance of involving project partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the evaluation process, mainly at the field level, is now generally recognised. The evaluation manager will have to decide the extent to which it is possible to include stakeholders in the evaluation, and if a participatory evaluation is possible and/or suitable. This decision should be taken when planning the evaluation and will influence all the stages of the evaluation process. Specific guidelines for carrying out participatory evaluations will be provided in the next paragraph.

5.4.7 Reporting

The evaluation report is the most important output of the evaluation process. The evaluator must produce a report that meets the requirements established in the ToRs and the work-plan, while the evaluation manager should ensure that the report meets the contractual obligations and provides a useful response to the evaluation questions.

The purpose of the evaluation report is to give a clear picture of the assessment of the project being evaluated and to bring useful elements for future planning and implementing of interventions.
• What results and objectives were achieved by the project vis-à-vis the expectations? Did the project produce any unexpected result?
• What recommendations would help to improve NGO planning, both specific to the type of project and/or region and more widely?
• What can be learnt from the project that could benefit NGO strategies?

Evaluation reports serve some key functions. These include:

- **Informing NGO management.** The report is primarily intended to inform the NGO management about the findings, conclusions and recommendations arising from the assessment.
- **Advising project staff and coordination offices.** Field operators of the project being evaluated, as well as those who are directly concerned with the project such as the coordinators, need to know how the intervention they are implementing (or they have implemented) is performing and what recommendations have been developed for the future.
- **Demonstrating accountability and transparency.** Donors need to know how they are spending public funds and NGOs need to give evidence of the impact of their interventions. The evaluation report can be an instrument for measuring the appropriateness of resources being used through NGOs.
- **Promoting knowledge and learning.** Through the evaluation process NGOs and major stakeholders can build knowledge about best practices and strengthen their planning and management capacities.

The report should be finalised within the first month after the completion of the mission in the field. A standardised format for the evaluation reports should be used, although the evaluator and the evaluation manager when drawing the work-plan can introduce a number of modifications. Whatever the format, the text should be kept as clear and concise as possible: only relevant information on what has been learnt from the evaluation and recommendations on ways for improving future performance should be included in the report.

The audience of the evaluation should always be kept in mind when writing the report. If it has to be a learning instrument, the contents should be easily understandable also by readers with little or no technical knowledge. A translation, at least of the executive summary, might be necessary to ensure that conclusions and recommendations become accessible to a wider audience.

All evaluation reports should contain the following essential elements (see also annex 7):

- Answer the questions set-out in the ToRs and the evaluation matrix.
- Include an executive summary outlining the major findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Describe the methodology used during the desk study phase and field mission for collecting and analysing data, including the assumptions.
- Provide evidence for the statements and indicate the reliability of data used.
- Present figures, graphs and tables.
- Provide information on any reference included in the report.
- Present a clear structure, including table of contents, executive summary, core text, conclusions and recommendations, and annexes.
5.5 Participatory Evaluation

5.5.1 Participatory methods

This paragraph provides an overview of Participatory Evaluation (PE) characteristics, functions and rationale, as well as its differences with other traditional approaches.

The growing interest in participatory approaches accompanies the increasing attention to issues such as democratisation, partnership, and sustainability. Each of them reflects an attempt to give a greater say to the spectrum of voices in the South not only at the level of national governments, but also at civil society, local institutions and community level.

Moreover, over the past ten years the capacity to engage key stakeholders has become critically linked to the achievement of performance results. Various donors and organisations have been experimenting with the concept of participation, although for most donors, Participatory Evaluation (PE) is relatively new and methods and PE approaches do not seem to have been mainstreamed into operational processes and organisations.

"Participatory evaluation, a dimension of participatory development embodying many of the same concepts, involves the stakeholders and beneficiaries of a programme or project in the collective examination and assessment of that programme or project. It is people-centred: project stakeholders and beneficiaries are the key actors of the evaluation process and not the mere objects of the evaluation" (UNDP-Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning (OESP), 1997.

In this process, local people (stakeholders and beneficiaries) are involved together with NGOs, development agencies and policy makers in order to decide how progress should be measured, and results acted upon.

Beside the definitions, there is no definitive approach to PE. Rather, each evaluation requires a unique response that addresses NGOs/stakeholders expectations, the local contexts, the capacities and abilities of key stakeholders and limiting constraints (e.g. financial, time-related).

Nevertheless, the different approaches to PE share some basic principles that distinguish them from conventional approaches. These include:

1. Participation, which means opening up the design of the process to include major stakeholders, and agreeing to analyse data together.

2. Negotiation, to reach an agreement about what will be monitored and evaluated, how and when data will be collected and analysed, what data actually means, and how findings will be shared and action taken.

3. Learning from experience, which becomes the basis for subsequent improvement and for the adoption of corrective actions.

4. Flexibility, essential because of the changing over time of multiple factors such as the number, role and skills of stakeholders involved in the process, as well as the modification of the external environment.
beginning (e.g. needs identification, implementation, monitoring), and thus this learning process should occur throughout the life of the project. If this is not done, then person responsible for the evaluation will have to involve project recipients at mid-term or at the end of project evaluations.

• It contributes to the development of lessons learnt that can lead to corrective actions for improvements by project recipients. The involvement of stakeholders in problem analysis and in the proposal of solutions establishes stronger partnerships and increases their sense of ownership; in this way the findings and recommendations of the evaluations are much more likely to be taken into account and lead to the introduction of necessary changes.

• It helps in the identification of problems during implementation and provides feedback for lessons learnt that could help project staff to improve project implementation and management decision-making. Although PE also looks into the past, it is typically oriented to the future.

• It ensures accountability to stakeholders, managers and donors by providing relevant and timely information on the degree to which project objectives have been met and on how resources have been used.

PE differs from more conventional evaluations in different ways.

Conventional evaluations have been more donor-driven. The donor is the key client, provides financial support and defines the evaluation’s work plans, while the participation of project stakeholders is minimal. In most cases the stakeholders play a passive role, providing information required by the evaluator(s) but not participating in the evaluation process itself.

Often the evaluations are carried out by external expert(s) more to fulfil donors management or accountability requirements than to respond to project needs.

In PE, the focus and the purpose of the evaluation changes considerably. The emphasis is placed on the process as much as (in some cases even more) on the final output, i.e., the report. The purpose is not to fulfil bureaucratic requirements but also to develop capacities of stakeholders to assess their environment and to act on the basis of such an assessment.

The stakeholders do much more than providing information for external evaluator(s). They also decide on the evaluation work plan, conduct researches, analyse findings and make recommendations. The evaluator(s) of conventional evaluations becomes more a facilitator in PE, animating workshops, guiding the process at critical moments and consolidating/finalising the report on the basis of the findings of the stakeholders.

PE also calls into question the objectivity of scientific inquiries that would provide valid information with the external experts holding the ultimate truth. PE recognises a wider range of knowledge, values and concerns (those of stakeholders) and acknowledges that these should guide the assessment of project performance.
As a result of the active involvement of stakeholders in reflection, assessment and action, a sense of ownership is created, capacities are built, beneficiaries are empowered and lessons learnt are likely to be applied both in the field and at the management level, increasing efficiency and effectiveness.

PE may also have some disadvantages, related in particular with time and costs. If stakeholders have to be involved in a meaningful way, PE is likely to be more time-consuming than conventional evaluations, while additional costs are typically associated with expanded stakeholders’ involvement.

The selection of relevant stakeholders is of vital importance in PE: the potential domination and misuse by some stakeholders to further their own interests are higher than in conventional approaches.

Some critical issues should be considered when planning and managing a PE. These include:

- Whether (all) evaluations should be PE and involve the beneficiaries. There seems to be a growing consensus among NGOs that there are limits to the extent to which it is possible to undertake PE involving the beneficiaries. It is sometimes too ambitious to hope to involve the beneficiaries in an evaluation especially if they have not been involved in either appraisal or ongoing monitoring, and particularly if they have been involved in neither.

- The role that the stakeholders should play in the evaluation process. There is an important difference between PE - where the stakeholders and beneficiaries are involved in the evaluation process – and seeking out the views and opinions of stakeholders as a necessary part of the evaluation process.

- The weight of beneficiaries’ views. Although some NGOs state that the views of the beneficiaries should always take precedence over other views, a more commonly held view is that the opinions of the beneficiaries are extremely important but they should not necessarily be dominant.

### 5.5.2 Carrying out participatory evaluations

Although in the last years the increasing value of engaging key stakeholders in the evaluation process has been widely recognised, there is no definite approach to Participatory Evaluation (PE). In fact, PEs are context-specific and flexible, and the methods adopted to involve stakeholders depend on the project’s end-users.

Depending on the specific context of the project to be evaluated and the region, the demands to which the stakeholders are practically participating in the management plan vary.
5.5.3 Basic questions

Before planning a PE, the evaluation manager may be confronted with a number of questions aimed at determining whether or not a PE is appropriate.

a) For what type of project is a PE relevant?
Projects that have a clearly identified target group, and where the target group has actively participated in project implementation, should be selected.

b) When should a PE be done?
In theory a PE may take place during project implementation (mid-term), at project completion (end-of-project) or 2 years after completion (ex-post). However, since all stakeholders may not be involved with the project after its completion, the level of participation may vary considerably in end-of-project and ex-post evaluations. Moreover, mid-term PE has the advantage of providing the stakeholders with the tools to take different courses of action.

c) How long does a PE take?
Although the duration will be specific to each project, PE typically takes more time than traditional evaluations. Sufficient time should be allowed to plan the evaluation in the field with relevant stakeholders; their commitment from the early stages is very important and adequate time has to be allocated to develop relationships of trust and mutual understanding.

d) What are the key skills and the role of the PE facilitator?
Facilitators should be experienced in education of adults and/or informal training and must be able to work with qualitative methods and group dynamics techniques. The appropriate evaluation method is usually chosen after the facilitator has become familiar with the project’s contents and operational procedures. Facilitators act as a stimulus for the participation of stakeholders in the evaluation process; thus, they must be able to conduct the evaluation without being seen as directing it.

e) Which is the suitable degree of stakeholders’ participation?
Although the degree of participation will depend on a number of factors (e.g. context of the project, existence of baseline data, availability of key stakeholders, external constraints), a minimum level can be identified for the evaluation to be meaningful. Stakeholders should at least participate in defining the key issues and evaluation questions, analysing the findings and formulating recommendations.

f) How should the ToRs be prepared?
Although the ToRs should be kept as flexible as possible in order to allow the facilitator and those who participate in the evaluation process to re-define them once in the field, they must identify key stakeholders. A number of workshops should be included in the ToRs.

5.5.4 Responsibilities

- Evaluation manager
  The evaluation manager is responsible for maintaining the control over the process. He is responsible for the preparation of the ToRs, which should identify key stakeholders, set out their roles and provide indications on the extent of their participation.

- Evaluator/facilitator
  The evaluator/facilitator is charge of managing participatory activities. The work-plan should provide a strategy for the involvement of stakeholders, while during implementation the evaluator/facilitator is expected to maximise stakeholders’ contribution to the development of evaluation results.
5.5.5 Implementation of PE

The steps for implementing PEs are the same as those of more traditional approaches. However, particular attention must be paid on the ways in which stakeholders’ views and expectations can be included in each stage of the evaluation process. The following describes the key steps for increasing stakeholders’ participation.

1. Planning phase
   - Identify key stakeholders and contact them to explain the benefits of PE.
   - Assess the information needs of stakeholders and their availability in participating in the evaluation.
   - Formulate a strategy for stakeholders’ participation setting out the extent of involvement, expectations, responsibilities, activities.
   - Establish how to monitor stakeholders’ participation during the process.
   - Determine the costs associated with stakeholders’ involvement, identifying the different items (workshops, data collection, data analysis, etc).

2. Implementation
   - Organise logistics for the field mission with local communities, keeping in mind that the evaluator/facilitator should live directly with participants during the evaluation process.
   - Arrange an initial workshop with participants to build consensus on the aim of the evaluation and refine the scope of the work (including evaluation questions and methods for data collection) and its agenda.
   - Collect and analyse the information with the stakeholders using participatory methods.
   - Analyse the data through participatory approaches and build consensus on results and major findings.
   - Agree on recommendations, paying attention to the implications of the actions to be taken by stakeholders.

3. Reporting and follow-up
   - Provide feedback on findings to stakeholders and local representatives through a de-briefing.
   - Distribute the evaluation report and ensure that stakeholders receive a copy (a translation may be required).
   - Check if decision-making for the continuation of the project or for future similar initiatives is being informed by evaluation results.

Summary points

- Evaluations should be undertaken on a selective basis.
- The management of an evaluation is an important task at all stages of the evaluation process: the evaluation manager should ensure quality control and dissemination of results.
- Terms of Reference (ToRs) define the management’s requirements and describe the scope, the focus, the methodology and the expected results of the evaluation; the evaluation plan transforms the ToRs into an operational framework and serves as key reference to manage the evaluation.
- Experts undertaking field missions should use a mixture of data and information collection techniques, as well as diversified appraisal methods, and should involve local partners and beneficiaries.
- The evaluation report is the main output of the evaluation process and is needed to inform NGOs’ and projects’ staff, and to promote knowledge and learning.
- Participatory evaluations are important to promote a sense of ownership and to
USE OF RESULTS OF M&E

One of the main purposes of M&E is to enable as many people as possible, within and outside the NGOs, to learn from what has been done with a view to improve future performance. Significant strategic and practical issues that have emerged from M&E (in terms of evaluation findings, methods used, and NGOs’ own practices) have to be highlighted, discussed and disseminated.

However, improved recording and distribution of M&E results will not automatically lead to better performance. Lessons learnt from M&E have to be institutionalised so that they can be applied and have an impact both on the specific project and on other future interventions and strategies. If this does not happen, the resources used in carrying out M&E will have been wasted, and the same mistakes are likely to be repeated in the future.

Specific systems to encourage the institutionalisation of lessons learnt should be developed and measures should be taken to make these systems effective in practice. In particular, NGOs’ senior management needs to actively support the process of learning from experience, recognising that it may imply the allocation of specific resources to the attainment of this purpose.

At the moment there are various factors that affect learning processes arising from M&E activities within NGOs. These include:

- Difficulties in dealing with failure, mainly because failure tends to lead to financial punishment. The link between M&E results and on-going funding tends to inhibit open assessments and the use of M&E results.
- Limited diffusion of an evaluation culture leading to the regular measurement of results as indicators for performance.
- Weaknesses of structures, mainly related to the low level of standardisation of M&E practices and systems, staff turnover in the field, and ‘bureaucratic inertia’.
- Lack of ownership of evaluation findings and recommendations by those who should plan and/or implement future interventions.

6.1 Effective communication

Communication and information sharing is a critical issue for increasing the use of M&E results. Information flows within and between NGOs should be increased. At the moment information circulates mainly within regions (between project staff and coordination offices) and within the same geographical units, while information sharing is very limited between different areas.

In this way, the value of M&E is not optimised. In fact, the full potential offered by M&E results and lessons learnt is only realised if knowledge gained is strategically communicated to influence decision-makers at various levels.

There is no unique way for developing effective communication strategies. By responding to some basic questions, more standardised communication practices can be developed:

- Who are the target audiences of M&E results?
- What information should be shared?
- When should the information be provided?
- How can each target audience be best reached?
M&E results should be shared with those stakeholders who can benefit from lessons learnt. Local partners, whether they have been involved in M&E activities or not, are particularly concerned with this issue, and should be provided with feedback in order to increase their M&E skills and improve their design capacities.

A selection of the information to be disseminated may be necessary: only relevant and useful information for target audiences should be shared, while all information should be recorded for possible consultation on a case-by-case basis.

Information on monitoring results should be disseminated throughout the life of the project, and those on evaluation throughout the evaluation process, in order to inform audiences about what is being found and what directions are being taken.

Information should be framed to be easily accessible, understandable and applicable. This may need sensitivity to local customs and languages.

The strengthening of effective communication practices is the basis for improving the use of M&E results. In this framework, two main elements should be considered:

- The implementation of specific recommendations.
- The dissemination of findings and lessons learnt for future initiatives and organizational learning.

### 6.2 Implementation of specific recommendations

Recommendations arising from monitoring and mid-term evaluations offer the opportunity for introducing remedial actions into on-going projects, while recommendations of end-of project or ex-post evaluations offer the opportunity to improve other projects and future initiatives.

During an evaluation process, evaluation managers must ensure that the quality of the evaluation’s recommendations is up to standard, particularly from the point of view of brevity and clarity. Recommendations must always clearly indicate who should react to them (target audience) and in which timeframe.

Once the evaluation reports are approved, specific tools need to be provided to NGOs’ managers, coordinators and project staff to encourage them to apply M&E recommendations, and ensure follow-up.

For this purpose, NGOs’ managers should fill the table provided below for all evaluation reports and distribute it to all people concerned with planning and implementation of future initiatives.

### Summary table of recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations (as stated in the evaluation report)</th>
<th>Responsibility (managers, coordinators, team leaders)</th>
<th>Deadline (after 3 months, 6 months, 1 year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table based on a model used by the EC (fiche contradictoire)

The target audience of recommendations will be clearly identified and will be responsible for responding to them. NGOs’ managers, in consultation with national/regional coordinators, will then decide the actions to be taken in order to apply the recommendations to new projects or next phases of the projects currently evaluated.
In the case of end-of-project or ex-post evaluations, recommendations should inform planning documents of future initiatives. There should be evidence in the project planning documentation that shows how the recommendations are incorporated into the new or re-formulated project.

Not all the recommendations, however, must or should be implemented. In this sense, a distinction must be made between recommendations arising from monitoring activities and from evaluations, especially if external experts carry them out.

The recommendations arising from monitoring focus on management aspects and come from internal staff, which is supposed to have a deeper knowledge of the project being assessed. On the other hand recommendations from evaluations bring external views based on what the evaluator has learnt during the evaluation process.

The evaluation manager can bring a broader and more strategic point of view that can be influenced by other sources of information or managerial constraints. However, this prerogative should not be used to prevent the target audience from adopting the necessary measures recommended by evaluations when these are supported by evidence.

The following factors can be instrumental in limiting the value of an evaluation:

- The evaluation results and recommendations have no applied value because of ill-conceived evaluation methodology.
- The evaluation results are not pragmatic or realistic given the financial and timing constraints that would obstruct effective implementation.
- Significant changes in the context occurred and have made the evaluation irrelevant.

### 6.3 Dissemination of lessons learnt and information sharing

Feeding back lessons learnt is one of the most important steps of the evaluation process. Lessons learnt from the various stages of the project cycle must be fed into policy and ongoing planning processes to assist in making future project design and management activities more efficient and effective.

The dissemination of lessons learnt, as well as of evaluation methodologies, is important for all evaluations, although results may be particular to projects in specific sectors or geographical areas, or have more general implications for NGOs’ policies and strategies.

Effective dissemination practices must ensure that major findings are available and used for future activities. For this purpose, recording instruments and procedures must be in place in order to make relevant information available to NGOs’ staff.

A database of lessons learnt will be the primary tool for collecting and recording evaluation results at the institutional level. In this way, feedback from NGOs’ projects should be provided to project planners, designers and implementers.

One person among the headquarters staff should be responsible for the maintenance and updating of the database. Monitoring (both coming from the field and from monitoring visits) and evaluation reports, as well as executive summaries and tables with recommendations for each project, will be entered into the database.

NGOs’ managers and/or consultants in charge of planning of new projects should access this database and select the lessons which are relevant for their activities.
Strategy for dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of dissemination</th>
<th>NGO: managers</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Other NGOs</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Local partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring reports</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation reports</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. summaries/abstracts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web sites</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Workshops</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other mechanisms for dissemination of lessons learnt include:
- Distribution of evaluation reports (complete or in a synthetic format) to all national/regional coordinators, local partners and other stakeholders.
- Improvement in the use of intranet information and documentation systems and introduction of all M&E reports in the system.
- Publication of selected evaluation reports (or executive summaries) on the NGOs’ web sites.
- Organisation of seminars and workshops to discuss about lessons learnt and feedback mechanisms.

Checklist of action points to improve lessons learning and information sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Possible actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation managers | • Ensure that the quality of evaluation outputs is up to standard, particularly for brevity and clarity  
• Fill the summary tables with recommendations and make sure they are adequately distributed  
• Consult the database on lessons learnt and apply evaluation results when formulating new projects or new phases of on-going projects  
• Establish a routine of briefing senior management on lessons learnt highlighted by an evaluation, and involve them in the communication of major findings |
| NGOs’ senior staff | • Take steps to increase the space and incentives for learning within the NGO (both from M&E and other sources)  
• Recruit specialist staff where necessary to fill gaps, particularly in communication works |
| Responsible for communication | • Maintain an updated database with M&E reports and lessons learnt and ensure that all staff can access it  
• Make efforts to improve web sites and intranets with M&E results, recognising that ease of access and user-friendliness are key factors |
| National/regional co-ordinators | • Make sure that approved recommendations of mid-term evaluations are effectively taken into account and incorporated into project activities in the field  
• Involve local partners in M&E works and lesson learning processes and push for more ownership and control by local stakeholders  
• Insist on being involved in evaluations right from the beginning of the process, as well as in receiving feedback from evaluation results |

Summary points

✓ Lessons learnt from experience should be institutionalised and used to improve future performance: the lessons learnt database will be the primary tool for collection and recording of results at the institutional level.
✓ Effective communication strategies provide the basis to improve the use of M&E results.
✓ Specific tools need to be provided to NGO staff to improve the use of M&E results.
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Annex 1: GLOSSARY

Please note that this glossary is not to be considered as exhaustive. It should rather be viewed as an attempt to provide Solint members with a same understanding of key terminology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis-à-vis mandated roles and/or plans. For instance, a report to parliament, to a board or a constituency answers to the accountability obligation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>The actions that have to be undertaken to produce the results. They summarise what will be carried out during the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Schedule</td>
<td>A graphic representation setting out the timing, sequence and duration of project activities. It can also be used to identify milestones for monitoring progress and to assign responsibility for achievement of milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Objectives</td>
<td>Identification and verification of future desired benefits to which the beneficiaries attach priority. The output of an analysis of objectives is the objective tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Strategies</td>
<td>Critical assessment of the alternative ways of achieving objectives, and selection of one or more for inclusion in the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>Analysis of a proposed project to determine its merit and acceptability in accordance with established criteria, prior to decision of funding. It checks that the project is feasible against the situation on the ground and that the objectives set remain appropriate and that costs are reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>A process of making judgement on the basis of the analysis of available information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>External factors which could affect the progress or success of the project, but on which the project manager has no direct control. They represent the 4th column of the LogFrame matrix. An external factor is called killing assumption when it has a high probability of occurring, thus causing the failure of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>An assessment that determines whether and to what extent the measures, processes, directives and organisational procedures conform to norms and criteria set out in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline study</td>
<td>The analysis describing the situation prior to receiving aid. It is used to determine the results and accomplishment, and serves as important reference for ex-post evaluation and progress monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Reference point or standard against which a performance can be compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>The individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that ultimately benefit, directly or indirectly from a project/programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
<td>The process through which capacity is created. This is an increasingly important cross cutting issue in poverty reduction interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Compliance with the policies, guidelines, priorities, and approaches set by an institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>A group of people living in the same locality and sharing common characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>A verification that financial documents are exact and expenditures conform to norms and to authorisation procedures (financial control); or a management function to determine if materials conform to technical specifications and to international norms (technical control).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost-benefit analysis</strong></td>
<td>A form of economic analysis that takes into account the benefits and costs in commensurable and actual monetary values and arrives at a single index to determine the value of a project. The financial cost-benefit analysis is made from the perspective of the project; an economic cost-benefit analysis is made from the perspective of the entire economy of which the aid activity is part; a social cost benefit analysis also includes distributional considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost-effectiveness analysis</strong></td>
<td>An economic or social cost-benefit analysis that quantifies benefits without translating them into monetary terms. This analysis allows one to compare alternative ways to accomplish a same objective(s). It also allows the selection of the activity - among those feasible - that will allow the attainment of the objective at the least cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical assumption</strong></td>
<td>An important factor outside management control that can strongly influence the project implementation and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAC Evaluation Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Criteria defined by the Development Aid Committee of OECD and used by the donor community to assess a project/programme performance. They are: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>The degree of achievement of the planned specific objectives and thus the extent to which the beneficiaries have reaped the planned benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Effects** | Intended or unintended changes resulting directly or indirectly from a development intervention.  
*Primary effects*: the changes brought about by an assistance effort to accomplish the specific objective of the intervention.  
*Direct effect*: The immediate costs and benefits of both the contributions to and the results of a project, without taking into consideration their effect on the economy.  
*Indirect effects*: the costs and benefits, which are unleashed by the contributions to a project and by its results.  
*External effects*: the costs and benefits not taken into account in determining the expenditures and financial revenue of the aid programme.  
*Intangible effects*: costs and benefits, which are thought to be pertinent but which cannot be measured and which therefore, cannot be included in the economic analysis. These effects are taken into account by sociological analyses. |
| **Efficiency** | The extent to which project inputs were supplied and managed and activities organised in the most appropriate manner at the least cost to produce the necessary outputs. |
| **Evalability** | The extent to which a project has been designed in such a way as to enable the evaluation of its outputs and impact. |
| **Evaluation** | An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and the fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. There are different kinds of evaluations according to:  
*Timing*: prior to action (ex ante), during it (mid-term), or after completion (ex post).  
*Implementer*: the ones involved in the performed action itself (self or internal) or an external body or consultant (external), or a combination of both.  
*Focus*: on accountability (summative) or on learning, improving performance (formative).  
*Trigger*: evaluation defined, carried out by entities and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and the implementation of the action (independent), or by entities involved in its management or its implementation (dependent). |
### Evaluation

**Additional features:**
- **Driver:** led by donor or partner (*donor-led, partner led*), by several authorities, donors (*joint*), along with stakeholders (*participatory*).
- **Reach:** when limited to one's performed activities (*self*).

### Evaluation Framework study

Assessment conducted at the starting up of the project to verify the conditions for allowing monitoring and evaluation of the project. It includes the revision of data availability and possible collection of baseline data; the final selection of the indicators; the agreement on the targets to be achieved and their measurement on the basis of selected indicators; the selection/provision of tools for data collection according to the selected/available sources of verification.

### Feasibility study

It is an assessment conducted during the appraisal phase to verify whether the proposed project is well founded, and is likely to meet the needs of its intended target groups/beneficiaries. It should take into account all policy, technical, economic, financial, institutional, management, environmental, socio-cultural, gender-related aspects.

### Feedback

A management term which includes: organising evaluation findings to guide future aid programme decision-making; and establishing procedures and necessary measures to deal with weakness found during the M&E activities.

### Gender Analysis

Assessment of the likely differences in the impacts of proposed policies, programmes or projects on women and men. It includes attention to: the different roles; the differential access to and use of resources and their specific needs, interests and problems; and the barrier to the full and equitable participation of women and men in project activities and the equitable distribution of the benefits obtained.

### Hierarchy of objective

A diagrammatic representation of the proposed project interventions planned logically following a problem analysis, and showing a means to ends relationship. Its synonym is the Objective tree.

### Horizontal logic

Indicates the relation between the resources and the results of a project or programme through the identification of objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification for these indicators.

### Impact

The effects of the project on target beneficiaries as well as its wider overall effect on larger numbers of people, within the sector or in a geographic area, in terms of technical, economic, socio-cultural and institutional factors. It relates to the relationship between the project’s purpose and overall objectives.

### Inception Phase

The period from the project start-up until the finalisation of the updating of the work plan, LogFrame Matrix and the evaluation framework study. It extends between one and three months and ends with a first project report.

### Indicator

The measure used to demonstrate the change or the result of a programme.

### Input

Financial, human and material resources required for project / programme implementation.

### Intervention Logic

The strategy underlying the project. It is the narrative description of the project at each of the four levels of the hierarchy of the objectives used in the LogFrame.

### Key informants

People in a community, region, organisation, who, because of their position, are able to provide information or insights on some aspects relevant to the project. These informants play a key role in evaluation, especially in qualitative evaluation, though it is important to bear in mind that they also provide a subjective/one-sided perspective. Therefore the evaluators will have to obtain the information from a large number of key informants.

### Lesson Learned

It is a general hypothesis based on the findings of one or more evaluations, but which is presumed to relate to a general principle that may apply more generally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Logical Framework Approach</strong> (LFA)</th>
<th>A methodology for planning, managing and evaluating programmes and projects involving stakeholder analysis, problem analysis, analysis of objectives, analysis of strategies, preparation of the LogFrame Matrix and activities and resources schedule.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Information System</strong> (MIS)</td>
<td>The creation, through a well designed monitoring system, of a regular feedback to the management at the project and central level on all key aspects of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong></td>
<td>See inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestones</strong></td>
<td>They correspond to the process indicators. They are an indication of short and medium-term objectives (usually activities) which facilitate the measurement of achievements throughout the project rather than just at the end. They also indicate times when decisions should be taken or an action should be finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>A continuing observation function that uses systematic collection of relevant and selected data to provide the management and the main stakeholders of a programme/project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives as well as the process and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective Tree</strong></td>
<td>A diagrammatic representation of the situation in the future once problems have been remedied, following a problem analysis and showing a means to ends relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</strong> (OVI)</td>
<td>Indicators of the different level of objectives, they represent the second column of the LFM. OVI s provide the basis for designing an appropriate monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Results achieved following the delivery of outputs, i.e. changes in behaviour, institutions, economic circumstances that occur in order to satisfy the project purpose. According to some donors outcomes are to be considered as part of the impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>Deliveries, products or services of a project. They are usually tangible and are necessary to realise outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong></td>
<td>It explains why the project is important to the society in terms of long-term benefits to final beneficiaries as well as wider benefits to other groups. It may also help to show how a programme fits into the regional/sectoral policies of the government/organisation concerned and of the donor community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory approach</strong></td>
<td>It refers to the involvement of project participants in the design, monitoring and evaluation of a project. It is particularly suitable for process projects, but requires specific skills to be implemented and is more time consuming than other approaches. On the other hand, the use of participatory approach increases beneficiaries’ ownership and therefore potential sustainability of project results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which a project/organisation operates according to specific guidelines or achieves results in accordance to project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>The process through which overall objective and purpose of a project/programme are set, partners identified, inputs figured out, activities specified and scheduled, monitoring mechanisms defined, so that expected outputs and outcomes might be achieved timely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-conditions</strong></td>
<td>Conditions that have to be met before the project can commence. Typically the existence of funds from the donor agency, or the approval of a specific policy/law by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Analysis</strong></td>
<td>A structured investigation of the negative aspects of a situation in order to establish causes and their effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem tree</strong></td>
<td>A diagrammatic representation of a negative situation, showing a cause-effect relationship. It is the visual result of a problem analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Cycle Management (PCM)

A methodology for the preparation, implementation and evaluation of projects and programmes based on the logical framework approach.

### Project Purpose

It is the central objective of the project and represents what the project is expected to achieve by the end of the project and with the resources available. By achieving its purpose the project contributes to the overall objective.

### Project Strategy

An overall framework of what a project will achieve and how it will be implemented.

### Proxy indicators

An indicator that is used to represent a less easily measurable one.

### Qualitative data

Data that uses non-numeric information for description (e.g. words, photographs and films, audio and recordings, artefacts).

### Qualitative methods

They belong to the social science tradition and are based on the observation of people in their own territory, and interaction with them in their own language, on their own terms. Qualitative methods emphasise understanding reality as the persons being studied construe it. Most qualitative studies rely on descriptive rather numerical or statistical analysis.

### Quantitative data

Information expressed in the form of numbers (ordinal or ratios).

### Quantitative methods

They rely on a structured instrument to collect standardised information on a carefully selected sample of individuals, units, or events. The information is then analysed by statistical comparison between groups or conducted to a multivariate analysis.

### Rapid Appraisal

Methods first developed in agriculture and rural development (where they are known as Rapid Rural Appraisal, RRA) to provide rapid and cost-effective means of assessing the conditions of a community or area at the time a project was planned. Since then, they have been extended to provide a rapid method of impact assessment and are now being used in other sectors such as health and nutrition. They are based on qualitative methods such as observation, semi-structured interviews. Currently one speaks about Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA), which puts more focus on process and ownership of the participants.

### Relevance

The appropriateness of project design to problems to be solved (beneficiaries' needs, country needs) and based on the assumptions.

### Reliability

Consistency or dependability of data used in M&E.

### Results

They are both the outputs and the outcomes of a project. In the EC terminology they represent the product of the activities undertaken, the combination of which leads to the achievement of the purpose of the project.

### Sample

A number of people, households, communities, or other units that have been selected to estimate the characteristics of the population from which the units were drawn. The sample is generally used when carrying out impact evaluations. Sampling methods include:

- **Cluster sample.** Groups selected as blocks, communities, sector or other definable areas. The use of cluster samples reduces the time and cost of data collection, although it might lead to less precise statistical estimates.

- **Purposive sample.** Respondents are selected according to given characteristics that are particularly relevant for the study. It is a very economical way to obtain information, but caution has to be used in making generalisation.

- **Random sample.** Each unit has an equal chance to be selected. Generalisation can be therefore made directly from the sample for the total population without introducing a bias.

- **Stratified sample.** Reduces the number of interviews required to achieve a required level of statistical precision in the estimation of population attributes. The primary units (households, individuals, etc) are classified in groups according to characteristics. For each stratum a sample is extracted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sources of verification</strong></th>
<th>They represent the third column of the LogFrame matrix and indicate where and in what form information on the achievement of the overall objective, the project purpose and the results can be found.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Agencies, organisations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect stake or commitment in the programme/project design, implementation, benefits or in its evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Analysis that involves: the identification of all stakeholder groups likely to be affected by the proposed intervention; the identification and analysis of their interest, problems, potentials, etc. The conclusions of this analysis are then integrated in the project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Whether the benefits, effects generated by a project/programme continue after its termination. The extent to which the groups affected by the aid want and can continue to carry out the activities that are necessary to accomplish the project objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWOT analysis</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of an organisation’s <strong>Strengths</strong>, and <strong>Weaknesses</strong>, and the <strong>Opportunities</strong> and <strong>Threats</strong> that it faces. A tool that can be used during all phases of the project cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>A specified objective that indicates the number, timing and location of what is to be realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group</strong></td>
<td>The specific group for whom the intervention is planned and undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of Reference</strong></td>
<td>The document that defines the tasks required of a contractor and indicates project background and objectives, planned activities, expected inputs and outputs, budget, timetable and job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangulation</strong></td>
<td>The systematic use and comparison of independent information and estimates from different methods of data collection. It is used to increase the degree of confidence in the findings of an evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical logic</strong></td>
<td>It designates the casual relationships between each level of a narrative summary (inputs-activities, activities-results, results-purpose, purpose-overall objective) and the critical assumptions affecting these linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workplan</strong></td>
<td>The schedule that sets out the activities and resources necessary to achieve a project’s results and purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: EXAMPLES OF LOGFRAMES

The LogFrames provided below refer to three different projects.

PROJECT 1

Project Title
Integrated and Community Based Rural Development Projects in three Districts of Amhara Region (Ethiopia)

Background
- The envisaged project will take place in three woredas (districts) of Amhara region (Ethiopia). The project area has been jointly identified by the regional authorities and the NGO on the basis of two main criteria: high degree of food insecurity, lack of other NGO interventions.
- The areas selected are characterised by a generally poor and degraded natural resource base but present untapped sources of water for irrigation purposes. Tourist attractions within the area are not fully exploited and do not benefit the local population.
- The project will take place within a renovated policy framework characterised by: a) a sharpened focus of public spending and donors assistance towards poverty reduction goals; b) an enhanced role of district level institutions in the planning and management of public investments linked to the progressive implementation of the decentralisation reform.

Problem statement
- Poverty and food insecurity prevail in the area with an average of 30% of HHs receiving food assistance for at least 4 months per year.
- Food insecurity is linked to the limited livelihoods basis of the majority of HH (80% of HH depend on rain-fed agriculture). Micro enterprise development opportunities are hindered by lack of access to financial services and business information, and by poor management skills.
- Although poverty is widespread in the three woredas, the feasibility study of the project has allowed the identification of the most vulnerable groups, i.e. landless people and women headed households.
- Vulnerability problems are compounded by inadequate access to basic services, safe water being the most crucial one.
- Aid assistance to the area is mostly food aid related and is managed by local NGOs.
- Mandated line departments are active in the area, but they are faced with difficulties in adapting their work to the on-going decentralisation process and to the progressive phasing out of their implementing role in favour of private sector and non-governmental actors.
- Woreda Councils are increasing their functions and role in the development process but still lack accountability towards local informal organisations.

Project activities
In order to provide sustainable solutions to the problems affecting the area, the project will be articulated along three main activities or sub-sectors, namely:
- The development of non-farm income opportunities through the strengthening of...
2. The creation of community based assets (domestic water supply, small scale irrigation and access roads) through a demand driven micro-projects facility.

3. The dissemination of participatory techniques and the strengthening of grass-root organisations to increase the responsiveness of service providers and decentralised public institutions to the inhabitants of the three woredas.

**Project Duration**

Three years

**Project Monitoring**

Data on indicators for project outputs and outcomes will mainly be originated from mandated institutions records. However the Project will undertake an in depth analysis of the outcomes of the activities in a sample of three villages which will be closely monitored by Project staff.

**Project Log-frames**

Two log-frames are annexed. The first one includes the project in all its three set of activities, whilst the second one refers to a sub-component of result n° 2. The two log-frames could be linked through an interlocking log-frame.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intervention Logic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources of Verification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assumptions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong></td>
<td>To contribute to overall efforts by GoE and donors community to improve food security and reduce poverty in the Country</td>
<td>Poverty and Food Security indicators</td>
<td>Approval and sound implementation of PRSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme purpose</strong></td>
<td>To reduce rural poor vulnerability in three woredas (districts) of Amhara Region through the diversification of economic activities and decentralised planning for socio-economic investments</td>
<td>- Basic health statistics (% water borne diseases, child malnutrition) - % of households receiving food aid (from the current 30% to 15%) - Increased diversification of vulnerable household livelihoods basis</td>
<td>- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED) welfare Monitoring Unit - Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau (DPPB) - A number of mutually reinforcing programmes under implementation - Establishment of a favourable climate to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>1. Non – farm income opportunities developed</td>
<td>- % of small entrepreneurs with access to financial services (from current 5% to 25%) - Nº of registered micro-enterprises (from 30 to 70) - Nº of registered enterprises managed by women (from 2 to 30) - Non-farm sector employment level (from 8% to 20%)</td>
<td>- Micro-finance institutions (MFIs) data - Small Scale Development Agency data - Chambers of Commerce - Ad hoc qualitative surveys - Demand for services sustained by economic growth - Stakeholders’ active participation - Institution capacity building programmes undertaken - Conductive legal and institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Asset creation enhanced at local level (community based micro-projects)</td>
<td>- % of population with access to safe water (from 20 to 35%) - 100 Has under irrigation effectively managed by smallholders - Woreda Budgetary allocation to infrastructure maintenance (from 5,000 Birr to 50,000 Birr)</td>
<td>- Project Monitoring Data - Water Bureau data - Road Authority data - Regional ad Woreda budgets - Ad hoc qualitative surveys - Willingness to pay by stakeholders - Proper implementation of sectoral programmes (water and roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Strengthened local development capacity at Woreda level</td>
<td>- Woreda Development plans quality (e.g. typology of projects with respect to vulnerable groups’ priorities) - % of public investments identified and implemented at local level (from 30 to 70%) - Information dissemination on woreda development plans</td>
<td>- Woreda Budget - Woreda Development plans - Ad hoc qualitative surveys - Decentralisation of management to the local administration - Envisaged local capacity building programmes undertaken - Concern of all interested parties in ensuring effective monitoring of sustainable economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1.1 Orientation training to MFIs staff to provide specific financial services to micro-entrepreneurs</td>
<td>1.2 Provision of credit lines to MFIs to extend its services to micro-entrepreneurs</td>
<td>1.3 Market surveys and needs assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Intervention Logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Project purpose</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce rural poor’s vulnerability to water borne diseases in three woredas (districts) of Amhara Region</td>
<td>To increase poor rural communities’ access to safe water in three woredas of Amhara Region</td>
<td>- Basic Health Statistics on water borne diseases</td>
<td>Health Centre records</td>
<td>A number of mutual programmes under implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- % of rural people in the woreda with access to safe water (from the current 20 to 35%)</td>
<td>- Woreda Water Office records (MIS)</td>
<td>Policy framework and bureau initiatives compatible with the proposed approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Time spent by women in fetching water (from two hours to 30 minutes in the three villages used as baseline reference for monitoring)</td>
<td>- Project monitoring records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Quantity of water used at HH level (from 20 litres to 40 litres)</td>
<td>- Qualitative sampled surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Safe water supply at community level, improved</td>
<td>- 40 operational new water points</td>
<td>- Woreda Water Office records (MIS)</td>
<td>Water considered a priority by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Delivery capacity of water points (2,000 litres per day)</td>
<td>- Project monitoring records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Community based O&amp;M capacities fully developed</td>
<td>- 40 Water Users Committees established</td>
<td>- Woreda Water Office records (MIS)</td>
<td>Willingness to pay by stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community contribution to construction costs and implementation (20% of total costs)</td>
<td>- Project monitoring records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of user fees collected (1 Eth birr per family per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 50% of water points fully maintained at community level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. O&amp;M capacities at Woreda level established</td>
<td>- 10 successful O&amp;M interventions by private sector operator</td>
<td>- Woreda Water Office records (MIS)</td>
<td>Climate conducive to the development of the private sector in community based water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 successful O&amp;M interventions by Woreda Water Office staff</td>
<td>- Project monitoring records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 90% of water points fully maintained at Woreda level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Community water use practices improved</td>
<td>- % of community members making use of safe water for daily use (from 50% to 90% in the reference villages)</td>
<td>- Ad hoc quality surveys</td>
<td>Hygiene measures compatible with local culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- % of communities members adopting appropriate hygiene practices (e.g. washing hands, washing kitchen utensils, etc) (from 20% to 60%)</td>
<td>- Woreda Health Office records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Human resources (provision of expertise)</td>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Community based identification of water points</td>
<td>Investment (vehicles, equipment, offices)</td>
<td>Project Monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Promotion of community contribution to water points construction</td>
<td>Working capital</td>
<td>Woreda line departments reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Selection of user friendly water pumps</td>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>Training reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Tendering of water points construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community level discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Supervision of water points construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Training activities for Water Committee Members, and community mechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Sensitisation of stakeholders on the importance of user fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Training of local mechanics in the installation and maintenance of the typology of pumps promoted by the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Training of Woreda Water Office staff in the management of information related to community based water points status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Refresher training for Woreda Health Office in community communication techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Production of culturally appropriate education materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Training sessions at community level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROJECT 2**

**Project Title**
Support to education and training in Brazilian urban areas

**Back-ground**
- The envisaged project will take place in the favelas of Santo André, an industrial town in the state of Sao Paulo.
- In Santo André the local government has started an urban development pilot initiative that combines infrastructure (transport and social) construction works, low cost housing, and the creation of new income generating opportunities for the people living in the poorest parts of the town.
- The project will take place in the framework of the above-mentioned developed plan.

**Problem statement**
- The education level of children between 12 and 18 year olds who live in the favelas has deteriorated; secondary schools and the last grades of primary school are characterised by low school attendance and high drop-out rates.
- The opportunity-cost of staying in school for the above-mentioned children has decreased due to the presence of easy income generation drug-related activities and to the financial instabilities of households.
- The creation of baby gangs has become a serious problem: criminal acts committed by minors have raised by 30% in the last two years; last year, one out of ten persons treated for gun or knife wounds was a minor.
- Job opportunities for secondary graduated students are very low and the current offer of vocational training does not provide the skills required to access the labour market. In particular a marked lack of training opportunities has been observed in relation to computer literacy, a skill that is in high demand.

**Project activities**
The project will be implemented as a pilot initiative in two of the favelas where the Municipality has started the revitalisation programme. It will foresee the creation of a youth training centres for children between 12 and 18 years old, offering training courses, consultancy services (such as web page design, network creation and maintenance, and software development) for local enterprises, and other activities aimed at supporting the local community.

**Project Duration**
Three years

**Project Monitoring**
The definition of the targets to be achieved shall be defined during the inception phase with the participation of community representatives, schoolmasters, families and students. Provision will made for a mid-term review aimed at assessing the results achieved and at establishing the necessary conditions to ensure the financial viability of the initiative. A final evaluation is foreseen to verify the possibility of replicating the initiative in other favelas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intervention Logic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources of Verification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assumptions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong></td>
<td>To improve the quality of life of children in the favelas of Santo André</td>
<td>Perception of the reduction of violence levels and of increased livelihood opportunities</td>
<td>- Survey within the communities - Interviews with young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme purpose</strong></td>
<td>To create a Youth training centre in the favelas A and B of Santo André in order to increase working opportunities and improve education standards for children abandoning the formal education system.</td>
<td>- At least 50% of children between 12 and 18 years old of the favelas A and B that have abandoned the formal schooling system, have become computer literate</td>
<td>- Final course examination tests for children attending the training centres - Interviews with ex-alumni and training records - Interviews and training centre records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>1. Training centres open to poor children and youths that have abandoned the formal schooling system are set up, and progressively managed by local personnel in a sustainable way.</td>
<td>- By the end of the project, the training centre is entirely managed by local staff able to elaborate the yearly plans and budgets, and ensure the financial viability of the centre</td>
<td>- Training centre management practices, yearly work plan and budget. - Profiles of training staff - Training centre records - Interviews with the training centres staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 90% of the children attending the classes come from the poorest families of the community or have abandoned formal education</td>
<td>- 10% of the children attending the courses go back to the formal education system</td>
<td>- The staff (management and teaching staff) trained by the centres for a period of at least 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 70% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system</td>
<td>- At least 10% of the courses offered by the training centre is included in normal secondary schools</td>
<td>The fees for school courses are sufficiently low to allow participation of children from the poorest families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 50% of children attending the classes and obtaining the diplomas are girls</td>
<td>- Interviews with the training centres staff</td>
<td>There is coordination with initiatives in the favelas to facilitate the participation of the poorest and most disadvantaged groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The centres offer training courses in computer and informatics that respond to the needs arising from the labour market (including different duration)</td>
<td>- A committee with representatives of local enterprises and the community at large is created and provides inputs for curricula development and consultancy activities.</td>
<td>- Training centres’ records - Interviews with members of the newly created committee - Analysis of curricula and course structure - Market analysis report - Interviews with the students - Interviews with local enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- From the second year the school provides at least 4 courses in different subjects and with duration from one week to three months</td>
<td>- The Curricula are developed in order to raise literacy standards of students and to increase responsiveness to the needs expressed by the local labour market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The diplomas offered by the training schools are recognised by the local enterprises</td>
<td>- The diplomas offered by the training centres are recognised by local enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>3. The training centres offer consultancy services in informatics and provide informatics/internet services for the communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Selection and training of local staff in management, internet and informatics consultancy services, and school management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Setting up of training centre management procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 School and computer equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Building refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Advertising campaign to identify the children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Local labour market analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Curricula Development, development of courses content and teaching material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Procurement of textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Identification of clients and definition of the list of services provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Selection and training of students for consultancy activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Identification of consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Setting up an internet point and maintenance activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-conditions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Municipality makes available the buildings for the schools and volunteers to pay the fees for the local staff until the sustainability is achieved by the end of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The revitalisation plan in the fvelas A and B has already started when the project begins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. By the end of second year, at least 50% of the training centres' operational budget is covered by consultancy activities |
| At least 50% of the consultants used have graduated from the training centres' |
| The attendance rate of the internet point opened at the Centre increases by 30% each year |
| By the end of the project, the Centres have agreed with the community representatives a new programme of services and the fee levels and mechanisms to ensure the financial sustainability of the Centres while ensuring attendance by the poorest. |

| 40 m/m of expertise in training centre management and development |
| 24 m/m of teacher training experts |
| 12 m/m of informatics consultancy experts |
| Computers and spare parts |
| School equipment |
| Textbooks |

| Project progress reports |
| School books and management records |

| Active participation of community members |
PROJECT 3

Project Title
Emergency relief and rehabilitation of rural communities affected by natural and man-made disasters in a State of Southern Sudan

Background
• In the last 2 years the project area has been severely affected by drought and recurrent floods;
• The negative effects of the natural disasters have been recently compounded by inter-ethnic conflicts which have caused displacements, massive destruction of assets and losses of lives (particularly of young male heads of households);
• At the moment 50% of the population in the project area is constituted by IDPs.

Problem statement
• Massive displacements and the substantial loss of productive assets is causing a food crisis: over 50% of the population does not have access to food and is on the border of starvation;
• Women and young children are at the moment particularly vulnerable and start to show signs of malnutrition;
• The loss of productive assets (seeds and tools in particular) hamper the re-start of agricultural activities (at the moment only 100 Has are under cultivation whilst cultivable land is 500 Has);
• Agricultural production is also hindered by soil degradation caused by an on-going deforestation process;
• Unreliable rainfall is another negative factor but in the area there is an important irrigation scheme which was abandoned during the ethnic strife and is currently operating at 10% of its capacity (5 Has out of 50 Has) because irrigation channels have been damaged and poorly maintained;
• Irrigated farming appears to be particularly important for women headed HHs who need to invest their limited labour force in activities with higher rates of return per unit of labour.
• Governmental agricultural extension services are quasi-absent in the area because of lack of resources.

Project activities
In order to provide rapid and effective solutions to the emergency problems and to establish the basis for a sustained rehabilitation of rural people’s assets and thus ensure a continuum between relief, rehabilitation and development actions, the project will undertake the following activities:

1. Free distribution of food aid to 50% of the population (IDPs, large families and women headed households) as a short-term measure (two months);
2. Implementation of a food safety initiative for the duration of the project to benefit those groups (elderly, handicapped) who cannot participate in food-for-work activities;
3. Participatory design of a series of micro-projects aimed at rehabilitating community assets;
4. Implementation of micro-projects (SWC and rehabilitation of irrigation channels) through food-for-work activities;
5. Implementation of agricultural training through food for training. Training activities will focus essentially on irrigated agriculture and will be targeted towards women head of HH.
6. Distribution of tools and seeds to farmers.

Project Duration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intervention Logic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources of Verification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assumptions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall objective</strong></td>
<td>The improvement of the living conditions of the rural population of a State in Southern Sudan affected by the civil war</td>
<td>Poverty and economic indicators</td>
<td>Peace prevail in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project purpose</strong></td>
<td>To reduce short-term food insecurity and rehabilitate people’s livelihoods basis</td>
<td>- % of household in need of relief assistance (from 50% to 25%)&lt;br&gt;- Food availability on local markets (from current 20% of demand to 50%)&lt;br&gt;- Food market prices (lower by 20%)</td>
<td>Relief Agencies records&lt;br&gt;- Sample surveys by the project&lt;br&gt;- District Agriculture Office records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>1. Short-term food gaps problems of 7,500 HHs properly addressed</td>
<td>- Children’s nutritional status (from 60% to 25% of chronic malnutrition)</td>
<td>Project monitoring records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Off-seasons agricultural production secured through the rehabilitation of irrigation canals and the distribution of seeds</td>
<td>- Area under irrigation during the dry season (from 5 Ha to 25 Ha)</td>
<td>Project monitoring records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Agricultural production rehabilitated through the distribution of agricultural tools and seeds and SWC measures</td>
<td>- Area under cultivation (from current 100 Has to 300 Has)</td>
<td>District Agricultural Office records&lt;br&gt;- Project monitoring records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Free food aid distribution to vulnerable groups</td>
<td>- Human resources (provision of expertise)&lt;br&gt;- Investment (vehicles, equipment, offices)&lt;br&gt;- Food aid&lt;br&gt;- Seeds&lt;br&gt;- Tools&lt;br&gt;- Working capital&lt;br&gt;- Contingencies</td>
<td>Project Budget&lt;br&gt;- Project Monitoring reports&lt;br&gt;- Community level discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3: LIST OF INDICATORS

#### A. Indicators of progress for international development goals

The international donor community has agreed on a set of development goals for the 21st Century to be used as reference by all development policies. A list of indicators has been also agreed to allow monitoring and evaluation of the progress towards their attainment. The table here below provides the list of the agreed development goals and the selected indicators of progress\(^1\). These indicators should be used as **impact indicators**, when the international development goals are taken as overall objective of a given project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT GOALS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing extreme poverty</td>
<td>- Incidence of Extreme Poverty: Population Below $1 Per Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people living in extreme pov-</td>
<td>- Poverty Gap Ratio: Incidence times Depth of Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erty in developing countries by at least</td>
<td>- Inequality: Poorest Fifth’s Share of National Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-half by 2015</td>
<td>- Child Malnutrition: Prevalence of Underweight Under 5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal primary education</td>
<td>- Net Enrolment in Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be universal primary education</td>
<td>- Completion of 4th Grade of Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in all countries by 2015.</td>
<td>- Literacy Rate of 15 to 24 Year-Olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender equality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards gender equality and the</td>
<td>- Ratio of Girls to Boys in Primary &amp; Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowerment of women should be demon-</td>
<td>- Ratio of Literate Females to Males (15 to 24 Year-Olds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strated by eliminating gender disparity in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary and secondary education by 2005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infant &amp; child mortality</strong></td>
<td>- Infant Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The death rates for infants and children</td>
<td>- Under 5 Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under the age of five years should be re-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duced in each developing country by two-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirds the 1990 level by 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal mortality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rate of maternal mortality should be</td>
<td>- Maternal Mortality Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced by three-fourths between 1990 and</td>
<td>- Births Attended by Skilled Health Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reproductive health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access should be available through the</td>
<td>- Contraceptive Prevalence Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary health-care system to reproductive</td>
<td>- HIV Prevalence in 15 to 24 Year-Old Pregnant Women(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health services for all individuals of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate ages, no later than the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Environmental sustainability and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regeneration**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>- Countries with effective processes for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a current national strategy</td>
<td>- Population with [sustainable] Access to Safe Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for sustainable development, in the process</td>
<td>- Forest Area as a % of National Surface Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of implementation, in every country by</td>
<td>- Biodiversity: Land Area Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005, so as to ensure that current trends in</td>
<td>- Energy Efficiency: GDP per Unit of Energy Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the loss of environmental resources are</td>
<td>- Carbon Dioxide Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively reversed at both global and na-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional levels by 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other General Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Population</td>
<td>- Adult Literacy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gross National Product</td>
<td>- Total Fertility Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GNP per Capita</td>
<td>- Life Expectancy at Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aid as % of GNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- External Debt as % of GNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Investment as % of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trade as % of GDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Additional methodological information about the indicators, as well as some charts and data are available
B. Participation indicators

Participation indicators can be quantitative or qualitative. The quantitative indicators can be easily measured and are usually preferred, especially when elaborating a project framework (i.e. the LFM). These indicators are suitable when talking about outputs. However, the use of qualitative indicators may be more appropriate at project purpose level, especially when participation is an end in itself (i.e. when the success of a project depends on the participants empowerment).

Quantitative indicators of participation can be used to monitor the process. Once proper tools for data collection and recording have been agreed upon with project stakeholders, their verification can be easily carried out given that the project coordinator can record the necessary data for their calculation during implementation.

Qualitative indicators of participation describe aspects of the participation that cannot be captured with a number. They shall be used to monitor the degree of achievement of the project purpose, for instance during field visits, mid-term reviews, or end of project evaluations.

Since they use data that takes the form of are descriptive statements, or observations of behaviour, qualitative indicators they carry a subjective judgement and are influenced by the context and people involved in their measurement. Therefore, their measurement should be carried out by experienced people external to the project, possibly acting as facilitators rather than as evaluators.

Here below is a list of possible aspects referring to the two categories of indicators, and how possible means to they can be measured them. The list can be used to identify establish what the data to be collected at project level and which the aspects to be assessed during a field monitoring visit, mid-term review, etc.

### Quantitative dimension of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Possible measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is participating?</td>
<td>- # of women / men participating&lt;br&gt;- # or % of most vulnerable people&lt;br&gt;- # of people from different ethnic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many people are participating?</td>
<td>- # of groups / local institutions established&lt;br&gt;- # of members&lt;br&gt;- Growth rate of membership&lt;br&gt;- Drop-out rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the level of participation in key activities?</td>
<td>- # of people attending workshops, training sessions, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are participants mobilising their own resources?</td>
<td>- # of labour days / construction materials / tools / money, contributed by users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are project investments / installations maintained?</td>
<td>- # of schools / health centres maintained&lt;br&gt;- # of water points operating&lt;br&gt;- Trial plots cultivated / tree nurseries managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are local institutions developing / becoming self-sufficient?</td>
<td>- Frequency of group meetings&lt;br&gt;- # of members attending meetings (gender, economic status, ...)&lt;br&gt;- Reduced reliance on project staff&lt;br&gt;- # of independent actions undertaken by the local group/institution&lt;br&gt;- # of micro-projects plans / work-plans, drawn up independently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Qualitative dimension of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
<th>Possible measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How are groups expected to achieve stability and self-reliance? | - The effective allocation of special roles and functions amongst group members;  
- The rotation of leadership roles over time;  
- Evidence of reduced reliance on project staff;  
- Increased level of managerial and technical competence in maintaining installations;  
- Evidence of independent collective actions taken by group to further project purpose;  
- Evidence of effectiveness of participants’ modifications to inputs of project and staff guidance to suit local conditions; |
| What capabilities are participating groups being encouraged to develop? | - Decision-making;  
- Managerial roles;  
- The ability to analyse and identify local needs and opportunities;  
- The realistic prioritisation of opportunities;  
- The ability to draw up micro-plans and annual workplans;  
- The ability to self-monitor their own activities and progress; |
| What are the expected qualities of participants’ contributions? | - High levels of skills for maintaining project installations;  
- Effective use of indigenous technical knowledge in relevant activities such as on-farm trials;  
- Provision of high quality materials for communally constructed buildings; |
| What behavioural characteristics are groups and participants expected to display? | - High level of involvement of all group members in meetings and discussions;  
- Evidence of consensual decision-making;  
- Speed of arriving at decisions;  
- Increasing evidence of collective identity and solidarity;  
- Confidence in expressing their opinions and needs;  
- Active involvement in decision making process; |

A way to combine the two dimensions of participation is to use together both the index of participation (quantitative measures) and the socio-institutional maturity index (qualitative). For instance in an NGO project aimed at community development, the following can list represents the key aspects (quantitative and qualitative) to be taken into consideration:

- a. Number of groups formed  
- b. Number and low drop out of members  
- c. Frequency of, and attendance at meetings  
- d. Number of groups forming cluster links with others  
- e. Attendance of group members at leadership and skills training workshops  
- f. Members labour and material contributions to group activities  
- g. Democratic changes in leadership over time (elections)  
- h. Consensual production of micro-plan and implementation workplans  
- i. Evidence that workplans have been adhered to and the specified outputs achieved  
- j. Effective applications of skills to maintain group assets in working order (buildings, machines, water supply installations etc)  
- k. Mutual support between group members in non-project activities  
- l. Examples of collective bargaining with local elites
## C. Key questions for the identification of indicators

Here below a list of key questions that should guide the main stakeholders in the definition of the **indicators of outcome, outputs, process** that altogether lead to successful projects. Concrete examples of indicators in correspondence to the key questions are provided drawing from the LogFrames presented in Annex 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY QUESTION</th>
<th>EX. FOR WATER SECTOR</th>
<th>EX. FOR EDUCATION SECTOR</th>
<th>EX. FOR EMERGENCY RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PURPOSE:</strong></td>
<td>How has the project improved access to safe water for the intended beneficiaries?</td>
<td>How has the existence of the training centre improved the education standards and job opportunities of the intended beneficiaries?</td>
<td>How has the project contributed to the reduction of short-term food insecurity and to the rehabilitation of people's livelihoods basis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Increased % of rural people in the Woreda with access to safe water (from the current 20 to 35%)</td>
<td>At least 50 % of children between 12 and 18 years old of the favelas A and B that have abandoned the formal schooling system, have become computer literate</td>
<td>Reduced % of households needing relief assistance (from 50% to 25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible outcome indicators</td>
<td>- Reduced time spent by women in fetching water (from two hours to 30 minutes) in the three villages used as base line-reference for monitoring</td>
<td>- At least 50 % of children between 15 and 18 years old have found a job following the participation to the courses offered by the centre</td>
<td>- Improved food availability on local markets (from current 20% of demand to 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased quantity of water used at HH level (from 20 litres to 40 litres)</td>
<td>- 10% of the children attending the courses go back to the formal education system</td>
<td>- Lower food market prices (lower by 20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 1 of the courses offered by the training centre is included in normal secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY QUESTION</td>
<td>EX. FOR WATER SECTOR</td>
<td>EX. FOR EDUCATION SECTOR</td>
<td>EX. FOR EMERGENCY SECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULTS:</strong></td>
<td>Question Possible output indicators</td>
<td>Question Possible output indicators</td>
<td>Question Possible output indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How are the physical achievements used/how do they work?</td>
<td>- Has water supply at community level improved?</td>
<td>- Do the intended beneficiaries attend the training centre?</td>
<td>- Has access to food in the project areas improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are the services/products delivered working and used as planned?</td>
<td>- Delivery capacity of water points (2,000 litres per day)</td>
<td>- 90% of the children attending the classes come from the poorest families of the community or have abandoned formal education</td>
<td>- Area under irrigation during the dry season (from 0 to 25 Ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Who uses the services and the products?</td>
<td>- Community contribution to construction costs and implementation (20% of total costs)</td>
<td>- 50% of children attending the classes and obtaining the diplomas are girls. At least 70% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system.</td>
<td>- Area under cultivation (from current 100 Has to 300 Has)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What capacities have been created / improved through the delivery of the services/products?</td>
<td>- Level of user fees collected (1 Eth birr per family per week)</td>
<td>- By the end of the project, the training centre is entirely managed by local staff able to elaborate the yearly plans and budgets ensure the financial viability of the centre.</td>
<td>- Increased agricultural production (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How has the organisational system/structure changed?</td>
<td>- 50% of water points fully maintained at community level</td>
<td>- At least 70% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system.</td>
<td>- A committee with representatives of local enterprises and the community is created and provides inputs for curricula development and consultancy activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will the services/products continue beyond the project duration?</td>
<td>- Type and quality of O&amp;M operations undertaken at community level</td>
<td>- By the end of second year, there is at least 50% of the training centre operational budget that is covered by consultancy activities.</td>
<td>- Increased productivity (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of water points fully maintained at community level</td>
<td>- At least 50% of the consultants used are graduated from the centres’ training courses.</td>
<td>- Area under cultivation (from current 100 Has to 300 Has)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have O&amp;M capacities at Woreda level been established?</td>
<td>- A committee with representatives of local enterprises and the community is created and provides inputs for curricula development and consultancy activities.</td>
<td>- Area under cultivation (from current 100 Has to 300 Has)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 successful O&amp;M interventions by Woreda Water Office staff</td>
<td>- 90% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system.</td>
<td>- Increased agricultural production (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 successful O&amp;M interventions by private sector operator</td>
<td>- 90% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system.</td>
<td>- Area under irrigation during the dry season (from 0 to 25 Ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 90% of water points fully maintained at woreda level</td>
<td>- 50% of children attending the classes and obtaining the diplomas are girls. At least 70% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system.</td>
<td>- Area under cultivation (from current 100 Has to 300 Has)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Availability of spare parts on the local markets</td>
<td>- By the end of the project, the training centre is entirely managed by local staff able to elaborate the yearly plans and budgets ensure the financial viability of the centre.</td>
<td>- Increased agricultural production (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How is the centre working?</td>
<td>- At least 70% of the children obtaining the courses diplomas come from the poorest families and have abandoned the formal schooling system.</td>
<td>- Area under irrigation during the dry season (from 0 to 25 Ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What capacities have been created?</td>
<td>- By the end of second year, there is at least 50% of the training centre operational budget that is covered by consultancy activities.</td>
<td>- Increased agricultural production (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What organisational changes have been brought?</td>
<td>- At least 50% of the consultants used are graduated from the centres’ training courses.</td>
<td>- A committee with representatives of local enterprises and the community is created and provides inputs for curricula development and consultancy activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY QUESTION</td>
<td>EX. FOR WATER SECTOR</td>
<td>EX. FOR EDUCATION SECTOR</td>
<td>EX. FOR EMERGENCY SECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are the services/products delivered/created as planned?</td>
<td>What are the physical achievements?</td>
<td>What are the physical achievements?</td>
<td>What are the physical achievements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the physical achievements?</td>
<td>Nº of operational water points</td>
<td>From the second year the school provides at least 4 courses in different subjects and with duration from 1 week to three months.</td>
<td>From rehabilitation canals (# of meters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has water supply been increased as planned?</td>
<td># of Water Users Committees established</td>
<td>The Curricula are developed in order to raise literacy standards of students and to increase responsiveness to the needs expressed by the local labour market</td>
<td>Training sessions carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nº of operational water points</td>
<td>What are the physical achievements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of Water Users Committees established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is an additional list of key questions that should guide the main stakeholders in the definition of the **indicators of outcome, outputs and process** for emergency projects. Concrete examples of indicators in correspondence to the key questions are provided.

### Distribution of Dry and/or Wet Rations to Populations at Risk

**Purpose:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Possible Question(s)</th>
<th>Possible outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are effects of the beneficiaries’ access to / use of / satisfaction with the goods / services provided? | - How has the distribution of dry and/or wet food rations contributed to the reduction of mortality / malnutrition rates among the targeted population? | - Crude mortality rates for men, women, mothers and children (# of deaths per 1,000 reduced by X in a given period)  
- Malnutrition rates of target population (by sex, age group, ethnic group, etc) (maintained / reduced at X)  
- % of targeted children under age of 5 suffering from malnutrition (reduced by X)  
- % of HH income of target population spent on food (decrease by X) |
| - How has the distribution of dry and/or wet food rations influenced the survival / coping strategies of the targeted population? | - % people targeted men, women and children who have remained in, or moved to, the appropriate locations (X%)  
- # and rate of people graduating from the programme (X and X% people that no longer meet the eligibility criteria)  
- % of target population selling off assets (decrease by X)  
- % change in HHs exhibiting “negative” coping behaviours (decrease by X) | |

### Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Possible question(s)</th>
<th>Possible output indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Who uses the services and products delivered?                              | - Who receives the dry and/or wet food rations?                                      | - # of men, women, and children who have received food rations  
- How and when are the services and products delivered?  
- Are the food rations delivered in a timely and efficient manner? | - # of food rations provided per day  
- Timeliness of delivery of food rations |

### Activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Possible question</th>
<th>Possible process indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Are the services/products delivered/created as planned?                    | - Are the dry and/or wet food rations delivered as planned?                        | - # of women and men receiving food rations at the distribution point  
- Operation implemented according to original plan  
- Operation resources as planned  
- Operation implemented within approved budget |

# Support the Rehabilitation of Essential Assets: Rehabilitation of Rural Roads through FFW

## Purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Possible Question(s)</th>
<th>Possible outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are effects of the beneficiaries' access to / use of / satisfaction with the goods / services provided? | - How has the project contributed to the reduction of food insecurity and to the rehabilitation of people's livelihoods basis? | - Reduced malnutrition rates of target population (by sex, age group, ethnic group, etc)  
- % of targeted children under age of 5 suffering from malnutrition (reduced by x)  
- % increase of HH income by FFW participants |

## Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Possible Question(s)</th>
<th>Possible output indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What capacities/physical achievements have been created / improved through the delivery of the services/products? | - Has access to food in the target area improved, and for whom?  
- Have local structures/capacities been reinforced / created? | - % of HH income by male/female-headed HH spent on food  
- Improved variety of local food consumption/diets  
- Improved food availability on local markets (from X% of demand to 50%)  
- Reduced travel time to local markets  
- Reduced transportation costs to local markets  
- # of community associations involved in FFW  
- # of men and women on decision-making committees  
- # of men and women with increased knowledge on maintenance practices |

## Activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Possible process indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Are the services /products delivered/created as planned?  
- What are the physical achievements? | - Are the products (food rations & tools) delivered as planned?  
- How many Km of rural roads have been rehabilitated? | - # of men and women who have received food rations in return for activity  
- # of daily participants of FFW activities  
- # of other beneficiaries of FFW activities  
- Amount and type of other inputs distributed, e.g. tools  
- # of Km of rural roads rehabilitated |
## Annex 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation Review</strong></td>
<td>Review of existing documents (project / mission reports, country reports, statistical data, etc).</td>
<td>Understand the historical evolution and performance of a project/programme, as well as the background setting of the project.</td>
<td>Availability, accessibility and reliability of information contained in the documents.</td>
<td>Provides a good starting point. The information collected can integrate or substitute a baseline data.</td>
<td>Possibility of bias, depending on how &amp; who collected/presented the information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation</strong></td>
<td>Observing what people do, their settings, behaviour, interactions, as well as physical and social assets.</td>
<td>Complement other techniques and gain an understanding of the context in which the project takes place.</td>
<td>It generally requires less skills and time than other methods.</td>
<td>Fairly simple although it should be structured to enhance its effectiveness (e.g. use of tools to record the results of the observation).</td>
<td>May be biased, people who might change their behaviour. It is highly subjective and needs to be verified through other methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong></td>
<td>Use of a sequence of questions requiring an open-ended answer.</td>
<td>Gain information on the person's perception about one or more topics. Very useful to gain an in-depth understanding of qualitative issues.</td>
<td>High sensitivity and skills (questions formulated so as to encourage discussion, taking accurate and useful notes).</td>
<td>Allows understanding the point of view of local actors (their perception and opinions). Can rapidly get inside information.</td>
<td>The interview may be conducted by other methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-ended</strong></td>
<td>Use of structured survey formats / questionnaires, i.e. set of closed questions, e.g. yes/no, categorical answer (male/female), multiple choice or answer expressed by a number (time period, distance, land size, yield, etc).</td>
<td>Gain quantitative data on pre-defined topics from a large number of people. Allow the collection of data for statistical analysis.</td>
<td>High skills in the definition of the questionnaire (questions worded properly, can be analysed easily, etc.). Requires time for pre-testing and training of surveyors.</td>
<td>Rapid collection of information in the field. Allows to collect information from large numbers of people. The surveyor needs less skills that the interviewer.</td>
<td>Provides little, if any, insight into how people feel (their perceptions and opinions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close-ended (Survey)</strong></td>
<td>Use of structured survey formats / questionnaires, i.e. set of closed questions, e.g. yes/no, categorical answer (male/female), multiple choice or answer expressed by a number (time period, distance, land size, yield, etc).</td>
<td>Gain quantitative data on pre-defined topics from a large number of people. Allow the collection of data for statistical analysis.</td>
<td>High skills in the definition of the questionnaire (questions worded properly, can be analysed easily, etc.). Requires time for pre-testing and training of surveyors.</td>
<td>Rapid collection of information in the field. Allows to collect information from large numbers of people. The surveyor needs less skills that the interviewer.</td>
<td>Provides little, if any, insight into how people feel (their perceptions and opinions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Interviews / Discussions</strong></td>
<td>Semi-formal discussions based on a pre-defined set of topics, through the use of broad questions.</td>
<td>To collect general information, clarify and/or gather opinions about one or more specific issues. Gain qualitative information (perceptions, behaviour, attitudes).</td>
<td>Skills needed in setting the topics and good facilitation skills (moderating the group and recording responses).</td>
<td>It provides opinions of different people and enables a direct view of differences and similarities of opinions. Relatively inexpensive and rapid.</td>
<td>Easily dominated by one or two participants; unlikely to generate sensitive personal data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group Discussions (6-12 people)</strong></td>
<td>Semi-formal discussions based on a pre-defined set of topics, through the use of broad questions.</td>
<td>To collect general information, clarify and/or gather opinions about one or more specific issues. Gain qualitative information (perceptions, behaviour, attitudes).</td>
<td>Skills needed in setting the topics and good facilitation skills (moderating the group and recording responses).</td>
<td>It provides opinions of different people and enables a direct view of differences and similarities of opinions. Relatively inexpensive and rapid.</td>
<td>Easily dominated by one or two participants; unlikely to generate sensitive personal data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Use of broad questions in a formal setting; may be guided by a semi-structured questionnaire.</td>
<td>Gain qualitative information on one or more specific issues.</td>
<td>Need of a meeting place, requires mobilisation of the community. Good facilitation skills.</td>
<td>Good for brainstorming and likely to generate – though indirectly - information on group dynamics (e.g. power relations within the community).</td>
<td>Very easily dominated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: MONITORING REPORTS FORMATS

1. Check-list for re-assessment during the inception phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Group(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group(s) identification and selection</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group(s) needs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for involvement of target group(s)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders importance</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for involvement of stakeholders</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs and constraints of the targeted region</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LogFrame Matrix</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem analysis</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective analysis</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption and external risks</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of indicators</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages with other interventions</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities scheduled</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results planned</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation and management capacities</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and non physical means</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology to be used</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project location</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable, costs and financing plan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Quarterly flash Report Format

### Part A – Level of activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Country/Region:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Duration:</td>
<td>Report No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report Prepared by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints/Problems:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions recommended:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means planned and used:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints/Problems:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions recommended:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities planned and implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part B – Level of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of/Progress towards result:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Constraints:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of/Progress towards result:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress against indicators:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part C – Progress towards sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership by beneficiaries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional and management capacities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coherence and complementarity with other interventions in the same region:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part D – Conclusions and recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall conclusions on implementation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main problems/constraints:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress towards the achievement of objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for the next implementation period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the heads of project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the managers and desk officers at the headquarters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the central administration:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Field visit Report Format

#### Part A – Review of LogFrame Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the planned <em>activities</em> adequate to achieve the results and purposes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the <em>purposes</em> correctly determined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the <em>objectives</em> correctly determined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the <em>risks and assumptions</em> adequately identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capacity of project to adapt to changes during implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well did project adapt to <em>changing needs</em>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well did project adapt to <em>other external changes</em>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a = excellent; b = good; c = satisfactory overall; d = problems; e = weak

**Overall Conclusion:**

#### Part B – Efficiency of implementation to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have project means been acquired on time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have project means been acquired at planned cost?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have project means been well managed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activities planned and implemented**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Have project activities been implemented at planned cost? | 
Have project activities been well managed? | 
Note: a = excellent; b = good; c = satisfactory overall; d = problems; e = weak | **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Part C – Effectiveness to date**

| PROJECT TITLE | COUNTRY/REGION: | 
| TOTAL DURATION | MONITORING VISIT DATE | REPORT PREPARED BY: |

**ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have planned results been achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have results been achieved within timeframe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENEFICIARIES ACCESS TO AND SATISFACTION WITH RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have planned beneficiaries access to project results and services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are planned beneficiaries using the project results and services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the planned beneficiaries satisfied with project results and services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Note: a = excellent; b = good; c = satisfactory overall; d = problems; e = weak

**Part D – Impact to date**

| PROJECT TITLE | COUNTRY/REGION: | 
| TOTAL DURATION | MONITORING VISIT DATE | REPORT PREPARED BY: |

**PROGRESS TOWARDS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF PLANNED OVERALL OBJECTIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project contributing to the achievement of planned overall objective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the project generated unexpected effects, how do you judge these effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How well is the project adapting to any external factors?

Is the project coherent and coordinated with other interventions in the same region?

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Note: a = excellent; b = good; c = satisfactory overall; d = problems; e = weak

---

**Part E – Progress towards sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How far is the project embedded in local structures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the local partners being trained for the handing over of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF TECHNOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the technology adopted by project understandable and easy to use by local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it maximise the use of local resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIO-CULTURAL AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project respect local customs and, if changes have been made, how have they been accepted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project acknowledge gender roles and related needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the project produced, or is it likely to produce, and environmental damage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the results sustainable for the beneficiaries after project completion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has any institutional agreement been made to ensure the availability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part F – Conclusions and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance and quality of design</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project performance in the implementation of activities</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of results</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction of beneficiaries with results</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of specific objectives</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards the achievement of overall objective</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sustainability</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL CONCLUSIONS:**

**MAIN PROBLEMS/CONSTRAINTS:**

**PROGRESS TOWARDS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES:**

**Recommendations for the next implementation period**

For national/regional coordinators:

For the heads of project:

For the desk officers:

For the central administration:

For the board of directors:

---

**Ratings guide**

(A) EXCELLENT. Over and above normal good practice, something particularly innovative. Project considered as a model to follow.

(B) GOOD. Fully satisfies all requirements: there are only a few minor weaknesses.

(C) SATISFACTORY OVERALL. There are weaknesses as well as strengths: the weaknesses are not severe enough to threaten the project.

(D) PROBLEMS. There are serious weaknesses although other aspects may be satisfactory: early action is required if the project is to continue to progress.
Annex 6: EXAMPLE OF TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION

TITLE OF THE EVALUATION

The title should already indicate the object of the evaluation and possibly whether is a mid-term, final, impact evaluation.

Ex:

a. MID TERM REVIEW OF THE PANAFRICAN PROGRAM FOR THE CONTROL OF EPIZOOTIC DISEASES
b. EVALUATION OF THE EDUCATION SECTOR OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AID TO ACP COUNTRIES
c. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR IMPACT EVALUATION OF CDP (Community Development Programme in Kenya)

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

It indicates what has to be evaluated (it could be a country, a sector, a theme, a programme, or a project), the period to be taken into account and the geographical coverage, the financial amount involved.

Ex:

The PACE programme is a major development programme financed by the EDF in the field of animal health in Africa, reaching 32 African countries. The Programme started on November 1st, 1999, and countries started the implementation of their PACE national projects from the summer of 2000. After two years of implementation, a mid term review is commissioned, as foreseen in the Financing agreement.

This evaluation should cover EC support to education and training activities in ACP developing countries, with an emphasis on the years 1993-98, and take into account the evolution of priorities over time (7th and 8th EDF).

OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

It indicates why the evaluation is carried out. This can be, to improve the programme, to assess the outcomes, to verify the evolution and the results, to assess how an instrument works.

Ex:

a. The objectives of the Mid Term Review are to:
   - Analyse the coherence and the relevance of the objectives of the PACE programme
   - Analyse the strategy adopted during the project implementation
   - Analyse the results and the impact of the project so far
   - Formulate recommendations for the remaining period of the programme.

b. The objectives for this evaluation are to analyse the evolution in orientation, volume, coverage (types, target levels, geographically) and modalities of EC support to E&T activities, and to assess its quality in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Based on this assessment, and taking into account the current re-
c. There is a need to carry out an impact evaluation study of the first phase of the “Community Development Programme” (CDP1) to obtain a better understanding as to how far the programme has achieved its goals and objectives. The results shall assist the management to improve effectiveness during the second phase of the programme (CDP2), especially in relation to targeting of poverty reduction initiatives.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In this section the information about the object of the evaluation is provided. This includes: the project rationale; objective; geographical coverage; components; results; main actions; management and organisational structure; main stakeholders; implementing agency; local counterpart(s); participants; costs and duration. This section should be maximum 1 page.

Ex:

The PACE program is an on-going 5 years programme financed with EDF regional funds. The financing agreement was signed in August 1999 for an amount of 72,000,000 EURO. A number of European Member States have made additional financial contribution to the EDF resources of PACE (UK, France, Italy). They are providing technical assistance, additional funds for specific countries, or a ‘project within a project’ (CAPE).

The PACE programme aims at building upon the headway made in the campaign against rinder pest in order to establish lower-cost national and continental epidemiological surveillance networks for the main animal diseases, provide the countries with the capacities needed to organise economically and technically justified control programmes and develop effective and sustainable distribution of veterinary products and services.

A more detailed description of the programme are presented in annex A. The programme includes national operations planned and implemented in each country and also sub-regional and regional support and coordination components.

The PACE programme covers 32 sub-Saharan Africa countries. The national projects are ‘consolidated’ in a regional Work programme signed by the RAO and endorsed by the lead delegation every 6 months in batches. In November 2001, almost all PACE country projects have their first or second annual work programmes approved, and have consequently started implementation (Annex B). Exceptions relate to countries where EU development cooperation is suspended, and to Northern Sudan where implementation is linked to the recruitment of technical assistants for the PACE national programmes, which is not yet conducted. The Coordination Unit has prepared a manual of procedures for the management of the National projects early 2000.

PACE is coordinated by the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR) of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU/IBAR), where Common services are also set. The organisational chart of the programme include a Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) in Nairobi and two Regional Coordination Units, in Bamako for West and Central Africa and Nairobi for Eastern Africa. Regional coordination aim at minimising duplication of effort and at harmonising the different national activities within the PACE programme. In December 2000, this structure was fully staffed. Several changes in Technical assistance have occurred, including the main Technical assistant to the Programme.

A backstopping mission to the management of the PACE Coordination unit has been undertaken in December 2001. The backstopping mission made recommendations to improve the efficiency between the Coordination Unit and the regional coordination units, the Common Technical Services, the Regional Authorising Officer and the Lead EC Delegation.
FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

This is often also called issued to be studied. It includes the description of the specific issues that will have to be covered by the evaluation; i.e. specific aspects within the evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. For each evaluation the issues will be different, but they usually cover the following aspects:

- **Analysis of the intervention logic:** relevance of the project with respect to the needs and coherence and coordination with respect to other interventions; appropriateness of the choice of participants and beneficiaries; the appraisal of the assumptions; analysis of the current situation and changes occurred.

- **Project design:** the involvement of the stakeholders; the structure and components of the project; the feasibility of the project with respect to the inputs, the timing, the type of resources requested and made available.

- **The implementation process:** the organisation’s settings and management structure; the adaptability to changes in the general situation; the use of resources; coordination and consultation mechanisms; monitoring system.

- **The local counterparts and other stakeholders:** their participation in the implementation process, the role covered, the type of cooperation; the organisational and capacity changes; the ownership of the results.

- **The results and their sustainability:** the degree of realisation; their capacity in eliminating the cause of the problem; the appropriateness of the changes and the need for re-orientation; the changes produced on a larger target group; the unexpected changes; the results’ replicability and dissemination potential.

METHODOLOGY

This part should give clarify the methodological issues that the evaluator manager wants to be taken into consideration. For instance, whether participatory methods should be used; whether the sampling should take into account specific issues; or whether the evaluation should use quantitative rather than qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. This section will also describe the evaluation phases, which usually are: a desk review of the documentation; field visits and report writing. This section should also indicate if there are specific consultation mechanisms, and whether the work should include also the dissemination of the evaluation results (for instance in a workshop).

**Ex:**

a. The study will initially largely concentrate on countries in Southern and Easter Africa, in particular Zambia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, and in the Caribbean: Jamaica. Also the regional programmes in those areas will be analysed (e.g. SADC, "West Indies"). However, it is not excluded that at a later stage other countries and regions (e.g. West Africa) will be considered. In this perspective, the results to be obtained from the initial series of country studies will be very relevant.

b. The consultant’s should review the key project documents including the Financing Proposal, Project Financing Agreements, the project evaluation report, which developed the new approach to Microprojects, the internal management guidelines and the projects work plans and reports. The consultants should also review minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings and project monitoring meetings with the District level personnel. They should review as well the recommendations of the Fiscal Decentralization Study, which should be implemented by MOPFED from next financial year and the recommendations of the study on the “Links between the Local Government Development Programme..."
d. To conduct this assignment, the consultants will undertake the following visits:

- OAU/IBAR office in Nairobi, where the team will be based.
- PACE coordination Unit in Bamako.
- The Delegation of the EC in Kenya.
- A sample of PACE countries (representative of the different ‘batches’ of national projects financed), where the national administration and the Delegation of the EU will be interviewed.

In addition, the reviewers will liaise with the OIE in Paris and the FAO in Rome. A provision is made for visits deemed necessary in Europe, and for report preparation in country of residence.

e. **Phase 1**- Desk study phase, to prepare an inventory of E&T interventions during the 7th and 8th EDF, and to prepare detailed methodology for assessment. Criteria should be proposed to guide the choice of types of interventions to be analysed and its geographic spread, as well as a set of indicators and measurement concepts to be applied during the field evaluations in beneficiary countries.

**Phase 2**- Field phase to analyse in selected beneficiary countries EC supported sector programmes, projects and other specific interventions as well as programmes with a regional dimension (where applicable). The analysis shall include assessments of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the selected programmes, projects, and other interventions or support actions.

**Phase 3**- Analysis and reporting will take place immediately after the field phase. A synthesis report will summarise the findings of phases 1 and 2, will elaborate on key issues and present the lessons learned. The provisional results of this evaluation will be presented, during this phase at a seminar to be organised in Brussels for Commission Services as well as for MS-specialists and E&T practitioners.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

This section will clearly indicate the role of the different parties involved, namely of the evaluation manager, the other NGO personnel, the evaluator, the local counterparts and stakeholders. The section will also establish who is responsible for the collection of data and other documents necessary for the evaluation. When specific consultation mechanisms are required, e.g. working groups, this section will indicate the composition of the WG and its responsibilities. A working group following an evaluation is suggested when the evaluation has a cross-cutting dimension (i.e. in a country evaluation, in a sector evaluation, in a programme evaluation), or when it is conducted internally to increase the independency of the assessment.

The usual division of tasks between the evaluation manager and the evaluator is as follows:

**Evaluation Manager**
- Preparation of T.O.R
- Schedule meetings, accompany + brief/debrief team, facilitate data collection
- Coordinate follow-up
- Ensure dissemination of the lessons learnt

**Evaluator**
- Choosing the experts of the Team
- Identify the stakeholders
- Finalising the methodology exp. the methods for data analysis and gathering, and for analysis of findings
- Gathering the relevant documentation
- Planning the work and the field visits
This section will outline the type of expertise required to carry out the evaluation. Please note that the evaluation team should be composed of at least two people, combining the technical knowledge of the subject of the project/programme to be evaluated with sociological skills. All experts, or at least the team leader will also have to possess strong evaluation skills. When the project is capacity/organisational development-oriented, it is advisable to include an expert of qualitative analysis in the team. The use of both local and international experts should be foreseen and indicated. Local experts are usually involved in the field visits and during participatory evaluation when specific knowledge of the local communities is an advantage. It is also useful to specify the input required by the each expert.

**Ex:**

a. **For the evaluation of a Micro-project programme:**
   - A community development expert with experience in programmes operating through Local Government management. Expertise and knowledge of social infrastructure and decentralised policy. The consultant is expected to have a relevant degree in a social science subject (35 m/d).
   - An institutional strengthening/capacity building expert with a relevant qualification and experience in management issues, especially in a decentralised context (35 m/d).
   - A community development expert with experience in community water supply/sanitation programmes and participatory approaches to community involvement (35 m/d).

b. **For the evaluation of a pan-African programme for the control of the epizootic disease:**
   - The evaluation team should comprise at least four members each of whom should have a university degree, and preferably a higher degree in a relevant discipline. It is proposed that the members have the following profiles:
     - An agricultural economist, with a particular experience in the field of animal production/health economics.
     - A specialist of the organisation of livestock services, preferably with an experience related to animal health services.
     - A veterinarian experienced with epizootic diseases and knowledgeable with epidemic-surveillance.
     - A Communication and information management expert with an experience in rural communication and/or development support communication.

Proven experience of every team member in development cooperation is needed, and in particular in the evaluation of complex projects.

c. **For the impact evaluation of a community development programme:**
   - Social science and participatory community development
   - Field experience in non formal education techniques and qualitative methods such as participatory rural appraisal and group dynamic techniques
   - Expertise in rural engineering (local expert)
   - Expertise in gender and poverty reduction (local expert)
REPORTING AND FEEDBACK

This section includes the type of reports and presentations that the evaluator will have to submit during the study. They represent the outputs of an evaluation study. The reports are usually submitted in correspondence to the completion of a specific phase. Other presentations (such as briefings notes, methodological notes, aide-memoire) can be submitted together or in preparation of a specific phase. The number of pages and copies and the language, should be also indicated. At least for the end of evaluation report, the format and structure should be provided as annex to the ToR. For each of the reports to be submitted, it is a good practise to indicate the time by which the feedback will be provided.

Ex:

a. **Inception report**: The inception report will be regarded as a working document and its format must reflect this requirement. It should be a maximum of 10 pages. The report will be based on a dossier comprising financing proposals, financing Agreement, various Work programmes and reports as well as preliminary discussions with the Regional Authorising Officer, the EC Lead Delegation in Nairobi, Staff of the IBAR Office, the PCU, the Office of the Regional Coordination and other key project personnel met.

   **Aide memoire**: An aide memoire will be presented to a workshop at the end of the field work. It will include a concise self-contained summary with major conclusions and corresponding recommendations clearly listed.

   **Main report**: The final report should follow as closely as possible the format of evaluation reports (Annex C). The report of the MTR will include: (a) a concise, self-contained executive summary of four pages with recommendations, (b) a main report of a maximum of 75 pages, (c) annexes, (d) a list of content, (e) a list of all the used acronyms, (e) maps.

   Twenty (20) of the draft final report will be presented. The main text of the draft report should be in English with the executive summary in French and English (4 pages each). Forty-five (45) copies of the final report will be submitted. The main text of final report will be presented in English and French (20 and 25 copies respectively). Appendices may be presented in any of the two languages.

b. The team leader is responsible for submitting:

   - An **end-of-mission report** to be submitted to the BoT before the evaluation team disperses.
   
   - The **draft version of the evaluation report** (based on EC format) to be submitted to the BoT within 30 days of the completion of the field mission. Comments on the draft will require about three weeks and will result in the production of a revised draft.
   
   - **Final consolidated report** to be submitted within 21 calendar days of the receipt of comments on the draft.

c. The consultant will provide the following reports:

   - The **Inception report**: At the end of Phase 1 (it largely prepares the field phase). 10 copies in English or French.
   
   - The **country reports**: In draft thirty days after the end of the respective field missions: (maximum 50 pages each including 3-5 pages executive summary): 10 copies in English or French or Portuguese, depending on the country; 3-5 page executive summary (in all three languages).

   The **draft synthesis report**. One month after the draft country reports: maximum 25 pages.
country studies into a broader perspective, and identify clearly the key issues arising.

- A short résumé of two pages suitable for wider distribution should be provided separately: a model is attached.

- The final report will be submitted in 20 copies in English and in French, as well as in electronic form (formatted in commonly used word processors like "Word").

**TIME SCHEDULE AND BUDGET**

This section includes the indication of the total duration of the evaluation, timeframe and period in which the evaluation will have to be carried out, and the approximate time devoted to each of the evaluation phases. When a WG is foreseen the schedule of the WG meetings will be included here. This section will also include the overall budget for the study and the typology of costs that are covered.

Ex:

a. The duration of the evaluation study will be six weeks, including travel time. It will consist of five weeks field mission to projects sites and one week in Nairobi. On average, each project evaluation will take some three days.

b. The evaluation study will start in July 2201 and will have a total duration of 9 months with the following distribution:

   - **First phase**: 3 months from the signature of the contract
   - **Second phase**: 4 months from the end of the first phase
   - **Third phase**: 2 months from the end of the second phase

The evaluator will have to meet the working group at least:

- At the starting of the evaluation
- 2 weeks after the end of the phase 1
- At week 10 of the phase 2
- At week 5 of the phase 3

**ANNEXES**

This section should include references for the evaluators. This could be the full description of the project; the geographical map of the project sites; the list of relevant documentation to be consulted; the list of people to be visited (stakeholders); methodological guidelines for assessing specific aspects (i.e., checklist of questions, the methodology to be adopted for gender analysis; environmental impact, etc); and it should include the report formats.

Ex:

a. Annexes provided in the evaluation of a pan-African programme for the control of the epizootic disease:

   - Annex A: Detailed description of the programme and budget breakdown
   - Annex B: Implementation stage of the country projects
   - Annex C: Format of the final Report

b. Annexes provided in the impact evaluation of a community development programme:

   - Annexes provided in the impact evaluation of a community development programme:
   - Annex 1: Evaluation report format
   - Annex 2: Glossary
Annex 7: EVALUATION REPORTS FORMAT

The evaluation reports should be based on existing or re-designed LogFrames, which should always be annexed to the reports. However, their purposes and target audience should also determine the structure of evaluation reports. Below a format based on the EC model for the evaluation reports is provided.

**Executive Summary**

Length: 5-6 pages

The executive summary is an essential part of the report: it is more influential and has higher readership than the main body of the report. It should focus on the main purpose and issues of the evaluation, emphasise performance highlights, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learnt and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

The executive summary should contain information on: (a) Purpose of the evaluation; (b) Context of the evaluation; (c) Methodology; (d) Analysis of main results; (e) Conclusions and recommendations.

**Introduction**

Length: 1-2 pages

Briefly describe the purpose of the report and the scope and context of the project being evaluated. Acknowledgements to those who contributed to the evaluation can be included.

**Findings**

Length: this is the longest section of the report, 30 pages

Findings constitute statements based on the information collected. The core of the report should follow the five evaluation criteria, describing the facts and interpreting or analysing them in accordance with the key questions pertinent to each criteria.

i. **Relevance**: whether the design of the project was originally, and still is, sound, i.e. it targets the real needs and problems of the intended beneficiaries.

ii. **Efficiency**: whether the same results could have been achieved at lower costs; whether there might have been different, more appropriate ways of achieving the same results.

iii. **Effectiveness**: whether the specific objectives were in fact achieved and the planned benefits received by the beneficiaries; whether the results achieved lead to the project purpose.

iv. **Impact**: refers to the wider outcomes for target beneficiaries as well as for a larger group of persons or for society as a whole; the successes and failures in achieving the overall objectives, and the main reasons why.

v. **Sustainability**: whether the flow of benefits to the beneficiaries, and to society generally, is likely to continue or not, and why.
Conclusions and recommendations

Length: 3-6 pages

Conclusions describe the results achieved and how they compare with the expectations set out during project planning and design phases. Recommendations are statements derived from the evidence that prescribe who should do what in the future, and provide suggestions for introducing improvements and/or identify matters for follow-up. Wherever possible, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation.

The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. Recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the project, and of the resources available to implement them both locally and in the Commission.

Recommendations should be carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the NGOs’ structures (the evaluation managers, desk officers, national/regional co-ordinators, heads of project).

Annexes

The report should generally include the following annexes:

Conclusions describe the results achieved and how they compare with the expectations set out during project planning and design phases. Recommendations are statements derived from the evidence that prescribe who should do what in the future, and provide suggestions for introducing improvements and/or identify matters for follow-up. Wherever possible, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation.

1. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
2. The composition of the evaluation team (CVs should be shown, better if summarised)
3. Logical Framework matrices (original and possibly improved/updated)
4. Technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses)
5. Map of project area, if relevant
6. List of persons met/organisations consulted
7. Literature and documentation consulted
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